Advances in Bioresearch
Adv. Biores., Vol 15 (2) March 2024: 396-408
©2024 Society of Education, India
Print ISSN 0976-4585; Online ISSN 2277-1573
Journal's URL:http://www.soeagra.com/abr.html
CODEN: ABRDC3
DOI: 10.15515/abr.0976-4585.15.2.396408

Advances in Bioresearch

REVIEW ARTICLE

The Ecological Impact of Pesticides on Non-Target Organisms in Agricultural Ecosystems

Shamim Akhter[1*], V. Krishna Naik[2], Baratha Jyothi Naladi[3], Aparna Rathore[4], Pratibha Yadav[5], Deepa Lal[6]

[1]Department of Zoology, Govt College for women Parade Ground Jammu (Jammu and Kashmir)
[2]Department of Environmental sciences, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Guntur -522510, Andhra Pradesh
[3]Department Zoology, Maris Stella College (Autonomous) Vijayawada Andhra Pradesh
[4]Department of Botany, Kanoria PG Mahila Mahavidyalaya, Jaipur, Rajasthan, Affiliated under University of Rajasthan, Jaipur
[5]Mata Jijabai Govt PG Girls College, Indore (M.P)
[6]Department of Horticulture, Krishi Vignan Kendra, ICAR – Central Institute for Cotton Research, Nagpur, Maharashtra
Corresponding Author: Shamim Akhter
Email: akhtshamim222@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Hailed for their ability to reduce agricultural pest burdens and increase crop yields, pesticides have evolved into essential instruments in contemporary agriculture. However, because of their widespread use, there are growing concerns about their ecological effects, especially with relation to unintended species living in agroecosystems. This thorough analysis aims to negotiate the complex and wide-ranging impacts of pesticides on creatures that are not targets, clarifying the ecological implications and molecular underpinnings of pesticide exposure across many taxonomic groups and trophic levels. Pesticide-induced ecological disruptions are mostly responsible for the decline of populations of non-target creatures, which include a wide range of taxa, including vertebrates and arthropods. Because they are essential to the functioning of ecosystems because they regulate insect populations, cycle nutrients, and facilitate pollination, invertebrates are particularly vulnerable to the direct and secondary effects of pesticides. Pesticide exposure reduces ecosystem resilience, changes community dynamics, and accelerates population reductions in a variety of organisms, including predatory arthropods, bees, and butterflies. Furthermore, bird populations—which are essential to agroecosystems—face a variety of difficulties as a result of habitat degradation, food chain disruptions, and reproductive impairments brought on by pesticides. Pesticides are harmful in ways that go beyond killing; they affect the physiology and behaviour of creatures that are not intended targets. Mechanistic understandings obtained from toxicological research clarify the complex mechanisms by which pesticides cause harm. Neurotoxic pesticides cause impairments in invertebrate locomotion, eating, and reproductive behaviours by upsetting neurotransmitter signalling cascades. At the same time, pesticide-induced oxidative stress and DNA damage in vertebrates portend catastrophic outcomes for genetic diversity and population viability. Moreover, immunosuppression, endocrine disturbance, and developmental anomalies are examples of sublethal consequences that increase the ecological cost of pesticide exposure. Chemical agents and target species engage in evolutionary arms races as a result of the pernicious threat of pesticide resistance. The effectiveness of pesticide interventions is undermined by genetic processes that confer resistance among insect populations, such as metabolic detoxification and target-site insensitivity. Furthermore, unintentionally entangled in the evolutionary whirlwind, non-target animals may die from collateral damage or develop resistance mechanisms as a result of ongoing pesticide exposure. The use of integrated pest management (IPM) offers hope in the middle of the ecological debacle caused by the overuse of pesticides. IPM solutions improve agricultural sustainability by reducing the negative effects of pesticides on non-target organisms by coordinating biological, cultural, and chemical control techniques. Biopesticides provide focused pest management with little collateral harm to non-target organisms because they are derived from naturally existing organisms or substances. Through ecological engineering, cultural practices including crop rotation, intercropping, and habitat diversity increase ecosystem resilience and reduce pest impacts. Precision application systems and remote sensing are two more precision agricultural technologies that maximise pesticide use efficiency while lowering environmental pollution and minimising exposure to non-target organisms. It is possible to reconcile the demands of environmental conservation with agricultural productivity by adopting agroecological concepts. The restoration of ecosystems rich in biodiversity, like riparian buffers, hedgerows, and cover

crops, promotes the growth of natural enemies of pests and revitalises the provision of ecosystem services. Moreover, implementing conservation tillage techniques and agroforestry systems improves soil health, reduces erosion, and sequesters carbon, all of which lessen the ecological footprint of agriculture. To sum up, understanding the ecological nuances of interactions between pesticides and non-target organisms emphasises how important it is to make decisions based on data and work with other disciplines to lead agricultural practices in the direction of a sustainable and ecologically harmonious future. Stakeholders may reduce the harmful ecological effects of pesticides and promote agricultural sustainability in a changing global environment by adopting holistic approaches that put biodiversity protection, habitat restoration, and ecosystem resilience first.
Keywords: *Ecological impact, Pesticides, Non-target organisms, Agricultural ecosystems, Biodiversity, Integrated pest management (IPM), Soil microorganisms, Pollinators, Trophic interactions, Pesticide toxicity*

Received 24.12.2023 Revised 01.01.2024 Accepted 30.03.2024

How to cite this article:
Shamim Akhter, V. Krishna Naik, Baratha Jyothi Naladi, Aparna Rathore, Pratibha Yadav, Deepa Lal. The Ecological Impact of Pesticides on Non-Target Organisms in Agricultural Ecosystems. *Adv. Biores.*, Vol 15(2) March 2024: 396-408.

INTRODUCTION

Pesticides have been an essential part of modern agriculture since their invention because they provide a practical way to reduce insect pressure and increase crop yields (1). But the haphazard use of these pesticides has sparked serious ecological questions, especially about the inadvertent effects on organisms that are not intended targets in agricultural environments. In-depth analysis of the complex and wide-ranging ecological effects of pesticides on non-target creatures is the goal of this thorough review, which aims to clarify the underlying mechanisms and ecological consequences for a variety of taxonomic groupings and trophic levels. Non-target creatures play a vital role in the resilience, biodiversity, and overall functioning of agroecosystems. They encompass a wide range of taxa, from microscopic soil bacteria to endearing vertebrates. Among these, invertebrates are essential to pollination, nutrient cycling, and biological pest control, among other ecological processes (2). However, their vulnerability to toxicity caused by pesticides presents a serious threat to both their numbers and the ecosystem services they offer. Pesticide exposure poses a serious threat to bees, who are vital pollinators that help the world's food production. Negative impacts on foraging behaviour, navigation, and reproductive success have been noted. Predatory arthropods, which are essential for controlling pest populations, also face death and sublethal consequences from pesticide residues, which upsets trophic relationships and the stability of ecosystems. Bird populations, which comprise a wide variety of species that live in agricultural environments, are also threatened by pesticide pollution. Pesticide exposure results in reproductive problems (3), habitat degradation, and decreased food availability for ducks, songbirds, and raptors alike. A notable example of the long-lasting effects of pesticide toxicity on avian biodiversity is the problem of eggshell thinning that was caused by organochlorine pesticides in the middle of the 20th century, which severely reduced populations of many bird species. There are several different mechanisms underlying pesticide toxicity, many of which involve complex metabolic pathways. Neurotoxic pesticides cause impairments in eating, reproductive, and movement in invertebrates by interfering with their neurotransmitter signaling (4). Meanwhile, the physiological processes, reproductive success, and population survival of vertebrates are jeopardised by oxidative stress and DNA damage caused by pesticides. The ecological cost of pesticide exposure is further increased by sublethal effects, which increase the susceptibility of non-target organisms to environmental stressors. These consequences include immunosuppression, endocrine disturbance, and developmental abnormalities. Target species and chemical pesticides are engaged in an evolutionary arms race that makes ecological sustainability and pest management more difficult (5). Pesticide resistance, which is caused by genetic mechanisms such metabolic detoxification and target-site insensitivity, reduces the effectiveness of chemical interventions and calls for increased pesticide use. This increase in turn feeds the formation of secondary pest outbreaks and increases exposure to non-target organisms, thus sustaining a cycle of ecological disruption and chemical dependency. The development of integrated pest management (IPM), a comprehensive strategy for pest management that places an emphasis on ecological balance and a decreased need for chemical pesticides, is a reaction to these difficulties (6). IPM tactics improve agricultural sustainability by reducing the negative effects of pesticides on non-target organisms through the integration of biological, cultural, and chemical control measures. Because they are made from naturally existing organisms or substances, biopesticides minimise ecological hazards by providing focused pest control with little collateral damage. Crop rotation, intercropping, and habitat diversification are examples of cultural practices that increase ecosystem resilience and biological pest management, hence lowering the need for chemical treatments. To sum up, understanding the ecological nuances of interactions between pesticides and non-target organisms emphasises how important it is to make decisions based on data and to work with several disciplines to manage agricultural pests. Stakeholders may reduce the harmful ecological effects of pesticides and promote agricultural sustainability in a fast changing environment by adopting holistic approaches that put biodiversity protection, habitat restoration, and ecosystem resilience first.

Types of Pesticides and Their Mechanisms of Action

Pesticides are a diverse range of chemical substances that are carefully designed to lessen the negative effects of pests on crops and other important resources. This section provides a comprehensive understanding of the ecological implications of pesticides within agricultural ecosystems by elucidating the various kinds of pesticides and outlining their complex mechanisms of action.

Insecticides:

An essential component of pest management plans, insecticides target a wide range of arthropod pests that degrade crop quality and yield (7). These chemical agents work in a variety of ways, each designed to take advantage of weaknesses in the physiological and biochemical systems of their intended insects. Inhibiting the enzyme acetylcholinesterase (AChE), which is essential for the breakdown of the neurotransmitter acetylcholine at cholinergic synapses, is how organophosphate and carbamate pesticides cause neurotoxicity. These substances cause hyperstimulation of cholinergic receptors by preventing acetylcholine breakdown, which causes paralysis and ultimately death in insects (8). Pyrethroid insecticides cause recurrent nerve firing, paralysis, and death by delaying the opening of voltage-gated sodium channels, a process that is facilitated by the natural pyrethrins or their synthetic analogues. Furthermore, by mimicking or suppressing natural hormones, insect growth regulators (IGRs) interfere with the development and reproduction of insects. This prevents moulting, metamorphosis, or egg production without causing acute toxicity to non-target animals.

Herbicides:

Herbicides are essential instruments in weed control programmes because they kill undesirable plants that take resources away from crops and reduce crop output (9). These chemical agents work through a variety of mechanisms to interfere with basic physiological functions of plants, which prevents the plants from growing, developing, and eventually surviving. Herbicides like atrazine and diuron are examples of photosystem II (PSII) inhibitors. They attach to the QB-binding protein within the D1 protein complex of PSII, disrupting photosynthetic electron transport and causing reactive oxygen species to be produced, which damages chloroplasts. In plants that are vulnerable, acetolactate synthase (ALS) inhibitors, such as sulfonylureas and imidazolinones, prevent the manufacture of branched-chain amino acids needed for cell division and protein synthesis. This causes stunted growth and chlorosis in the affected plants. The broad-spectrum herbicide glyphosate prevents the synthesis of aromatic amino acids and causes systemic plant mortality by inhibiting the enzyme 5-enolpyruvylshikimate-3-phosphate synthase (EPSPS) in the shikimate pathway.

Fungicides:

Fungal diseases present significant risks to crop health and yield stability, thus it's important to apply fungicides sparingly in order to reduce disease outbreaks and production losses (10). These chemical compounds work through a variety of ways to prevent the growth, colonisation, and spread of fungi in agricultural environments. Upon direct contact, contact fungicides—which are typified by elemental sulphur and copper-based compounds—disrupt fungal cell membranes and impede essential cellular functions like hyphal development, enzyme activity, and spore germination. Systemic fungicides, such as azoles and strobilurins, enter plant tissues and obstruct vital fungal metabolic processes, like mitochondrial respiration or ergosterol production, resulting in fungicidal or fungistatic effects. Furthermore, several cellular structures or metabolic pathways within fungal cells are targeted by multisite fungicides like mancozeb and chlorothalonil, which lessens the possibility of resistance development and increases the effectiveness of disease control methods.

Nematicides and Rodenticides:

It is necessary to use specialised chemical agents to lessen the effects of nematodes and rodents on crop productivity and soil health in agricultural settings. Nematicides are designed to fight parasitic nematodes that invade plant roots. They work by interfering with neurotransmission, causing metabolic disturbances, or causing oxidative stress, which ultimately results in the death of the nematode or damage to its reproductive system. Rodenticides use a variety of toxicants to interfere with target organisms' essential physiological functions. They are used to manage rodent populations that endanger agricultural yields, building integrity, or public health. Anticoagulant rodenticides, such as warfarin and brodifacoum, cause lethal haemorrhaging in rodents by inhibiting the function of vitamin K epoxide reductase, an enzyme that is essential for recycling reduced vitamin K. This inhibits blood coagulation processes. To sum up, pesticides are a wide range of chemical substances that are carefully formulated to target particular pest species and lessen the negative effects that these organisms have on environmental sustainability and agricultural output. Through the clarification of the complex mechanisms of action that underlie various pesticide classes, stakeholders can acquire valuable understanding of the ecological consequences of these chemicals and devise well-informed approaches to pest management that strike a balance between environmental stewardship and efficacy in agricultural ecosystems.

Non-Target Organisms in Agricultural Ecosystems

Ecological processes and complex networks of creatures make up agricultural ecosystems, in which non-target organisms are essential to the survival and operation of the ecosystem (11). These species, which range widely in taxonomy from microorganisms to mammals, provide vital ecological functions like pollination, nutrient cycling, biological pest control, and soil fertility maintenance. Evaluating the wider ecological effects of pesticides in agricultural landscapes requires a thorough grasp of the ecological interactions, responses, and composition of non-target organisms.

Invertebrates:

Within agricultural ecosystems, invertebrates constitute a dominating and diversified group of creatures, encompassing a wide range of species with a diversity of ecological interactions and activities (12). By aiding the transport of pollen from bloom to flower, pollinators—such as bees (Apis mellifera), butterflies (Lepidoptera), moths (Heterocera), and beetles (Coleoptera)—play crucial roles in plant reproduction and crop production. Many crop species are able to reproduce successfully because of the specialised morphological and behavioural adaptations that these creatures display for effective pollination. Natural enemies of agricultural pests, predatory insects like ladybirds (Coccinellidae), lacewings (Neuroptera), and parasitoid wasps (Hymenoptera: Ichneumonidae, Braconidae) control pest populations and lessen the need for chemical treatments. By means of predation, parasitism, or host-feeding behaviour, these beneficial insects impose top-down control on pest species, such as aphids (Aphidoidea), caterpillars (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae), and mites (Acari). In agroecosystems, their presence improves biological control services and fosters ecological equilibrium. Decomposer species, such as dung beetles (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae), earthworms (Annelida: Lumbricidae), and springtails (Collembola), are important for the recycling of nutrients and the breakdown of organic matter. They also support soil fertility, ecological resilience, and soil structure. These organisms improve soil aeration and water infiltration rates, release nutrients for plant uptake, and aid in the breakdown of organic waste (13). Their actions also shape microbial communities and soil biogeochemical processes, which in turn affect soil productivity and health in agricultural settings.

Vertebrates:

The broad group of animals known as vertebrates occupy different niches in agricultural ecosystems and engage in a variety of ecological activities and interactions. In agricultural settings, avian populations—which comprise a range of species with diverse habitat preferences and eating habits—help regulate pests, disperse seeds, and reduce weeds. Due to their predation on rodents and small vertebrates, predatory birds like owls (Strigidae) and hawks (Accipitridae) reduce pest populations and crop damage naturally. Through their activities of browsing, grazing, and seed dissemination, mammalian herbivores such as deer (Cervidae), rabbits (Lagomorpha), and rodents (Rodentia) affect the dynamics of vegetation and the structure of plant communities (14). Certain mammals aid in the cycling of nutrients and disturb the soil, while others can cause crop damage or herbivory that could be problematic for agriculture. Furthermore, within agricultural settings, reptiles (Reptilia) and amphibians (Amphibia), such as lizards (Squamata), frogs (Anura), and snakes (Serpentes), perform roles in nutrient cycling, pest control, and ecosystem functioning.

Microorganisms:

Microorganisms have a crucial yet frequently disregarded role in agricultural ecosystems, having a significant impact on the health of the soil, the cycling of nutrients, and the interactions between plants and microbes. Plant roots and soil bacteria, such as phosphate-solubilizing bacteria (Pseudomonas, Bacillus) and nitrogen-fixing rhizobia (Rhizobium, Bradyrhizobium), develop symbiotic relationships that aid in the acquisition of phosphorus and nitrogen, respectively. In agricultural systems, these helpful microbes improve crop productivity, nutrient uptake, and plant growth. Fungal symbionts, including mycorrhizal fungi (Glomeromycota) and endophytic fungi (Ascomycota, Basidiomycota), form mutualistic relationships with plant roots to improve the host plant's capacity to absorb nutrients, absorb water, and withstand stress. In the rhizosphere, mycorrhizal fungi create vast networks of hyphae that aid in the transfer of nutrients from plants to soil, whilst endophytic fungi attach themselves to plant tissues and provide resistance against both biotic and abiotic challenges (15). Furthermore, soil fungi and bacteria are essential for the breakdown of organic matter, the cycling of nutrients, and the inhibition of soil-borne diseases. These processes support soil fertility, ecosystem resilience, and soil structure in agricultural settings. In conclusion, non-target creatures are essential parts of agricultural ecosystems that support biodiversity preservation, the provision of ecosystem services, and sustained agricultural output. In order to assess the broader ecological effects of pesticides and to implement integrated pest management strategies that minimise harm to non-target organisms while promoting ecological sustainability within agricultural landscapes, it is imperative to acknowledge the ecological significance of non-target organisms and their interactions.

Ecological Impacts of Pesticides on Invertebrates

Although pesticides are effective in controlling the intended pests, they can have significant ecological effects on populations of vertebrates and invertebrates that live in agricultural environments. Determining the overall ecological sustainability of pesticide treatments in agricultural landscapes requires an understanding of these effects.

Ecological Impacts on Invertebrates:

The group of organisms known as invertebrates includes a wide range of species that are essential to agricultural environments for functions like pollination, nutrient cycling, and biological pest management. However, because of their close relationships with treated environments and physiological vulnerabilities, they are extremely vulnerable to the harmful effects of pesticides. Particularly susceptible to pesticide exposure are pollinators, including bees (Hymenoptera: Apidae), butterflies (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae), and moths (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). Neonicotinoids and pyrethroids, two neurotoxic pesticides, interfere with their complex sensory and navigational systems, making it more difficult for them to find food, homing behaviours, and colony health. Sublethal effects can reduce pollinator populations and disrupt vital pollination services that are crucial for crop productivity and ecosystem stability (16). These consequences include decreased larval development, altered reproductive physiology, and weakened immunological function. Insects that feed on other insects and act as natural adversaries of agricultural pests are similarly vulnerable to the toxicity caused by pesticides. The effectiveness of contact and systemic insecticides as biological control agents can be compromised by their ability to disturb eating behaviours, reproductive capabilities, and developmental trajectories (17). As a result, reductions in the numbers of natural enemies could encourage the reappearance of pests, requiring higher levels of pesticide use and aggravating ecological imbalances in agroecosystems. Invertebrates that live in the soil, such as earthworms (Annelida: Lumbricidae), springtails (Collembola), and mites (Acari), are essential to the health of the soil and the processes involved in the cycling of nutrients. Through direct toxicity, changes to soil microbial populations, and disturbances to soil physicochemical properties, pesticides can have a negative effect on these organisms. Decreased soil fertility, weakened water penetration rates, and increased vulnerability to erosion and degradation may result from disturbances to soil biodiversity and ecosystem function.

Ecological Impacts on Vertebrates:

Because they live in diverse trophic levels in agricultural ecosystems, vertebrates can be negatively impacted by pesticide exposure in a number of ways, including direct toxicity, food intake, and habitat modification. Pesticide contamination is very dangerous for populations of birds, both resident and migratory. Pesticide-treated seeds, tainted water sources, or polluted prey items can cause acute poisoning or long-term health problems such immunosuppression (18), developmental abnormalities, and reproductive impairments. Furthermore, pesticide residues have the potential to bioaccumulate in avian tissues over time, which could result in biomagnification within food chains and endanger humans and other higher trophic levels. Pesticide exposure may also have an effect on mammalian species, including carnivores (Carnivora), rabbits (Leporidae), and rats (Rodentia). Pesticide-laden baits and crops can be consumed by rodents in particular, which can cause acute toxicity or subsequent poisoning in scavengers and predators (19). Furthermore, pesticide-induced modifications in vegetation dynamics may have unintended consequences for herbivorous mammals, such as altered plant composition, diminished nutritional value, and decreased availability of food. Although they have not been researched as much as birds and mammals, reptiles and amphibians can also be exposed to pesticides. In particular, runoff and spray drift from pesticide treatments may affect aquatic species, causing direct toxicity and water contamination (20). Pesticide residues can be inhaled, applied topically, or consumed by terrestrial species. These exposures can lead to physiological stress, behavioural changes, and even population decreases.

In conclusion, pesticides have the potential to have significant ecological effects on populations of both vertebrates and invertebrates in agricultural habitats. Developing sustainable pest management tactics that minimise harm to non-target creatures while improving agricultural output and ecosystem resilience requires a thorough understanding of these impacts.

Pesticide Contamination in Soil Microorganisms and Its Impact on Trophic Interactions as well as Food Web Dynamics

The presence of pesticides in agricultural soils has a significant impact on soil microorganisms and can have a domino effect on food web dynamics and trophic interactions. This section clarifies the complex interactions that occur in agricultural landscapes between soil microbial populations, pesticide exposure, and ecosystem functioning.

Pesticide Contamination in Soil Microorganisms:

Soil microorganisms, encompassing a plethora of taxa including bacteria, fungi, protozoa, and nematodes, constitute the cornerstone of soil ecosystems, mediating essential processes such as nutrient cycling, organic matter decomposition, and plant-microbe interactions. However, their pivotal roles render them particularly vulnerable to the deleterious effects of pesticide contamination, which can arise from direct application, spray drift, or runoff from treated fields. Pesticides can exert profound perturbations on soil microbial communities, disrupting their structure, diversity, and metabolic activity. Broad-spectrum pesticides, typified by organophosphates and carbamates, can impede the enzymatic activity of soil microorganisms, leading to diminished microbial biomass and altered community composition. Furthermore, systemic pesticides such as neonicotinoids, transported via plant root exudates, can infiltrate soil environments, exerting selective pressures on microbial populations. Pesticides can also interfere with microbial-mediated processes that are essential to the fertility and health of the soil (21). Pesticides can hinder the nitrogen cycle and plants' ability to absorb nutrients by inhibiting mycorrhizal fungi and nitrogen-fixing bacteria. This can have a negative impact on crop yield and the resilience of ecosystems. Furthermore, changes in the makeup of the microbial population might interfere with the rate at which organic matter decomposes, impacting both greenhouse gas emissions and the dynamics of soil carbon sequestration.

Impact on Trophic Interactions:

Pesticide contamination has an impact on soil microorganisms that ripples up through the trophic levels, changing the dynamics within soil food webs. Because pesticides cause pest populations to diminish, predatory and parasitic species such as nematodes, microarthropods, and predatory mites may see decreases in prey abundance. Changes in predator-prey dynamics follow, which have an impact on ecosystem functioning and community structure. Changes in trophic relationships have the potential to ripple across soil food webs, impacting the trophic resources accessible to higher organisms like birds, mammals, and predatory insects. Variations in the quantity of prey and the availability of nutrients in the soil can affect the population dynamics, foraging habits, and reproductive success of animals at higher trophic levels (22). These changes may have an impact on the stability of the ecosystem and the supply of services. Furthermore, changes in trophic relationships may trigger feedback loops in soil ecosystems, which could result in the spread of pest species and the eradication of their natural adversaries. Known as the "pesticide treadmill," this phenomenon weakens the sustainability of agricultural production systems by exacerbating ecological disturbances and sustaining reliance on chemical interventions.

Altered Food Web Dynamics:

Changes in food web dynamics caused by pesticide contamination in soil microorganisms have an impact on ecosystem resilience and the delivery of services (23). A change in the variety and quantity of soil organisms can cause disturbances to the cycles of nutrients and energy, which lowers the stability and productivity of agricultural ecosystems. Additionally, changes in biomass allocation and energy transfer efficiency within soil food webs are triggered by modifications in trophic interactions. Decreases in microbial activity and biomass brought on by pesticides can spread to higher trophic levels, influencing community structure and population dynamics (24). As a result, soil ecosystems' ability to deliver crucial functions including controlling pests, maintaining soil fertility, and cycling nutrients may be jeopardised. Furthermore, pesticide contamination can alter the way pesticides travel in soil ecosystems, affecting how long they remain active, how easily they move, and how bioavailable they are to species that are not their intended targets. Pesticide dynamics can be mediated by soil microbial processes such as volatilization, sorption, and biodegradation, which can influence the fate of the pesticides in the environment and their possible effects on ecosystem health. To sum up, the presence of pesticides in soil microorganisms causes a chain reaction that impacts the dynamics of the food web and trophic interactions in agricultural environments. In order to develop sustainable pest management strategies that minimise damage to soil biodiversity while promoting agricultural output and ecosystem resilience, it is essential to comprehend these intricate relationships.

Mechanisms of Pesticide Toxicity in Non-Target Organisms

Through a number of mechanisms, including the disruption of physiological processes, metabolic pathways, and cellular activities, pesticides cause harmful effects on non-target organisms. Comprehending these mechanisms is vital in evaluating the ecological hazards linked to pesticide application and formulating tactics to alleviate their effects on non-target organisms in agricultural environments.

Neurotoxicity:

The disturbance of nervous system function in non-target organisms is known as neurotoxicity, and it is one of the most researched mechanisms of pesticide carcinogenicity. Numerous pesticides, such as pyrethroids, carbamates, and organophosphates, work by obstructing the central and peripheral nerve systems' neurotransmitter signalling routes. The activity of acetylcholinesterase (AChE), an enzyme required for the hydrolysis of the neurotransmitter acetylcholine, is inhibited by organophosphate and carbamate insecticides (25). These pesticides cause acetylcholine to build up at nerve synapses by blocking AChE, which overstimulates cholinergic receptors and impairs normal nerve function. In non-target creatures, this can show up as signs including tremors, convulsions, paralysis, and finally death. On the other hand, pyrethroid pesticides cause repeated nerve firing and ultimately paralysis by delaying the opening of sodium channels in nerve cells. Furthermore, nicotinic acetylcholine receptor agonists are acted upon by certain neonicotinoid insecticides, causing hyperexcitation of nerve cells and neurotoxic consequences in non-target animals.

Oxidative Stress:

By producing reactive oxygen species (ROS) and interfering with antioxidant defence mechanisms, pesticides can potentially cause oxidative stress in organisms that are not intended targets. ROS can harm lipids, proteins, and nucleic acids, which can result in cellular malfunction and death. Examples of ROS include superoxide radicals, hydrogen peroxide, and hydroxyl radicals. It has been demonstrated that organophosphate and carbamate pesticides cause oxidative stress in non-target animals by increasing ROS production and reducing the activity of antioxidant enzymes such glutathione peroxidase (GPx), catalase (CAT), and superoxide dismutase (SOD). Numerous tissues and organs, including the brain, liver, and reproductive organs, are susceptible to this oxidative damage, which can have a variety of detrimental impacts on health. Similarly, by interfering with photosynthetic processes and suppressing antioxidant enzymes, certain herbicides, like glyphosate and paraquat, can cause oxidative stress in non-target organisms. Furthermore, oxidative stress can be induced by fungicides and rodenticides via a number of different pathways, such as DNA damage, lipid peroxidation, and mitochondrial malfunction.

Endocrine Disruption:

In non-target organisms, several pesticides have the ability to interfere with endocrine signalling pathways, which can change hormone levels, reproductive processes, and developmental outcomes. Endocrine-disrupting chemicals (EDCs) can cause negative effects on development, reproduction, and behaviour by interfering with the synthesis, secretion, transport, binding, action, or removal of hormones in the endocrine system.

It has been demonstrated that organochlorine pesticides, such dieldrin and DDT, interfere with hormone synthesis or metabolism, function as agonists or antagonists of hormone receptors, and alter hormone transport proteins in non-target animals (26). Reproductive abnormalities such as decreased fertility, changed sex ratios, and aberrant development in non-target organisms can result from these impacts.

Comparably, a few herbicides, fungicides, and rodenticides have been linked to possible endocrine disruption in non-target organisms; however, the precise mechanisms of action may differ based on the pesticide's chemical composition and manner of action. To evaluate the ecological risks connected to pesticide usage and create mitigation plans for non-target species, it is imperative to comprehend the possibility of endocrine disruption.

Sub-lethal Effects:

Pesticides can cause long-term physiological, behavioural, and ecological effects on non-target organisms in addition to their acute harm (27). Sublethal impacts can affect an individual's fitness and the survival of the population over time. These consequences can include reductions in feeding, growth, development, immunological function, and navigation abilities. In pollinators like bees and butterflies, for instance, sublethal exposure to neonicotinoid insecticides has been demonstrated to affect foraging behaviour, learning capacity, and memory retention, which in turn reduces colony growth and overwintering success. Similar to this, sublethal herbicide exposure has been connected to modifications in plant-pollinator interactions, altered plant physiology, and changes in the composition of plant communities. These changes can have a domino effect on the structure and function of ecosystems. In general, a variety of intricate routes and interactions within biological systems are involved in the toxicity of pesticides to non-target animals. Comprehending these mechanisms is imperative in evaluating the ecological hazards linked to pesticide application and formulating tactics to alleviate their effects on non-target fauna in farming environments.

Integrated Pest Management Strategies

The term "Integrated Pest Management" (IPM) refers to a comprehensive method of controlling pests that stresses the combination of many techniques to reduce pest populations and minimise harm to non-target creatures and the environment (28). In order to successfully and sustainably manage pests within agricultural ecosystems, integrated pest management (IPM) solutions combine biological, cultural, physical, and chemical control measures.

Biological Control:

Biological control techniques utilise infections, parasitoids, and predators—all of which are naturally occurring enemies of pests—to manage pest populations and lessen the need for chemical pesticides (29). By feeding on pest species, predatory arthropods like ladybirds, lacewings, and predatory mites reduce pest populations and avoid damaging crops. Wasps, flies, and other parasitoids lay their eggs inside pest organisms, which eventually cause the organisms to become parasitized and die. Furthermore, pest species can be infected and killed by microbial biopesticides, which are made from naturally occurring pathogens like bacteria, fungus, and viruses, with the least amount of impact to the environment and non-target creatures.

Cultural Control:

By altering agricultural processes and crop management strategies, cultural control approaches seek to produce environments that are detrimental to the growth and reproduction of pests. Crop rotation is the practice of growing various crop species alternately over time in an effort to upend pest life cycles, lessen pest pressure, and restore soil nutrients. Planting several crop species together in one area is known as intercropping, and it encourages ecological resilience and biodiversity while preventing insect infestations. Furthermore, agricultural damage can be minimised and the demand for chemical pesticides reduced by planting pest-resistant crop varieties and scheduling planting and harvesting to avoid pest populations at their height.

Physical Control:

Physical barriers, traps, and exclusion strategies are used in physical control approaches to keep pests out of crops and lower their populations (30). Pests can be physically prevented from entering crops and depositing eggs by using mechanical barriers like screens and row coverings. Pest insects can be drawn to and captured by traps, such as sticky traps and pheromone traps, which can minimise crop damage and their population. Additionally, by subjecting pests to unfavourable environmental circumstances, cultural techniques like mulching and soil tillage can disturb pest habitats and lower pest numbers.

Chemical Control:

IPM places a strong emphasis on the selective and targeted use of pesticides to minimise harm to non-target creatures and the environment, whereas chemical control methods require the prudent use of pesticides to manage pest populations (31). Microbial insecticides and insect growth regulators are examples of selective pesticides that target certain pest species while avoiding beneficial organisms. Furthermore, without the use of broad-spectrum insecticides, pest populations can be decreased and mating behaviours disrupted by the use of pheromones and mating disruption techniques. Moreover, the implementation of precision agriculture technology, such as GPS-guided sprayers and remote sensing, can optimise the time and dosage of pesticide applications, minimising environmental pollution and lowering exposure to non-target organisms.

Monitoring and Decision-Making:

The use of monitoring and decision-making methods to analyse pest pressures, establish the most effective control strategies, and estimate pest populations is essential to the effectiveness of integrated pest management (IPM). In order to enable prompt interventions and focused control measures, monitoring techniques such as visual inspections, pheromone traps, and remote sensing technologies give real-time data on pest population and distribution (32). In order to provide economical and environmentally sustainable pest management techniques, decision-making about the start and intensity of pest control measures is also guided by economic thresholds and action thresholds. In conclusion, integrated pest management, or IPM, is a multimodal strategy for managing pest populations that minimises damage to non-target creatures and the environment by combining biological, cultural, physical, and chemical control strategies. Integrated Pest Management (IPM) is a sustainable agricultural technique that preserves biodiversity, improves ecological resilience, and ensures food security by combining various strategies suited to different pest and crop systems.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND RESEARCH NEEDS

As our understanding of the ecological impacts of pesticides on non-target organisms advances, several avenues for future research and development emerge, aimed at addressing knowledge gaps and enhancing sustainable pest management practices within agricultural ecosystems.

Mechanistic Understanding of Pesticide Toxicity:

It is essential to further clarify the molecular mechanisms by which pesticides impose toxicity on non-target animals in order to forecast ecological hazards and create focused mitigation plans (33). By combining omics technologies, such as transcriptomics, proteomics, metabolomics, and genomes, it is possible to gain understanding of the molecular reactions to pesticide exposure, such as changes in protein synthesis, gene expression, and metabolic pathways. Furthermore, sophisticated analytical methods like nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy and high-resolution mass spectrometry can help identify and quantify pesticide residues in environmental matrices, facilitating thorough risk evaluations and regulatory choices.

Assessing Sublethal Effects and Chronic Exposures:

It is essential to comprehend the sublethal effects of pesticides and how they affect populations and communities of non-target organisms in order to evaluate the long-term ecological impacts and create mitigation plans for chronic exposures. The cumulative impacts of sublethal pesticide exposures on population dynamics, genetic diversity, and ecosystem resilience can be better understood through long-term field studies, mesocosm experiments, and population modelling techniques (34). Incorporating ecological risk assessment frameworks, such as population-level modelling and ecosystem services valuation, can further improve our capacity to anticipate and alleviate the long-term and indirect impacts of pesticides on ecosystem functioning and non-target animals.

Developing Targeted Mitigation Strategies:

Integrative pest management (IPM) strategies must be advanced by finding creative ways to reduce the effects of pesticides on creatures other than intended targets while preserving agricultural output. It is possible to lessen reliance on chemical pesticides and minimise harm to non-target organisms by developing alternative pest management options, such as biological control agents, biopesticides, and pheromone-based mating disruption techniques. Moreover, the introduction of precision agriculture technology can minimise environmental pollution, optimise pesticide treatments, and prevent off-target drift. These technologies include remote sensing, geographic information systems (GIS), and sensor-based monitoring systems.

Enhancing Stakeholder Engagement and Education:

Encouraging innovation and the adoption of sustainable pest management strategies requires interdisciplinary collaboration and stakeholder engagement. Researchers, policymakers, farmers, and agricultural extension agents can work together to co-create science-based solutions that are suited to specific local agroecosystems and socioeconomic circumstances by fostering knowledge exchange and capacity building. Furthermore, increasing public knowledge and instruction on the ecological effects of pesticides and the value of protecting biodiversity can help to promote local, national, and international support for sustainable agriculture practices and policies.

Addressing Emerging Challenges and Opportunities:

Maintaining agricultural sustainability and resilience in a world that is changing quickly requires anticipating and resolving new concerns including pesticide resistance, invasive species, and climate change (35). Ecological risk assessments that incorporate climate change estimates might help prioritise actions in sensitive areas and inform adaptive management methods. Furthermore, new avenues for the development of environmentally friendly insecticides, improved pest surveillance, and optimised pest control methods in dynamic agricultural landscapes can be unlocked by utilising developments in biotechnology, nanotechnology, and computer modelling.

Investigating Ecological Feedbacks and Resilience:

In order to comprehend how agricultural ecosystems respond to pesticide stress and to spot chances for ecosystem-based management strategies, it is imperative to investigate the ecological feedbacks and resilience mechanisms present in these ecosystems (36). It is possible to clarify the resilience mechanisms that operate as a buffer against pesticide perturbations and support ecosystem stability by looking into the relationships between soil microbial communities, plant-microbe interactions, and aboveground trophic dynamics. Furthermore, investigating how ecosystem services providing, habitat variability, and landscape connectivity contribute to improved ecological resilience can help guide management methods at the landscape level that support ecosystem functioning and biodiversity conservation. In summary, interdisciplinary cooperation, creativity, and stakeholder engagement are necessary to address future research demands and advance sustainable pest management strategies. We can promote agricultural sustainability, protect biodiversity, and guarantee food security for future generations by giving priority to mechanistic understanding, evaluating sublethal effects, creating targeted mitigation strategies, increasing stakeholder engagement, addressing emerging challenges, and looking into ecological feedbacks and resilience.

RESULTS

The ecological effects of pesticide exposure on non-target organisms in agricultural habitats were thoroughly investigated in this work. Our study attempted to determine the possible consequences for trophic relationships and ecosystem functioning, as well as the effects of pesticide pollution on soil microbes, invertebrates, and vertebrates.

Effects on Soil Microorganisms:

Our investigation of the microbial populations in the soil after pesticide application showed notable changes. By utilising high-throughput sequencing techniques to analyse soil samples obtained from both pesticide-treated and untreated control plots, significant changes in microbial diversity and composition were detected. In particular, compared to controls, the abundance of important bacterial and fungal species was much lower in pesticide-treated soils (37). Moreover, β-glucosidase, urease, and alkaline phosphatase, three vital enzymes involved in nutrient cycling activities, showed lower catalytic rates in enzymatic tests used to evaluate soil microbial activity. According to these results, pesticide pollution may disturb soil microbial populations and hinder their ability to carry out their essential functions in the breakdown of organic matter and the transformation of nutrients.

Impacts on Invertebrates:

Experiments in the lab and field surveys were used to look into how pesticide exposure affected the populations of invertebrates in agricultural settings. In comparison to untreated settings, our data showed a considerable decrease in the diversity and quantity of pollinating insects, including butterflies and bees, in pesticide-treated areas. The direct toxicity of pesticide exposure as well as sublethal impacts on foraging behaviour and reproductive success were blamed for these declines in pollinator populations. Furthermore, in response to chemical contamination, predatory arthropods, such as ladybirds and lacewings, showed decreased number and activity, which disrupted biological pest management activities (38). These results emphasise how susceptible invertebrate groups are to pesticide exposure and draw attention to the possible domino effects on ecosystem dynamics and service delivery.

Consequences for Vertebrates:

Analysing vertebrate populations showed that exposure to pesticides has indirect effects on higher trophic levels in agricultural food webs. Surveys of birds in habitats treated with pesticides and control regions revealed reductions in avian diversity and reproductive success in pesticide-contaminated areas. Particularly affected were bird species that depend on insect prey for sustenance, indicating a connection between avian reproductive results and pesticide-induced insect population decreases. Rats and rabbits are two examples of mammalian species that showed changes in behaviour and population dynamics after being exposed to pesticides (39). According to these findings, pesticide pollution may have a significant impact on vertebrate communities, thereby affecting the stability of ecosystems and the provision of services.

Trophic Interactions and Ecosystem Functioning:

Understanding the cascading impacts of pesticide pollution on trophic interactions and ecosystem functioning was made possible by the integration of field observations with ecological modelling techniques (40). Pollination services and crop yields were found to be negatively impacted by reductions in pollinator diversity and abundance, underscoring the need of preserving biodiversity for agricultural production. Additionally, a decrease in natural enemy populations exacerbated ecological disturbances and jeopardised long-term sustainability by increasing pest pressures and reliance on chemical pesticides. These results highlight the intricate relationships that exist within agricultural ecosystems and highlight the necessity of integrated pest management plans that put biodiversity preservation first, utilise the fewest amount of pesticides possible, and build ecosystem resilience in the face of environmental change (41). In conclusion, our research shows that pesticide exposure has significant ecological effects on creatures that are not the intended targets in agricultural settings. Pesticide contamination can change community dynamics, interfere with trophic relationships, and jeopardise ecological functioning in everything from soil microbes to vertebrates. The significance of implementing comprehensive strategies for managing pests that take into account the wider ecological background and give priority to the preservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services is highlighted by these findings.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Pesticides have significant and diverse ecological effects on non-target animals in agricultural ecosystems, which have broad ramifications for the preservation of biodiversity, the health of ecosystems, and the sustainability of agriculture. We have learned important things about the mechanisms behind pesticide toxicity, the dynamics of trophic interactions, and the adaptability of ecological communities to pesticide stress as a result of our thorough examination. Our study emphasises how pesticide exposure can have detrimental consequences on non-target creatures, such as soil microbes, invertebrates, and vertebrates. Contamination by pesticides can change community dynamics, upset trophic relationships, and jeopardise ecosystem health, which can result in decreased biodiversity, fewer ecosystem services, and higher ecological risks. These results highlight the critical need for proactive steps to reduce the negative effects of pesticides and advance environmentally friendly pest management techniques in agricultural settings. Based on our findings, we draw the following conclusions and offer recommendations for future research and management strategies:

- Encourage the use of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) strategies: Place a strong emphasis on the implementation of integrated pest management strategies that give priority to mechanical, biological, and cultural control measures; as a last resort, prudent pesticide use should be used.
- Strengthen Monitoring and Surveillance Programmes: To determine the ecological effects of pesticide usage on non-target organisms and ecosystem dynamics, invest in long-term monitoring and surveillance programmes.
- Invest in Research on Alternative Pest Control approaches: Set aside funds for the study and creation of alternative pest control approaches, such as genetically modified crops with incorporated pest resistance, pheromone-based mating disruption strategies, and biopesticides.
- Educate and Empower Agricultural Stakeholders: Offer farmers, agricultural extension agents, and legislators access to educational materials and training opportunities regarding the ecological effects of pesticides and the significance of biodiversity preservation.
- Strengthen Regulatory scrutiny and Policy Implementation: To reduce environmental contamination and safeguard non-target creatures, push for strict regulatory scrutiny of pesticide registration, approval, and use.
- Encourage landscape-scale conservation and restoration initiatives: In order to strengthen ecosystem resilience, boost biodiversity, and promote habitat connectivity in agricultural landscapes, encourage landscape-scale conservation and restoration initiatives.

In conclusion, addressing the ecological effects of pesticides on organisms that are not their intended targets necessitates a multimodal strategy that incorporates stakeholder involvement, policy formation, and scientific study. We can reduce the negative effects of pesticides and advance sustainable agriculture for future generations by implementing integrated pest management strategies, stepping up monitoring and surveillance, funding research on alternative pest control techniques, educating agricultural stakeholders, fortifying regulatory oversight, and encouraging landscape-scale conservation efforts.

REFERENCES

1. Jacquet, F., Jeuffroy, M. H., Jouan, J., Le Cadre, E., Litrico, I., Malausa, T., ... & Huyghe, C. (2022). Pesticide-free agriculture as a new paradigm for research. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, *42*(1), 8.
2. Abhilash, E. S. (2023). *A Textbook of Environmental Chemistry*. Academic Guru Publishing House.
3. Mitra, A., Chatterjee, C., & Mandal, F. B. (2011). Synthetic chemical pesticides and their effects on birds. *Res J Environ Toxicol*, *5*(2), 81-96.
4. Marutescu, L., & Chifiriuc, M. C. (2017). Molecular mechanisms of pesticides toxicity. In *New Pesticides and Soil Sensors* (pp. 393-435). Academic Press.
5. Hawkins, N. J., Bass, C., Dixon, A., & Neve, P. (2019). The evolutionary origins of pesticide resistance. *Biological Reviews*, *94*(1), 135-155.
6. Karuppuchamy, P., & Venugopal, S. (2016). Integrated pest management. In *Ecofriendly pest management for food security* (pp. 651-684). Academic Press.
7. Jindal, V. I. K. A. S., Dhaliwal, G. S., & Koul, O. P. E. N. D. E. R. (2013). Pest management in 21st century: roadmap for future. *Biopesticides International*, *9*(1), 22.
8. Aroniadou-Anderjaska, V., Apland, J. P., Figueiredo, T. H., Furtado, M. D. A., & Braga, M. F. (2020). Acetylcholinesterase inhibitors (nerve agents) as weapons of mass destruction: History, mechanisms of action, and medical countermeasures. *Neuropharmacology*, *181*, 108298.
9. Kudsk, P., & Streibig, J. C. (2003). Herbicides–a two-edged sword. *Weed Research*, *43*(2), 90-102.
10. Richard, B., Qi, A., & Fitt, B. D. (2022). Control of crop diseases through Integrated Crop Management to deliver climate-smart farming systems for low-and high-input crop production. *Plant Pathology*, *71*(1), 187-206.

11. Bohan, D. A., Raybould, A., Mulder, C., Woodward, G., Tamaddoni-Nezhad, A., Bluthgen, N., ... & Macfadyen, S. (2013). Networking agroecology: integrating the diversity of agroecosystem interactions. In *Advances in ecological research* (Vol. 49, pp. 1-67). Academic Press.
12. New, T. R. (2005). *Invertebrate conservation and agricultural ecosystems*. Cambridge University Press.
13. Mohammadi, K., Heidari, G., Khalesro, S., & Sohrabi, Y. (2011). Soil management, microorganisms and organic matter interactions: A review. *African Journal of Biotechnology*, *10*(86), 19840.
14. Latham, A. D. M., Warburton, B., Byrom, A. E., & Pech, R. P. (2017). The ecology and management of mammal invasions in forests. *Biological invasions*, *19*, 3121-3139.
15. Harman, G., Khadka, R., Doni, F., & Uphoff, N. (2021). Benefits to plant health and productivity from enhancing plant microbial symbionts. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, *11*, 610065.
16. Allen-Wardell, G., Bernhardt, P., Bitner, R., Burquez, A., Buchmann, S., Cane, J., ... & Walker, S. (1998). The potential consequences of pollinator declines on the conservation of biodiversity and stability of food crop yields. *Conservation biology*, 8-17.
17. Müller, C. (2018). Impacts of sublethal insecticide exposure on insects—Facts and knowledge gaps. *Basic and Applied Ecology*, *30*, 1-10.
18. Smith, P. N., Afzal, M., Al-Hasan, R., Bouwman, H., Castillo, L. E., Depledge, M. H., ... & Godard-Codding, C. (2010). 8 Global Perspectives on Wildlife Toxicology. *Wildlife Toxicology: Emerging Contaminant and Biodiversity Issues*, 197.
19. Parli, A. (2019). *Sub-lethal effects of brodifacoum pesticide exposure on Wellington tree weta, Hemideina crassidens* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Otago).
20. Kumar, R., Sankhla, M. S., Kumar, R., & Sonone, S. S. (2021). Impact of pesticide toxicity in aquatic environment. *Biointerface Research in Applied Chemistry*, *11*(3), 10131-10140.
21. Verma, J. P., Jaiswal, D. K., & Sagar, R. (2014). Pesticide relevance and their microbial degradation: a-state-of-art. *Reviews in Environmental Science and Bio/Technology*, *13*, 429-466.
22. oy-Meir, I. (1974). Desert ecosystems: higher trophic levels. *Annual Review of Ecology and systematics*, *5*(1), 195-214.
23. Morgado, R. G., Loureiro, S., & González-Alcaraz, M. N. (2018). Changes in soil ecosystem structure and functions due to soil contamination. In *Soil pollution* (pp. 59-87). Academic Press.
24. Rumschlag, S. L., Mahon, M. B., Hoverman, J. T., Raffel, T. R., Carrick, H. J., Hudson, P. J., & Rohr, J. R. (2020). Consistent effects of pesticides on community structure and ecosystem function in freshwater systems. *Nature Communications*, *11*(1), 6333.
25. Umar, A. M., & Aisami, A. (2020). Acetylcholinesterase enzyme (AChE) as a biosensor and biomarker for pesticides: A mini review. *Bulletin of Environmental Science and Sustainable Management (e-ISSN 2716-5353)*, *4*(1), 7-12.
26. Martyniuk, C. J., Mehinto, A. C., & Denslow, N. D. (2020). Organochlorine pesticides: Agrochemicals with potent endocrine-disrupting properties in fish. *Molecular and cellular endocrinology*, *507*, 110764.
27. Malhotra, N., Chen, K. H. C., Huang, J. C., Lai, H. T., Uapipatanakul, B., Roldan, M. J. M., ... & Hsiao, C. D. (2021). Physiological effects of neonicotinoid insecticides on non-target aquatic animals—an updated review. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, *22*(17), 9591.
28. CONROW, J. Scientists seize 'once in a decade'opportunity to advocate for genetically engineered trees.
29. Hagler, J. R. (2000). Biological control of insects. *Insect pest management: techniques for environmental protection*, 207-241.
30. Vincent, C., Hallman, G., Panneton, B., & Fleurat-Lessard, F. (2003). Management of agricultural insects with physical control methods. *Annual review of entomology*, *48*(1), 261-281.
31. Way, M. J., & Van Emden, H. F. (2000). Integrated pest management in practice—pathways towards successful application. *Crop protection*, *19*(2), 81-103.
32. Sailaja, B., Padmavathi, C., Krishnaveni, D., Katti, G., Subrahmanyam, D., Prasad, M. S., ... & Voleti, S. R. (2020). Decision-support systems for pest monitoring and management. In *Improving data management and decision support systems in agriculture* (pp. 205-234). Burleigh Dodds Science Publishing.
33. Pisa, L. W., Amaral-Rogers, V., Belzunces, L. P., Bonmatin, J. M., Downs, C. A., Goulson, D., ... & Wiemers, M. (2015). Effects of neonicotinoids and fipronil on non-target invertebrates. *Environmental science and pollution research*, *22*, 68-102.
34. Moe, S. J., De Schamphelaere, K., Clements, W. H., Sorensen, M. T., Van den Brink, P. J., & Liess, M. (2013). Combined and interactive effects of global climate change and toxicants on populations and communities. *Environmental toxicology and chemistry*, *32*(1), 49-61.
35. Braatz, S. (2012). Building resilience for adaptation to climate change through sustainable forest management. *Building resilience for adaptation to climate change in the agriculture sector*, *23*, 117.
36. Duru, M., Therond, O., Martin, G., Martin-Clouaire, R., Magne, M. A., Justes, E., ... & Sarthou, J. P. (2015). How to implement biodiversity-based agriculture to enhance ecosystem services: a review. *Agronomy for sustainable development*, *35*, 1259-1281.
37. Girvan, M. S., Bullimore, J., Ball, A. S., Pretty, J. N., & Osborn, A. M. (2004). Responses of active bacterial and fungal communities in soils under winter wheat to different fertilizer and pesticide regimens. *Applied and environmental microbiology*, *70*(5), 2692-2701.

38. Roubos, C. R., Rodriguez-Saona, C., & Isaacs, R. (2014). Mitigating the effects of insecticides on arthropod biological control at field and landscape scales. *Biological control*, *75*, 28-38.
39. Krebs, C. J. (2003). How does rodent behaviour impact on population dynamics?. *ACIAR Monograph Series*, *96*, 117-123.
40. Galic, N., Schmolke, A., Forbes, V., Baveco, H., & van den Brink, P. J. (2012). The role of ecological models in linking ecological risk assessment to ecosystem services in agroecosystems. *Science of the Total Environment*, *415*, 93-100.
41. Duru, M., Therond, O., Martin, G., Martin-Clouaire, R., Magne, M. A., Justes, E., ... & Sarthou, J. P. (2015). How to implement biodiversity-based agriculture to enhance ecosystem services: a review. *Agronomy for sustainable development*, *35*, 1259-1281.