Traditional and Derived Cotton Crops Using Biotechnology

[1]Dr. Shiva Sharma, [2]Ayush Madan, [3]Priyank Bharti
[1,2,3]Shobhit Institute of Engineering and Technology (Deemed to be University), Meerut
Email Id- [1]shiva@shobhituniversity.ac.in, [2]ayush.madaan@shobhituniversity.ac.in
[3]priyank.bharati@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT: Cotton cultivation is well-known for utilizing a lot of plant protection chemicals. Because of the difficulty in developing a suite of beneficial organisms capable of responding effectively to the system's diversity of pests, the crop's annual nature, as well as the interrupting impacts of chemical control measures aimed directly against the surviving pests, physiological control by introduction and acclimation of beneficial arthropods has not been particularly successful in cotton production. Only inundate biological control has shown significant benefits, and only when chemical pesticide pressure has been reduced. This study looks at how and why crop protection concepts have changed dramatically since the invention of synthetic pesticides. With the advent of synthetic pesticides, crop protection ideas have altered significantly, according to this study. Because of the effectiveness of genetically modified cotton, chemical control treatments have been reduced, showing the beneficial role that natural enemies may play. This necessitates a shift from a field-by-field strategy to a farm-by-farm and agro ecosystem approach to a landscape-by-landscape approach to a holistic approach to sustainable pest management. This research will assist in the advancement of cotton farming in order to offer higher earnings and environmental methods to pest control.

KEYWORDS: Cotton, Farm, Management, Pest Control, Pesticides, Production.

INTRODUCTION

Cotton farming is said to reflect the development of crop protection ideas and techniques over the last 50 years, and is known for its heavy use of plant protection chemicals. Cotton has been grown in 69 countries over a total area of 30 to 35 million hectares. Despite the fact that the effectiveness of chemical control techniques continues to improve, harvest losses remain high, at about 30%. The cotton production system, which is an experimental paradigm for numerous plant protection programs under different agro-business circumstances and in the presence of various pesticide complexes, is the world's largest consumer of pesticides. This study examines how and why crop protection ideas have evolved significantly since the invention of synthetic pesticide [1]. After a spectacular show of yield increase via the application of chemical controls, cotton production soon confronted the negative effects of this control. The development of pesticide resistance as well as new pest damage until they are considered to be of secondary importance. In certain cases, a rise in the rate of application and frequency of insecticidal treatments has put the economic sustainability of the production systems in jeopardy. Harvest losses have remained high in general, although insecticides' technical effectiveness in combating pests has improved [2], [3].

There are two potential future plant protection models: overall plant pest management utilizing pestilence and integrated plant pest management (IPM), which combines chemical control and alternatives to pesticide population management below economic levels. In agriculture, the first method, complete pest management, is limited to certain situations when no significant alternative pests are present in the crop system's vicinity. IPM, on the other hand, is constrained by issues with leveraging the concept of "intervention threshold" as well as the limitations of many of the non-chemical treatments available, but it does take into consideration the whole pest complex in a crop system. In reality, the calendar, which was created primarily for insecticidal treatments, was created based on prior local findings that were widely accepted by farmers. The method resulted in significant productivity improvements in cotton-producing nations in Francophone Africa and elsewhere. This resulted in an integrated, area-wide pest management strategy that takes natural factors into account when controlling populations in a specific site. Because a number of beneficial organisms were difficult to develop, capable of effectively responding to the diversity of pests in the system, the annual nature of the crops, and the effects of chemical control measures directed at remaining pests, bio control by the introduction and acclimatization of useful arthropods in cotton production was not particularly successful [4].

Only flood-free biological management has shown to be effective, particularly when chemical pesticides have reduced pressure. It is more advantageous to actively preserve the local fauna of helpful animals. In practice, despite better understanding of the general environment, the development of developed pesticide resistance has played a major part in decreasing growing producers' judicious usage of control techniques. This may be shown by the development of window techniques for control measures during the growth season. The ability of indigenous natural enemies to reduce the efficacy of genetically modified cotton in chemical control treatments has been shown [5]. In the meanwhile, the importance of Bt toxin-free pest species has grown. As significant pests of Bt cotton, sucking pests, for example, increasingly replace caterpillar vegetation and fruit feeding. Farming methods and production systems have evolved as a result of the spatial-temporal dimension of regulating factors in natural populations. Manufacturing systems that use cotton as a permanent floor surface, for example, are becoming more popular. Intercropping and trap cultivation have shown to be helpful to beneficial arthropod complexes while being detrimental to pests.

This new design environment for crop protection in general, and cotton in particular, leads to the idea of true sustainable agriculture by applying agro ecological principles. This necessitates a shift from a field-by-field strategy to a farm-by-farm and agro ecosystem approach to a landscape-by-landscape approach to a holistic approach to sustainable pest management. Because maize cultivation covers such a vast region, it is the source of the most insecticides. Because most maize pesticides are applied in the early spring before plant emergence to suppress maize rootworms, and because these applications coincide with major rainfall events, there is a risk of run-off into aquatic systems and acute poisoning of aquatic animals. Although the usage of BT-corn is still too new to be examined in depth, insecticide loads should be 50 to 80 percent lower in order to evaluate insecticide burdens against potential ecological effects [6], [7].

Regulatory assessments, non-governmental organizations, and the media have all been questioned about the environmental safety of biotechnology-based plants on many occasions. The scientific literature reviewed and analyzed in response to these questions about soybean, maize, and cotton, in comparison to current agricultural practices for crop and pest management in conventionally grown crops, assesses the environmental effects of commercially available biotechnology crops. Nine potential environmental consequences have been identified:

- *Changes in pesticide use patterns:* Does the adoption of pesticide-driven biotechnologies in soya, maize, and cotton impact pesticide consumption, but does it change farmers' practices to alter soil or water quality?
- *Soil management and soil conservation*: do soil erosion, moisture retention, soil nutrient content, water quality, fossil fuel use, and greenhouse gas emissions influence the adoption of no-break and other conservation practices?
- *Weediness of crops:* Have biotechnology-based soya, maize, and cotton acquired weediness characteristics?
- *Gene flow and outcrossing:* Is biotechnology-derived soybean, maize, and cotton hybridized in the planting of soybeans, maize, and cotton with native plants or crops, reducing genetic diversity?
- *Pest resistance:* Do biotechnology-derived soybean, corn, and cotton offer plant-protection properties to which pests will evolve resistance, and, if so, are they distinct from conventional chemical and microbial resistance developments? What strategies are used to handle the emergence of resistance?
- *Pest population shifts:* Does biotechnology generated from soya, maize, or cotton cause changes in weed populations or secondary pesticides that have an impact on the environment or the agricultural system?
- *Non-target and beneficial animals:* Does biotechnology-derived pest-protected soya, maize, and cotton have any effect on natural enemies or others in the soil and crop canopy?
- *Land usability and efficiency:* Does biotechnology developed from soybean, maize, or cotton have an impact on agricultural yields or the need for forest or marginal land cultivation?
- *Human exposure*: Does herbicide tolerance and pest bug resistance obtained from biotechnology-derived soy, maize, or cotton pose new or different safety concerns when compared to traditionally grown plants with comparable traits?

Plants derived from biotechnology provide alternatives and potential solutions to a range of problems in modern agriculture, but the degree to which they are feasible or favoured depends on a number of economic, social, and geographic factors. Plant pests have been employed in significant numbers in the last century, and the crop security community has been looking for guiding principles that may meet both agricultural production needs and the constraints imposed by sustainable planetary development. Chemical control rapidly revealed its limits and potential, and solutions to pest control issues have been suggested since at least the 1960s. Under the title of 'integrated control,' a new strategy was developed that envisions the employment of a variety of control techniques, restricted only by their compatibility and environmental effect criteria [8].

BIOTECHNOLOGY-DERIVED COTTON

Cotton that is herbicide-tolerant reduces the use of pesticides in the environment [9].

- Promoting low- and no-till farming techniques results in improved management of dirty soil and soil moisture, as well as lower energy use.
- Herbicidal resistant cotton allows for greater scheduling flexibility in weed control treatments, resulting in less cotton damage.

Why Biotechnology-derived cotton may be used in impoverished countries without requiring significant financial investment, cultural change, or adoption training.

- The rapid adoption of Bt cotton in China is an example of how plant-incorporated proteins in developing nations reduce the frequency of pesticide applications and pesticide exhaust risks while improving the safety and health of agricultural workers.
- The usage of Bt cotton in Australia, India, and the United States has shown that these varieties may help reduce insect resistance to chemical pesticides while also increasing the quantity and variety of beneficial insects in cotton fields.
- Bt cotton was introduced in Australia, India, and the United States. Cotton production in these areas was in jeopardy before Bt cotton was introduced.
- The ability to use several genes to combat the same disease may delay the emergence of pesticide resistance.
- The use of Bt and herbicide-resistant cotton reduces farmers' production costs and increases their options for farm management methods.

Resistance to the cotton plague In the mid-1990s, the development of chemical resistance in the cotton sector in the United States was a significant source of worry. Without the introduction of Bt cotton, a significant number of cotton farmers in Alabama and other parts of the United States would be unable to cultivate their crops efficiently. However, pesticide resistance is not confined to cotton pests or the United States. Resistance is the result of selects that result in pesticide sprays surviving and reproducing a few insects in the population with genes for specific resistance mechanisms, thus raising the population's number of resistant insects. Insect resistance includes both high and low Bt toxins for transgenic plants, as well as the resistance development of microbial pulp compositions.

Cotton production can analyze the results of a wealth of phytosanitary experience, ranging from subsistence farming to industrial production systems, under a range of agroecological circumstances. Cotton commerce is now the subject of a World Trade Organization socio-economic research, which is anticipated to have a significant impact on the economics of cotton pest management in the future. The development of crop protection ideas, as well as their strengths and weaknesses, is shown in the case study below for a variety of reasons [10]. The entomological literature emphasizes the significance of crop loss caused by insect pests of cotton. Our theoretical and practical research were combined to create a synthesis illustrated by real-life examples, and we then attempted to draw lessons from this experience in support of a new cotton conservation strategy. To this diversity in agricultural structures and yields, increasing systems from subsistence farming to large-scale industrial systems must be included. The input level (minimal, moderate, or intense) of climatic conditions on one side (temperate or tropical, whether dry, semi-arid, or moist) and on the other side (temperate or tropical, whether dry, semi-arid, or wet) distinguishes eight distinct production systems.

The advent of synthetic pesticides dramatically altered crop protection concepts, as discussed in this article. Because of the effectiveness of GM cotton, chemical controls have been reduced, and natural enemies have been shown to have a beneficial impact. This necessitates a shift from a field-to-field pesticide control paradigm to an overall system approach to pesticide sustainability in farms and agro-ecosystems. This research will help to improve cotton production in order to generate more income and offer environmental solutions for insect management. Cotton is a significant industrial crop that is sometimes the only source of income for small farmers in industrialized countries and the subject of economic conflicts in fair trade research. These are connected to the significance of yields and quality losses caused by the large and complicated pesticide complex. This is why, since the 1950s, chemical control has been so effective. Synthetic pesticides were used in industrial systems that were poorly understood, resulting in their abuse. As the issue of developed resistance grew, a flood of new active chemicals in insecticides appeared, putting farmers in a financial bind. Cotton has been a bad example of their field for farm protection experts for a long time.

DISCUSSION

The information regarding biotechnology-generated cotton gathered from the scientific literature may be used to draw a few general conclusions.

a. Given the net environmental benefits of biotechnology-derived crops, further agricultural biotechnology research is advocated for improving environmental management. Bt and herbicide-tolerant cotton reduces farmers' production costs, improves efficiency, reduces risks, and broadens the range of farm management options.
b. Herbicide resistant cotton allows less lasting herbicides to replace more persistent herbicides in the environment. Cotton management becomes more flexible and reliable with herbicide resistant cotton.
c. Biotechnology is a risk management tool for agriculture. We suggest evaluating the role of biotechnology-generated crops as part of agricultural management. Biotechnology-based insect-resistant cotton technologies are easily transferable to poor nations since they do not need a significant financial commitment, a shift in cultural norms, or adoption training.
d. We suggest that judgments on the impact of biotechnology crops on productivity be drawn using comparisons encompassing the whole agricultural system.
e. Since its introduction in Australia, China, and the United States, Bt cotton has shown its ability to reduce insect resistance to chemical pesticides. Cotton production in certain areas of these countries was in jeopardy before Bt cotton was introduced.
f. The author recommends assessing the environmental implications of biotechnology-derived crops in agricultural areas where they may be adopted, as well as in the context of viable alternatives and practices currently available to farmers.
g. When comparing the effect of a particular feature, we recommend keeping the following features constant: genetically identical species in all aspects except the characteristics being assessed; crops to be cultivated simultaneously in the same geographical location; and the use of identical soil and crop management practices. For example, after seeing contradictory and inconsistent data on output in different crops, the author proposes a better evaluation of output impacts.
h. To provide additional information about the long-term environmental benefits and safety implications of biotechnology adoption, Large-scale and agricultural field studies are suggested by the author.
i. The author proposes that policies for the use of effective insect and weed resistance management methods in conventional and biotechnology crops be continued. Furthermore, it is suggested that ongoing research into management methods for minimizing or delaying the development of resistance to new and existing pest control instruments be conducted.
j. Given that gene flow is a natural occurrence that has the potential to enhance biodiversity, it is suggested that study be focused on the environmental and societal impacts/consequences of gene flux between biotechnologically produced plants and other crops or native plants.
k. As a result of the recognition of the potential for maize biotechnology to solve current maize rootworm control problems arising from the development of resistance to both chemical and plant insecticides, the author recommends that consideration be given to resistance management strategies and their impacts on soil and other non-target organisms.

l. The author advocates for the continued research of biotechnology-derived hybrids that increase agricultural yields, since we recognize that increased land efficiency is a major environmental benefit.
m. Herbicide-resistant cotton is an essential component in expanding the use of tillage conservation, which reduces energy consumption and soil loss due to erosion, improves water quality, and has other environmental benefits.

CONCLUSION

Cotton is a significant industrial crop that is sometimes the only source of income for small farmers in industrialized countries and the subject of economic conflicts in fair trade research. These are connected to the significance of yields and quality losses caused by the large and complicated pesticide complex. This is why, since the 1950s, chemical control has been so effective. Synthetic pesticides were used in industrial systems that were poorly understood, resulting in their abuse. The advent of the issue of developing resistance resulted in a flood of new pesticide active ingredients. Cotton has been a bad example of their field for farm protection experts for a long time. Because of the wide range of soil, climate, and cotton production techniques used throughout the globe, phytosanitary treatments have been successfully tested and are now being thoroughly examined. The most visible of these advances in the past ten years has been genetically modified cultivars that tolerate particular herbicides and many major insect pests. This change is often believed to aid in environmental preservation and, as a result, to make cotton manufacturing more environmentally friendly.

With a limited number of farmers per unit area and a high level of education and financial competence, some progress was made in this sector among the major industrialised producers. The potential ecological consequences of the industry's activities must be redirected toward agro ecological principles-based management methods. These conditions need a change in the mentality of cotton producers, which may be affected by both consumer and economic concerns. Within an essentially preventative approach, it is critical in plant protection to shift between a person's perspective and the collective, giving adequate weight to the medium and long-term forecast of risks. When synthetic pesticides were introduced, perceptions of crop protection altered dramatically, according to this study. Chemical restrictions have been decreased due to the efficacy of genetically engineered cotton, demonstrating the beneficial impact of native natural enemies. This necessitates a shift from a field-by-field pest control paradigm to a farm-by-farm and agro-ecosystem approach to sustainable pest management. This research will aid cotton expansion to provide higher revenue and environmental methods in order to avoid pest control.

REFERENCES

[1] C. James, "Global status and distribution of commercial transgenic crops in 1997," *Biotechnol. Dev. Monit.*, 1998.

[2] B. L. Hoyle and E. L. Arthur, "Biotransformation of pesticides in saturated-zone materials," *Hydrogeol. J.*, 2000, doi: 10.1007/s100400050010.

[3] J. J. Farrar *et al.*, "Assessing compatibility of a pesticide in an IPM program," *J. Integr. Pest Manag.*, 2018, doi: 10.1093/jipm/pmx032.

[4] S. Yasin, H. N. Asghar, F. Ahmad, Z. A. Zahir, and E. A. Waraich, "Impact of Bt-cotton on soil microbiological and biochemical attributes," *Plant Prod. Sci.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/1343943X.2016.1185637.

[5] F. T. Bergmann *et al.*, "COPASI and its applications in biotechnology," *Journal of Biotechnology*. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.jbiotec.2017.06.1200.

[6] R. D. Wauchope *et al.*, "Predicted impact of transgenic, herbicide-tolerant corn on drinking water quality in vulnerable watersheds of the mid-western USA," *Pest Manag. Sci.*, 2002, doi: 10.1002/ps.433.

[7] F. Gallardo-López, M. A. Hernández-Chontal, P. Cisneros-Saguilán, and A. Linares-Gabriel, "Development of the concept of agroecology in Europe: A review," *Sustainability (Switzerland)*. 2018, doi: 10.3390/su10041210.

[8] W. J. Lewis, J. C. Van Lenteren, S. C. Phatak, and J. H. Tumlinson, "A total system approach to sustainable pest management," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 1997, doi: 10.1073/pnas.94.23.12243.

[9] S. E. Naranjo, "Impacts of Bt transgenic cotton on integrated pest management," *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 2011, doi: 10.1021/jf102939c.

[10] P. Ferron, J. P. Deguine, and J. E. À. Mouté, "Évolution de la protection phytosanitaire du cotonnier: Un cas d'école," *Cah. Agric.*, 2006.