AGRI MAGAZINE
(International E-Magazine for Agricultural Articles)
Volume: 02, Issue: 11 (November, 2025)
Available online at http://www.agrimagazine.in
©Agri Magazine, ISSN: 3048-8656

Root Grub (White Grub) Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and Management Practices in Maize Crop

*V. Vishnu
Lovely Professional University, Jalandhar, Punjab, India
*Corresponding Author's email: vislavathvishnu4258@gmail.com

Root grubs — the white, C-shaped larvae of scarab beetles — are an underground threat for maize (*Zea mays* L.) in many cropping regions worldwide. These grubs feed on young roots and germinating seeds, weakening plants, reducing nutrient and water uptake, causing stunting and plant death, and ultimately lowering stand establishment and yields. Their life cycles, feeding behavior and species composition vary with region; some common genera include Holotrichia, Anomala, Phyllophaga and Popillia, and the severity of damage depends on grub species, size of larvae, soil conditions and preceding crops. Because the damage is below ground and often not visible until symptoms appear above ground (wilting, yellowing, uneven stands, plants uprooted with decayed roots), growers frequently underestimate the presence and importance of these pests until economic losses have already occurred.

IPM in root grub of maize

An integrated pest management (IPM) approach is the most sustainable and reliable way to manage root grub problems in maize. IPM for belowground pests relies on a combination of preventive, cultural, biological and, when necessary, chemical tactics that reduce pest populations below economic thresholds while minimizing non-target impacts and maintaining agro-ecosystem health. Preventive measures include landscape and field-scale planning to reduce beetle habitat and disrupt beetle life cycles, careful crop rotation to break continuous host presence, and use of healthy seed and proper planting windows to avoid peak larval activity. For example, eliminating nearby grassy refuges and boundary vegetation that serve as adult beetle feeding and mating sites can lower egg laying near fields; these landscape adjustments, together with rotation away from susceptible host crops for one or more years, reduce the chance that substantial grub populations will be present when maize is planted.

Cultural tactics are the backbone of grub IPM because they are low cost and enhance resilience. Mechanical soil disturbance through timely tillage can expose larvae to predators and desiccate them; conversely, reduced-tillage systems may favor certain grub species and therefore should be managed with additional complementary controls. Planting date adjustment can sometimes avoid the peak feeding stage of grubs or reduce seed vulnerability: early planting to establish robust root systems before peak grub feeding or delayed planting where feasible can both be considered depending on pest phenology and local climate. Intercropping and increased cropping diversity have also been shown to reduce belowground pest pressure by fostering natural enemy communities and reducing host continuity; maize-legume intercrops are one example that can alter soil insect dynamics and improve natural biological control. Additionally, good soil fertility and irrigation management produce vigorous seedlings that tolerate moderate root feeding better than stressed plants, so sound agronomy is an important part of any IPM program.

Scouting and monitoring for grubs before planting and at early seedling stages are essential because effective options for rescue control of established large grub populations are limited. Growers should sample soil in likely problem areas — grassy field edges, pastures converted to cropland, or fields with historical grub problems — by digging soil blocks or cores to the root zone and checking for larvae. Thresholds vary by species and region; for many “true” white grub species in field crops, finding one or more large grub per cubic foot of soil or a few grubs per square foot in high-risk areas may justify control at planting. Where scouting shows low or negligible grub numbers, avoid unnecessary chemical applications and rely on cultural and biological measures instead. Good record keeping of grub occurrences and field history helps predict future risk and makes targeted IPM decisions more effective.

Biological control agents are increasingly important in root grub IPM because many of them can provide regionally effective, environmentally benign suppression when used properly. Entomopathogenic fungi (EPF) such as Metarhizium spp. and Beauveria bassiana have demonstrated efficacy against a range of white grub larvae when applied to soil or delivered in seed treatments and granular formulations; some commercial biopesticide products based on these fungi are available in multiple countries. Entomopathogenic nematodes (EPNs) (e.g., Steinernema and Heterorhabditis species) also infect and kill grubs, and their compatibility with EPF in combined applications has been investigated to improve consistency and broaden the spectrum of control. Conservation and augmentation of natural enemies — including parasitoids, predators, fungi, nematodes and entomopathogenic bacteria — should be encouraged by reducing broad-spectrum insecticide use and by adopting habitat practices that support beneficials. While biologicals may not provide the immediate knockdown of synthetic insecticides in all situations, they are a crucial component of long-term, sustainable grub management and can often be integrated with cultural controls for meaningful suppression.

Chemical control remains an important component of IPM for white grubs in maize when monitoring indicates risk above economic thresholds. Best practice favors targeted, preventive applications rather than broad rescue sprays because belowground pests are difficult to reach once damage is established. Seed treatments and in-furrow or T-banded soil insecticide applications at planting deliver active ingredients near the seed and emerging root zone, where they have the most impact on early larval feeding. Choosing labeled, effective products and applying them at recommended rates and placement is crucial to achieve control while minimizing environmental exposure. Chemical options should be considered alongside non-chemical measures, used judiciously to delay resistance, and selected to be compatible with biological agents when possible. Where available, systemic seed treatments have reduced early damage, but regulatory changes and environmental considerations require growers to evaluate whether such options remain appropriate in their location and to prioritize integrated solutions.

An effective IPM program tailors tactics to local ecology, grub species and cropping system. For example, in regions where “true” root-feeding white grubs with multi-year life cycles are dominant, preventive measures and seed/in-furrow treatments timed at planting may be necessary, whereas in areas where smaller, transient species predominate, cultural controls and biologicals may suffice. Farmers should adopt an area-wide mindset: controlling grubs on a single field may be undermined by heavy infestation in adjacent unmanaged grasslands or pastures. Thus, community-level coordination and communication about grub management — including habitat reduction and timely sampling — increases the effectiveness of IPM. Extension services and local entomologists can help identify the grub species present and advise on thresholds and locally adapted control packages.

Research and on-farm trials continue to refine grub IPM for maize. Advances in formulation of entomopathogenic fungi and nematodes, combined application strategies, improved scouting tools, and the development of resistant or tolerant maize varieties (including host resistance traits and transgenic approaches where regionally accepted) are areas of active study. Some studies show that rotating to non-host crops and integrating biological control agents significantly increases yields and economic returns compared with sole reliance on conventional chemical regimes. Adopting cropping systems that promote biodiversity, natural enemy abundance and soil health generally reduces reliance on curative insecticides and stabilizes production in the face of pest pressure. Ongoing research also addresses how climate change and altered pest phenology might affect white grub populations and the relative performance of IPM tactics in coming decades.

To implement a practical IPM plan for root grubs in maize, growers can follow a tiered sequence of actions: first, conduct careful field history review and preseason scouting to identify risk areas; second, modify field edges and habitat to reduce adult beetle activity and egg deposition; third, adjust crop rotations, choose optimal planting dates and maintain good fertility and irrigation to promote strong seedlings; fourth, where scouting indicates a threshold exceedance, use seed treatments or in-furrow insecticides placed precisely at planting; fifth, integrate biologicals (EPF and EPNs) and conservation of natural enemies as routine practice; and finally, monitor post-planting emergence and crop performance and record outcomes for future planning. Combining these tactics reduces the probability of severe infestations, supports environmental stewardship and often yields better cost-benefit ratios compared to repeated blanket insecticide use.

Economic and environmental considerations must guide decision making in grub IPM. Chemical applications, even when effective, cost money and can harm beneficial soil organisms and non-target fauna if misused; biologicals and cultural practices often require more planning but provide longer-term benefits for soil health and sustainability. Cost-benefit analyses in multiple regions indicate that well-designed IPM packages (crop rotation, targeted chemical use only when necessary, plus biological augmentation) typically outperform farmer practice of routine chemical use in terms of both profits and yield stability. Extension outreach and farmer training are therefore critical: by improving farmers' ability to scout, interpret thresholds and choose appropriate tactics, agricultural advisors help reduce unnecessary inputs while preserving crop productivity.

Conclusion

root grubs are an important but manageable threat in maize production. Because their injury occurs below ground, effective management must begin before symptoms appear and rely on a suite of preventive, cultural, biological and targeted chemical tools. Successful IPM depends on good scouting, knowledge of local grub species and life cycles, sound agronomy to promote crop tolerance, and adoption of biological agents and habitat management to support natural enemies. Regionally adapted IPM programs that combine these tactics lead to sustainable suppression of grubs, improved yields and reduced environmental impact. Farmers, researchers and extension services should work together to refine local thresholds, improve biological product performance, and provide decision support so that maize producers can mitigate root grub risk intelligently and profitably.

Reference

1. University of Minnesota Extension (White Grubs in Corn); Purdue University Extension (White Grubs Management); ICRISAT Technical Review (Biological Control of Root Grubs); Penn State Extension (Belowground Insect Pests in Field Corn); UNL Extension (Seed and In-Furrow Insecticide Guidance).