International Scholars Journals

International Journal of Virology and Parasitology, Vol. 6 (1), pp. 001-004, January, 2017. Available online at www.internationalscholarsjournals.org © International Scholars Journals

Review

Advancement of Non Edible Oil (*Jatropha carcus)* Seeds For Development of Surfactants and Their Utilization in Pest Control Management

Gulab Chand Shah[1]*, Ganesh Pawar[1], Rakesh Arya[2]

[1]Non-Wood Forest Product Division, Tropical Forest Research Institute Jabalpur, PO-RFRC, 482021 India

[2]Sobt, Rgpv, Bhopal Mp India

Accepted 16 October, 2016

Natural toxins are a reserve of new substance prospectus of pesticides, as well as environmentally and toxicologically safer molecules than many of the currently used pesticides. Furthermore, they often have molecular goal sites that are not exploited by presently marketed pesticides. There are highly doing well products based on natural compounds in the major pesticide classes. These contain the herbicide glufosinate (synthetic phosphinothricin), the spinosad insecticides, and the strobilurin fungicides. These and other examples of currently marketed natural product-based pesticides, as well as natural toxins that show promise as pesticides from our own research are discussed. the materialization of drug resistant parasites and insecticide resistant mosquito strains, along with numerous strength, environmental, and ecological side effects of many element agents, decorated the necessitate to build up substitute tools that either correspond or substitute predictable pest classify approaches.

Keywords: IPM, Biopesticides*, Jatropha carcus, OECD,* pests

INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we discuss the challenges as well as opportunities for Integrated Pest Management (IPM) in the developing economies, with emphasis on the India. We focal point on a set of crop protection tools well-known as biopesticides. We are worried in particular through understanding the factors that hinder or smooth the progress of the commercialization and use of new biopesticide foodstuffs (Palle et al., 2013). Over the subsequently 30 years, crop fabrication will have to enlarge significantly to meet the needs of a rising human population. This has to be done without damaging the other community goods surroundings and common that unindustrialized brings (Rahman et al., 2012), in attendance will be no 'hoary bullet' solution to the awaiting food construction brave. To a certain extent, a sequence of innovations be obliged to be residential to meet the singular needs of farmers according to their local situation (Wilkins et al., 2000). Tetraploid cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.) has been the most important commercial crop and is sophisticated in about 100 countries. It provides source of revenue for more than 200 million people with an once a year contribution of $500 billion (Oerke 2006). Besides living being the strength of character of the textile industry, cotton and its by-product are also part of the domestic animals feed, seed-oil, fertilizers, paper with other consumer products

*Corresponding Author's Email: gulab777@gmail.com

(Amudha et al., 2011). Just about, 85% of cotton productivity is jeopardized by the happening of various biotic stresses such as vermin, weeds and pathogens (Bastiaans et al., 2008). Surrounded by different bug vermin of cotton, bollworms, sap sucking pests, shoot, leaf and foliar feeders are the major insects which source significant damage to the crop productivity. Sap-sucking pests, viz., jassids (*Amrasca devastans*), whiteflies (*Bemisia tabaci*) and aphids (*Aphis gossypii*), reason serious hurt to the crop both openly and by performing arts as vectors for unusual pathogens (Oerke et al., 1994), in addition, these insects are easier said than done to control using the predictable pesticide regimes outstanding to their rapid revision and enlargement of confrontation to the insecticides [(Elsevier et al., 2008).

Biopesticides

Biopesticides are a fastidious group of crop protection utensils used in IPM. There is no formally arranged definition of a biopesticide. We define a biopesticide as a bulk-produced agent artificial from a living microorganism or a natural manufactured goods and sold for the organize of plant vermin (this definition encompasses the majority entities classed as biopesticides inside the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries, see, for example, (Tidke and Sane 1962). Examples of some Biopesticides fall into three different types according to the energetic substance: (I) microorganisms; (II) biochemicals; and (III) semi chemicals. The US Environmental Protection Agency as well classes some transgenes as biopesticides. Biopesticides have a range of gorgeous properties that make them good machinery of IPM. Most are selective; produce little or no toxic residue, and progress costs are significantly lesser than those of unadventurous synthetic substance pesticides (Chakravarthy et al., 2012). Vicinity to the goal pest, giving an element of self perpetuating control. Biopesticides can be functional with farmers' presented spray equipment and many are apposite for local scale production. The disadvantages of biopesticides include a slower rate of kill compared with conformist chemical pesticides, shorter persistence in the situation and susceptibility to unfavourable environmental conditions. Because most biopesticides are not as efficacious as square chemical pesticides, they are not matched for use as stand-alone treatments. However, their selectivity and shelter mean that they can contribute evocatively to incremental improvements in pest control (Bharathi et al., 2011). A superior example is the entomopathogenic fungus *B. bassiana*, which is being used in combination among invertebrate predators against two-spotted spider mites on greenhouse crops (Hajek 2004). Spider mites are routinely managed using standard releases of predators, but there are often periods in the season when organize breaks down. In the past, growers relied on conventional pesticides as a accompanying behavior but this has become useless because of pesticide resistance and it can have knock-on effects on other insect natural enemies. *Beauveria bassiana* is effective against spider mites, has a little harvest interval, and is compatible with the use of predators. So it works well as an IPM component and is now the not compulsory supplementary treatment for spider mite on greenhouse crops crosswise Europe (Van Emden et al., 2004).

Biopesticide Commercialization

Universal there are about 1400 biopesticide foodstuffs being sold (Marrone 2007). At present, there are 68 biopesticide vigorous substances registered in the EU and 202 in the USA. The EU biopesticides consist of 34 microbials, 11 biochemicals and 23 semiochemicals (European Union Pesticides Database (EUPD) (2010), while the USA portfolio comprises 102 microbials, 52 biochemicals and 48 semiochemicals (United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) (2010). To put this into circumstance, these biopesticide harvest represent just 2.5 per cent of the total pesticide market. (Bailey et al., 2010). Marrone (Marrone 2007), has estimated the biopesticides segment currently to have a 5 year compound yearly growth rate of 16 per cent (compared with 3% for synthetic pesticides), which is expected to produce a global market of $10 billion by 2017. Though, the market may call for to increase substantially additional than this if biopesticides are to amuse yourself a full role in reducing our overreliance on synthetic chemical pesticides. Companies will only develop biopesticide foodstuffs if there is profit in doing so. correspondingly, the decision for a farmer whether or not to adopt a narrative technology can be thought of in economic terms as a cost-benefit assessment of the profits to be made from using the narrative versus the current technology. A number of facial appearances of the agricultural market make it difficult for companies to invest in developing new biopesticide harvest and, at the same time, make it hard for farmers to decide regarding adopting the new technology:

- Lack of profit from niche market goods
- Fixed expenses.
- Farmers' risk repugnance
- IPM portfolio economies.

Authoritarian Barriers to Biopesticide Commercialization

Biopesticides take in a very wide range of breathing and non-living entities that vary markedly in their basic properties, such as composition, mode of exploit, fate and behaviour in the atmosphere and so forth. They are grouped together by governments for the purposes of regulating their agreement and use. These regulations are in place: firstly, to look after human and environmental shelter; and secondly, to distinguish products and thereby make certain that manufacturers supply biopesticides of constant and reliable quality. The EU also requires that the usefulness of a biopesticide product is quantified and proved in order to support label claims. Only authorized biopesticide products can be used legally for crop fortification. The conclusion whether or not to authorize a biopesticide product is made on the basis of expert opinion residing within the dictatorial authority. When the regulators lack proficiency with biopesticides, they tend to delay making a decision and may request the applicant to provide them with more data. There is also a risk that the regulator using the chemical pesticide listing model requests in sequence that is not apposite. Some regulatory authorities, the UK, for illustration, have approved that basing the regulatory system for biopesticides on a chemical pesticides model has been a barrier to biopesticide commercialization (Advisory Committee on Pesticides (ACP). (2004). A key question is whether the manager, having recognized a dilemma, is able to do something about it. Social science theory indicates that govern-ment regulators and other practical organizations are vulnerable to 'goal displacement', during which they turn their focus away from achieving outcomes and as a substitute concentrate supplementary on internal processes (Merton 1968).

Future Guidelines

Governments are likely to continue magnificent strict safety criteria on conformist chemical pesticides, and this will result in fewer products on the market. This will create a real opening for biopesticide companies to help fill the gap, even if there will also be major challenges for biopesticide companies, most of which are small and medium enterprises with partial resources for R&D, product registration and promotion. Perhaps the biggest advances in biopesticide development will come from beginning to end exploiting knowledge of the genomes of pests and their natural enemies. Researchers are already using molecular-based technologies to reconstruct the evolution of microbial ordinary enemies and pull apart the molecular basis for their pathogenicity (Herniou et al., 2003; Wang and St Leger 2005), to understand how weeds compete with crop plants and develop resistance to herbicides (Muthumeenakshi et al., 2007), and to identify and characterize the receptor proteins used by insects to detect semiochemicals (Tranel and Horvath 2009). This information will present us new insights into the ecological interactions of pests and biopesticides and lead to new promise for humanizing biopesticide efficacy, for example, through strain improvement of microbial natural enemies (Pelletier and Leal 2009). As the genomes of supplementary pests become sequenced, the use of techniques such as RNA intrusion for pest supervision is also likely to be put into viable practice (Aiuchi et al., 2008).

REFERENCES

Advisory Committee on Pesticides (ACP). (2004). Final report of the sub-group of the advisory committee on pes-ticides on: alternatives to conventional pest control techniques in the UK: a scoping study of the potential for their wider use. Advisory Committee on Pesticides, York. See http://www.pesticides.gov.uk/uploadedfiles/Web_Assets/ACP/ACP_alternatives_web_subgrp_report.pdf (accessed 15 April 2013).

Aiuchi D, Inami K, Kuramochi K, Koike M, Sugimoto M, Tani M, Shinya R (2008). A new method for producing hybrid strains of the entomo-pathogenic fungusVerticillium lecanii (Lecanicillium spp.)

Amudha J, Balasubramani G, Malathi VG, Monga D, Kranthi KR (2011). Cotton leaf curl virus resistance transgenics with antisense coat protein gene (AV1). Curr Sci 101: 300–307.

Bailey KL, Boyetchko SM, Langle T (2010). Social and economic drivers shaping the future of biological control: a Canadian perspective on the factors affecting the development and use of microbial biopesticides. Biol. Control 52, 221 – 229. (doi:10.1016/j.biocontrol. 2009.05.003).

Bastiaans L, Paolini R, Baumann DT (2008). Focus on ecological weed management: what is hindering adoption? Weed Res. 48, 481–491. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-3180. 2008.00662.x)

Bharathi Y, Vijaya KS, Pasalu IC, Balachandran SM, Reddy VD, (2011). Pyramided rice lines harbouring Allium sativum (asal)andGalanthus nivalis (gna) lectin genes impart enhanced resistance against major sap-sucking pests. J Biotechnol 152: 63–71.

Chakravarthy VSK, Reddy TP, Reddy VD, Rao KV (2012). Current status of genetic engineering in cotton (Gossypium hirsutum L): an assessment. Crit Rev Biotech DOI: 10 3109/07388551 2012 743502.

Elsevier Science Publishers BV, Speranza CI, Kiteme B, Wiesmann U (2008). Droughts and famines: the underlying factors and the causal links among agro-pastoral households in semiarid Makueni district, Kenya. Glob. Environ. Change 18, 220–233. (doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2007.05.001)

European Union Pesticides Database (EUPD) (2010). Seehttp://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/protection/evaluation/database_act_subs_en.htm (accessed 28 April 2013).

Hajek, A (2004). Natural enemies: an introduction to biological control. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Heap, I. 2010 The International Survey of Herbicide Resistant Weeds. See www.weedscience.org/In.asp (accessed 29 June 2013).

Herniou EA, Olszewski JA, Cory JS, O'Reilly DR. (2003). The genome sequence and evolution of bacu-loviruses. Annu. Rev. Entomol. 48, 211 – 234. (doi:10. 1146/annurev.ento.48.091801.112756)

Marrone PG (2007). Barriers to adoption of biological control agents and biological pesticides. CAB Reviews: perspectives in agriculture, veterinary science, nutrition and natural resources , vol. 2, no. 15. Wallingford, UK: CABI Publishing.

Merton RK (1968). Social theory and social structure. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Muthumeenakshi S, Sreenivasaprasad S, Rogers CW, Challen MP, Whipps JM (2007). Analysis of cDNA transcripts from Coniothyrium minitans reveals a diverse array of genes involved in key processes during sclerotial mycoparasitism. Fungal Genet. Biol. 44, 1262 – 1284. (doi:10.1016/j.fgb.2007.07.011)

Oerke EC (2006). Crop losses to pests. J Agric Sci 144: 31–43.

Oerke EC, Dehne HW, Schoenbeck F, Weber A (1994). Crop production and crop protection: estimated losses in major food and cash crops. Amsterdam, The Netherlands:

Palle SR, Campbell LM, Pandeya D, Puckhaber L, Tollack LK, (2013). RNAi mediated ultra-low gossypol cottonseed trait: performance of transgenic lines under field conditions. Plant Biotechnol J 11: 296–304.

Pelletier J, Leal WS (2009). Genome analysis and expression patterns of odorant-binding proteins from the southern house mosquito Culex pipiens quinquefasciatus. PLoS ONE 4, e6237. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0006237)

Rahman M, Shaheen T, Tabbasam N, Iqbal MA, Ashraf M, (2012). Cotton genetic resources A review. Agron Sustain Dev 32: 419–432.

Tidke PM, Sane PV (1962). Jassid resistance and morphological of cotton leaf. Ind Cot Grow Rev 16: 323–327.

Tranel PJ, Horvath DP (2009). Molecular biology and genomics: new tools for weed science. Bioscience 59, 207 – 215. (doi:10.1525/bio.2009.59.3.5).

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) (2010). Regulating biopesticides. See http://www.epa.gov/opp00001/biopesticides/index.htm (accessed 29 June 2013).

Van Emden HF, Service MW (2004). Pest and vector control. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wang, C, St Leger RJ (2005). Developmental and transcriptional responses to host and non-host cuticles by the specific locust pathogen Metarhizium anisopliae sf. acridum. Eukaryot. Cell 4, 937 – 947. (doi:10.1128/ EC.4.5.937-947.2005)

Wilkins TA, Rajasekaran K, Anderson DM (2000). Cotton biotechnology. Crit Rev Plant Sci 19: 511–550.