AGRI MAGAZINE
(International E-Magazine for Agricultural Articles)
Volume: 03, Issue: 07 (July, 2026)
Available online at http://www.agrimagazine.in

Fall Armyworm (*Spodoptera frugiperda*): An Emerging Threat to Agriculture and Its Integrated Pest Management

*Manmohan Singh
Senior Research Fellow/Department of Plant Pathology, SKUAST-J, Chatha, Jammu & Kashmir- 180009, India
*Corresponding Author's email: manmohan77492@gmail.com

Among the invasive insect pests that have reshaped crop protection strategies across Asia and Africa in the last decade, the Fall Armyworm (FAW), *Spodoptera frugiperda* (J.E. Smith, 1797) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae), stands out for the speed and scale of its spread. Native to the tropical and subtropical Americas, this polyphagous caterpillar was first confirmed in Africa in 2016, reached India by mid-2018 through Karnataka and within a single cropping season had colonised maize fields across nearly every maize-growing state in the country. Unlike many introduced pests that take years to become economically significant, FAW became a first-generation major pest almost immediately, owing to its wide host range, extraordinary migratory ability and high reproductive potential. This article summarises the biology, damage symptoms and identification features of FAW and presents a practical, field-ready Integrated Pest Management (IPM) framework that farmers and extension workers can adopt to keep this pest under economic threshold levels without over-reliance on chemical insecticides.

Keywords: Fall armyworm, Integrated Pest Management, Maize, *Spodoptera frugiperda*, Invasive pest.

Origin and Spread

Fall Armyworm is native to the Americas, where it has long been a recognised pest of maize and other grasses. It was first reported outside its native range in West Africa in early 2016 and from there it spread across almost the entire African continent within two years. The pest entered Asia in 2018, with confirmed detections in India (Karnataka, May 2018) andsubsequently in China, Southeast Asia and beyond. Its rapid intercontinental spread is attributed to the adult moth's capacity for long-distance migration, aided by wind currents and, very likely, by inadvertent movement of infested plant material through trade. In India, FAW is now considered established and is reported from maize-growing tracts in nearly all states, with sporadic damage also recorded on sorghum, sugarcane and rice.

Host Range and Economic Importance

Although FAW is best known as a pest of maize, it is highly polyphagous and has been recorded feeding on more than 80 plant species, including sorghum, rice, sugarcane, millets, wheat, cotton and several vegetable and fodder crops. Maize remains its most preferred host, particularly in the whorl stage, where larvae cause the most conspicuous damage. Reported yield losses vary widely with crop stage, cultivar and management, but studies consistently document severe losses when infestation is left unmanaged, especially when larvae attack seedlings or bore into developing cobs. Because of this broad host range and destructive feeding behaviour, FAW is now recognised as one of the most economically important lepidopteran pests of cereal-based cropping systems in Asia and Africa.

Identification and Life Cycle

Correct identification is the first step in FAW management, since its larvae can be confused with other armyworms and cutworms common in Indian fields. The adult moth is a strong flier, greyish-brown in the male with a distinct pale, triangular spot near the wingtip and more uniformly greyish-brown in the female. Eggs are laid in masses of 100–200, covered with greyish scales from the female's abdomen, usually on the underside of leaves. The larva passes through six instars and is the most damaging and identifiable stage: mature larvae show an inverted "Y"-shaped pale marking on the head capsule and four raised black spots arranged in a square on the second-last abdominal segment a feature that reliably distinguishes FAW from look-alike *Spodoptera* and *Mythimna* species. Pupation occurs in the soil. Under Indian field conditions, the full life cycle from egg to adult is generally completed in about 30–35 days, though this shortens considerably in warmer weather, allowing several overlapping generations in a single cropping season.

Nature and Symptoms of Damage

Young larvae feed gregariously on tender leaves, producing characteristic pin-hole and "window-pane" injuries on unopened whorl leaves. As larvae grow, they move deeper into the whorl, where they feed voraciously and leave behind ragged, elongated holes and copious moist, sawdust-like frass, a key diagnostic symptom that distinguishes FAW damage from stem borer injury. In severe infestations, larvae can destroy the growing point, leading to a symptom known as "dead heart", or bore directly into developing cobs and feed on grains, causing both yield loss and quality deterioration through secondary fungal contamination. Because later instars tend to feed cryptically inside the whorl or cob, damage is often noticed only after significant harm has already occurred, which is why early-stage monitoring is so critical.

Table 1. Stage-wise symptoms of Fall Armyworm damage in maize

Crop Stage	Larval Stage Involved	Visible Symptom
Seedling / early whorl	1st–2nd instar	Pin-holes and window-pane feeding on young leaves
Vegetative / whorl stage	3rd–4th instar	Ragged holes in unfurled leaves, moist sawdust-like frass in whorl
Late vegetative	5th–6th instar	Destruction of growing point, "dead heart" symptom
Reproductive / cobbing	Late instar	Boring into cobs, grain feeding, frass at silk/husk entry point

Integrated Pest Management (IPM) of Fall Armyworm

Because FAW breeds continuously, migrates over long distances and can rapidly develop resistance to insecticides when these are used indiscriminately, no single tactic can keep it under control. Research from India, Africa and Southeast Asia consistently shows that IPM modules combining monitoring, cultural practices, biological control and judicious chemical use perform far better than reliance on insecticides alone reducing plant infestation, protecting natural enemies and improving benefit cost ratios for farmers. The following components form a practical, field-ready IPM package.

1. Monitoring and Surveillance

Pheromone traps baited with FAW-specific sex-pheromone lures are the backbone of monitoring. Installing traps at 4–5 per hectare, about two weeks before or immediately after sowing and maintaining them at roughly 1–1.25 m height, allows early detection of moth activity and helps time field scouting and spray decisions rather than following a calendar-based spray schedule. Regular field walks, especially during the first 30 days after crop emergence, should focus on checking whorls for egg masses and early instar feeding signs, since this is the most vulnerable and manageable window.

2. Cultural and Mechanical Practices

Simple, low-cost practices can meaningfully reduce pest build-up. These include early and synchronous sowing within a locality to avoid a staggered availability of susceptible young plants, deep summer ploughing to expose pupae in the soil to predators and heat, intercropping maize with legumes such as cowpea or with push-pull systems using Desmodium and Napier grass borders (which repel egg-laying moths and attract natural enemies) and hand collection and destruction of egg masses and early instar larvae, which are still clustered and have not yet dispersed into the whorl. Application of sand, ash, or soil mixed with a small quantity of insecticide directly into the whorl also physically hampers larval feeding.

3. Biological Control

Natural enemies play a significant role in suppressing FAW populations and should be conserved wherever possible. Egg parasitoids of the genus *Trichogramma* and larval parasitoids such as *Telenomus remus* and *Cotesia* species have shown promise in field releases, while entomopathogens including *Bacillus thuringiensis* (Bt) formulations, the fungus *Metarhizium anisopliae* and *Nucleopolyhedrovirus* (NPV) offer effective, environment friendly options for early instar control. Botanical extracts, particularly neem based formulations (azadirachtin), applied directly into the whorl can also suppress young larvae while minimising harm to pollinators and natural enemies.

4. Chemical Control (Need-Based)

Where pest populations cross the economic threshold level (commonly cited as around 5% plants showing fresh whorl damage with actively feeding larvae in early-stage crop, though thresholds vary regionally), insecticide application becomes necessary. Because later instars feed deep within the whorl, sprays are most effective when directed into the whorl itself and timed against early instars. Rotating insecticide groups with different modes of action is essential to delay resistance development, a concern already documented in FAW populations in several countries following repeated use of the same chemistries. Farmers should always follow label recommendations and respect pre harvest intervals.

5. Host Plant Resistance

Genetically engineered Bt maize hybrids expressing insecticidal Cry and Vip3Aa proteins have been deployed in several countries and provide a strong foundation for FAW management where approved, though susceptibility varies across FAW populations and events, making resistance monitoring important. In India, where Bt maize is not commercially approved, breeding programmes continue to screen germplasm for native tolerance traits such as thicker whorl leaves and higher leaf silica content, which can reduce larval establishment.

Conclusion

Fall Armyworm has, within a few short years, become one of the most consequential insect pests of Indian and global agriculture and its continuous breeding, migratory ability and wide host range mean it is here to stay. Effective management does not rest on any single tool but on the disciplined integration of early monitoring through pheromone traps, cultural practices that disrupt the pest's life cycle, conservation and augmentation of natural enemies, judicious and rotational use of chemical insecticides only when thresholds are crossed, and, where available, resistant planting material. Extension efforts that build farmers' capacity to correctly identify FAW damage at the pin-hole stage itself, rather than after cob damage has occurred, remain the single most important intervention for minimising yield losses while keeping input costs and environmental impact low.

References

1. Agboyi, L.K., Goergen, G., Beseh, P., Mensah, S.A., Clottey, V.A., Glikpo, R., Buddie, A., Cafà, G., Offord, L., Day, R. and Rwomushana, I. (2020). Parasitoid complex of fall armyworm, Spodoptera frugiperda, in Ghana and Benin. *Insects*, 11(2): 68.

2. Chawanda, G., Tembo, Y.L.B., Donga, T.K., Kabambe, V.H., Stevenson, P.C. and Belmain, S.R. (2023). Agroecological management of fall armyworm using soil and botanical treatments reduces crop damage and increases maize yield. *Frontiers in Agronomy*, 5: 1114496.
3. Goergen, G., Kumar, P.L., Sankung, S.B., Togola, A. and Tamò, M. (2016). First report of outbreaks of the fall armyworm Spodoptera frugiperda (J.E. Smith) (Lepidoptera, Noctuidae), a new alien invasive pest in West and Central Africa. *PLoS ONE*, 11(10): e0165632.
4. Kalleshwaraswamy, C.M., Asokan, R., Swamy, H.M.M., Maruthi, M.S., Pavithra, H.B., Hegbe, K., Navi, S., Prabhu, S.T. and Goergen, G. (2018). First report of the fall armyworm, Spodoptera frugiperda (J.E. Smith) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae), an alien invasive pest on maize in India. *Pest Management in Horticultural Ecosystems*, 24(1): 23-29.
5. Kenis, M., Benelli, G., Biondi, A., Calatayud, P.A., Day, R., Desneux, N., Harrison, R.D., Kriticos, D., Rwomushana, I., van den Berg, J. and Verheggen, F. (2023). Invasiveness, biology, ecology andmanagement of the fall armyworm, Spodoptera frugiperda. *Entomologia Generalis*, 43(2): 187-241.
6. Rakshit, S., Kalapati, K., Kumar, C.S., Bag, M.K., Rana, D.K., Kumar, A. and Singh, K.P. (2019). Fall armyworm: Diagnosis and Management (First Version). ICAR-Indian Institute of Maize Research, New Delhi.
7. Reddy, N.A., Anitha, C.N., Sridhar, S., Rachana, R.R., Prabhu, S.T., Hosmani, K. and Sagar, D. (2024). Evaluation of farmers friendly IPM modules for the management of fall armyworm, Spodoptera frugiperda (JE Smith) in maize in the hot semiarid region of India. *Scientific Reports*, 14: 7060.
8. Ramzan, M., Ali, S., Waqas, M.S., Aslam, M.N., Ahmad, S. and Idrees, A. (2024). Fall armyworm management in a changing climate: an overview of climate-responsive integrated pest management (IPM) strategies for long-term control. *Egyptian Journal of Biological Pest Control*, 34: 61.
9. Sisay, B., Simiyu, J., Malusi, P., Likhayo, P., Mendesil, E., Elibariki, N., Wakgari, M., Ayalew, G. and Tefera, T. (2018). First report of the fall armyworm, Spodoptera frugiperda (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae), natural enemies from Africa. *Journal of Applied Entomology*, 142(8): 800-804.
10. Sun, X.X., Hu, C.X., Jia, H.R., Wu, Q.L., Shen, X.J., Zhao, S.Y., Jiang, Y.Y. and Wu, K.M. (2021). Case study on the first immigration of fall armyworm, Spodoptera frugiperda invading into China. *Journal of Integrative Agriculture*, 20(3): 664-672.