A Study on the Farmers' View on the Incidence and Infestation of Muga Silkworm by Ants

Comment [SK1]: Impact of Ant Infestation on Muga Silkworms: Insights from Farmer Observations This can be a better titile

Abstract

The present study investigates the incidence and infestation of ants, a ubiquitous predator in muga silkworm (*Antheraea assamensis* Helfer) rearing.A survey was conducted during August 2021 to July 22across Jorhat and Lakhimpur districts of Assam, involving 120 respondents from 8 villages. The findings revealed100% ~~incidence~~ of ant infestation during muga silkworm rearing, by*Oecophylla smaragdina*(Fabricus)emerging as the most frequently observed and predacious species, particularly targeting the early larval instars. The respondents reported peak ant predation during the *Aherua* (June-July) crop cycle, with an estimated 1-25% crop loss. This study highlights the need for developing effective management strategies to mitigate the impact of ant predation on muga silk production.

Keywords: Assam, ant infestation,muga silkworm, *Oecophylla smaragdina*,

1. Introduction

Sericulture is an agro-based cottage industry that is well-suited to small and marginal farmers, which requires little financial input and is also carried out by women and family members[1]. India is one of the most important silk-producing countries ranking second, next to China, in the world for silk production[2]. The four commercially raised species of silkworms in India are the mulberry silkworm (*Bombyx mori* L.), tasar silkworm (*Antheraea mylitta* D.), muga silkworm (*Antheraea assamensis*Helfer), and eri silkworm (*Samia ricini*Donovan). Muga silkworm, *A~~ntheraea~~ assamensis*~~Helfer~~ (Lepidoptera: Saturniidae), which produces golden silk, is endemic to north-east India[3]. Muga silkworm is reared on two primary host plants, *Som*, *Persea bombycina* (King ex Hook f.) Kost and *Sualo*, *Litseamonopetala*(Roxb.) Pers. under outdoor conditions[4]. Assam has a total area of 12661.64hectares of muga food plants under both government and private farms[5].

Comment [SK2]: Check this once.

The success of all types of commercial silkworm culture is largely dependent on the quality of the leaves, ideal environmental conditions for raising silkworms, maintenance of hygienic conditions during rearing and protections against diseases and pests both in silkworm and host plants. As the~~a result of~~ leaf protein ~~being~~ getstransformed into silk protein, ~~food plants' leaves~~leaves provided as food are the only source of nutrition for the silkworms. These perennial trees are attacked by several

Comment [SK3]: Economic importance of muga silk can be explained here. Also highlight the need for these interviews and for the research in a better manner.

insect pests and diseases, thereby affecting the quality and reduction in the leaf yield which indirectly influences the production of muga silk. There are about 23 species of pests of muga host plants, belonging to the order Lepidoptera, Coleoptera Thysanoptera, Hymenoptera, Homoptera, Diptera, and Isoptera causing considerable loss to the tune of 11 to 95% of the total leaf biomass[6].

Among these pest, ~~A~~ants (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) infests both host plants and silkworm.

They are easy to identify, and collect because of stationary nesting habits. Generally, the relationship of ants and plants is mutualistic but in the case of muga ecosystem the scenario is different because reduces the food of muga silkworm and at the same time they are the predators of muga silkworm. Considering the importance of muga culture in the region, thestudy was carried out to know the predation of muga silkworm by ants from muga farmers.

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0.5"

2. Materials and Methods

The investigation was carried out in the Lakhimpur and Jorhat district of Assam during August 2021 to July 22. These districts were selected purposively to gather the information of ant infestation during muga silkworm rearing. A purposive and random sampling design was followed for selection of respondents. Two developmental blocks from each district *viz.*, *Kaliapani* block, and *Titabar* block of Jorhat district and *Telahi* block, and *Dhakuakhana* Block from Lakhimpur district were selected, ~~purposively~~. Two (2) villages from each block of the selected districts*ie.*, eight districts *in toto* were selected randomly for the collection of data. ~~Thus, the total number of villages was eight.~~ Fifteen respondents from each selected village were selected randomly. Thus, the total number of respondents for the present study was obtained to be 120. An interview schedule was created in order to collect data. The data were collected personally by the researcher through the scheduled interview. All the respondents were interviewed by the investigator himself in the residence as well as in the muga farms. It was ensured that the questions were answered, accurately. During the interview, a cordial atmosphere was maintained to make sure that respondents felt comfortable.

Comment [SK4]: Provide the rational behind your district selection please.

Formatted: Font: Italic, Font color: Auto

2.1.Target group

Active muga farmers were considered as target group in both the traditional districts.



Figure 1.Location map of study area

3. Results and Discussion

The study was carried out based on the preliminary investigation of Rajkhowa (2022) in which 8 species of ants belonging to 8 genera and 4 subfamilies i.e.,~~*Oecophylla*~~ *O.smaragdina*~~(Fabricus)~~, *Paratrachina longicornis* (Latreille), *Cataulacus taprobanae* Smith, *Crematogaster anthracina* Smith, *Pheidole* sp., *Diacamma* sp., *Odontoponera denticulate* (Smith) and *Tetraponera rufonigra* (Jerdon)were identified in the aforementioned location of muga eco-system.

The study revealed that 100% of the respondents responded that ants infest muga silkworms during ~~muga silkworm~~ rearing (Table 1). 70% of the respondents responded that ants are active during the afternoon period of the day (Table 2). The respondents opined that ant were predacious to 1st instar (100%) and 2ndinstar (100%) muga silkworm larvae followed by 3rdinstar (29.17%), 4thinstar (10.83%) and least predacious to 5thinstar (5.83%) muga larva (Table 3). The majority of the respondent i.e., 28.33% had the opinion that ants were most predacious during *Aherua* (June-July) (28.33%) muga crop cycle, followed by *Bhodia* (August-September) (24.17%) muga crop cycle, *Jethua* (May-June) (22.50%) muga crop cycle, *Chotua* (March-April) (19.17%) muga crop cycle, *Kotia* (October-November) (4.17%) muga crop cycle and least predacious during *Jarua* (December-February) (1.67%) muga crop cycle (Table 4).

Comment [SK5]: Typing mistake

Table 1. Distribution of the respondents regarding ant infestation during muga silkworm rearing

Sl. no.	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Yes	120	100.00
2.	No	0	0

Comment [SK6]: Try to depict tables in graphical manner for better understanding.

Table 2.Distribution of the respondents regarding the activeness of ants during muga silkworm rearing

Sl. no.	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Morning	13	10.83
2.	Afternoon	84	70.00
3.	Evening	23	19.17
Sl. no.	**Category**	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
1.	1st instar	120	100.00
2.	2nd instar	120	100.00
3.	3rd instar	35	29.17
4.	4th instar	13	10.83
5.	5th instar	7	5.83

Table 3. Distribution of the respondents regarding the predaciousness of ants to muga crop cycle

Sl. no.	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	*Jarua*	2	1.67
2.	*Chotua*	23	19.17
3.	*Jethua*	27	22.50
4.	*Aherua*	34	28.33
5.	*Bhodia*	29	24.17
6.	*Kotia*	18	4.17

Muga farmers were asked only about the infestation of ant species recorded during the study period. The data depicted in the Table 5., shows that majority of the respondent i.e., 40% responded that ~~*Oecophylla*~~ *O.smaragdina* was observed most frequently in muga ecosystem, followed by *T.*~~*etraponera*~~ *rufonigra* (15%), *C.*~~*reamtogatser*~~ *antracina* (12.50%),

P. aratrechinalongicornis (10.83%), *O. dontoponera denticulate* (7.50%), *Pheidole* sp. (6.67%), *Diacamma* sp. (4.17%) and *C. ataulacus taprobanae* (3.33%) was observed least frequently in muga ecosystem.

The study on the respondents' response revealed that ants create infestation during muga silkworm rearing. *Oecophylla smaragdina* was the most predacious ant species and mainly infested 1st and 2nd instar muga silkworm larvae. According to the muga farmers, the infestation of ants was highest in the *Aherua season* of rearing.

Table 4. Distribution of the respondents regarding frequently observed ant species in muga ecosystem

Sl. no.	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	*Oecophyllasmaragdina*	48	40.00
2.	*Paratrechinalongicornis*	13	10.83
3.	*Pheidole*sp.	8	6.67
4.	*Creamtogatserantracina*	15	12.50
5.	*Cataulacustaprobanae*	4	3.33
6.	*Odontoponera denticulate*	9	7.50
7.	*Diacamma*sp.	5	4.17
8.	*Tetraponerarufonigra*	18	15.00

The study on the response of the respondents revealed that ants create infestation during muga silkworm rearing. *Oecophyllasmaragdina*(63.33%)was the most predacious ant species followed by *P. aratrechinalongicornis*(12.50%) both in chawki muga silkworm rearing(Table 6). Similarly, it was also observed that *O. ecophyllasmaragdina*(80%)was the most predacious ant species followed by *P. aratrechinalongicornis*(15%) both in chawki muga silkworm rearing(Table 7).

Table 5. Distribution of respondents regarding most predacious ant species to chawki muga silkworm

Sl. no.	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	*Oecophyllasmaragdina*	76	63.33
2.	*Paratrechinalongicornis*	15	12.50
3.	*Pheidole*sp.	5	4.17
4.	*Creamtogatserantracina*	13	10.83

5.	*Cataulacustaprobanae*	0	0
6.	*Odontoponeradenticulate*	3	2.50
7.	*Diacamma*sp.	0	0
8.	*Tetraponerarufonigra*	8	6.67

Table 6. Distribution of respondents regarding most predacious ant species to late age muga silkworm

Sl. no.	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	*Oecophyllasmaragdina*	96	80.00
2.	*Paratrechinalongicornis*	18	15.00
3.	*Pheidole*sp.	0	0
4.	*Creamtogatserantracina*	6	5.00
5.	*Cataulacustaprobanae*	0	0
6.	*Odontoponeradenticulata*	0	0
7.	*Diacamma*sp.	0	0
8.	*Tetraponerarufonigra*	0	0

The majority of the respondents i.e., 97.50% revealed that 1-25% of crop loss was done by ants and only 2.50% of the respondent responded that 26-50% of crop loss was done by ants (Table 7).

Table 7. Distribution of the respondents regarding muga crop loss done by ants

Sl no.	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	1-25%	117	97.50
2.	26-50%	3	2.50
3.	51-75%	0	0
4.	76-100%	0	0

The survey conducted across Jorhat and Lakhimpur districts reveals the infestation of ant during muga silkworm rearing, as reported by 100% of the respondents. The findings

underscore the predominance of *O.~~ecophylla~~ smaragdina* as the most frequently observed and predacious ant species, particularly targeting the early larval instars of the muga silkworm. Subharani and Jayprakash (2015) also reported that *O.~~ecophylla~~ smaragdina*, *Solenopsis* sp., *Camponotus* sp. attacked larvae of muga silkworm[7]. The present study corroborates to the findings of Chowdhury (1981) and Singh et al. (2013) who reported ~~*Oecophylla* O.~~*smaragdina* as a pest of muga silkworm[8], [9].

Comment [SK7]: Mention about the results of research conducted by the corroborating studies for better comprehension.

Notably, the respondents identified the *Aherua* (June-July) crop cycle as the period of peak ant predation, highlighting the need for focused management strategies during this rearing season. Furthermore, the estimated crop loss of 1-25% attributed to ant infestation, as reported by the majority of respondents, which reveals the economic implications of this predatory threat on muga silk production.

4. Conclusion

The study's findings contribute to a comprehensive understanding of the ant-muga silkworm interaction dynamics, emphasizing the urgency for developing effective and sustainable management approaches. Potential strategies may include integrated pest management techniques, biological control methods, or the exploration of environmentally benign ant repellents or deterrents. Future research endeavors should focus on elucidating the ecological factors influencing ant predation, as well as investigating the potential impact of climate change on these interactions.

5. References

[1] K. Vani Sree, S. Upendhar, M. Rajsekhar, R. Prashanth Reddy, and M. Mahesh, “Sericulture as a Sustainable Tool for Economic Development of Small and Marginal Farmers”.

[2] S. P. Ingle, N. T. Bagde, R. F. Ansari, and A. B. Kayarwar, “Analysis of growth and instability of silk production in India,” *J Pharmacogn Phytochem*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 195–201, 2022.

[3] S. B. Dandin and N. Prabhu, “Silkworm Biodiversity, Conservation, Threats, and Sustainable Utilization in Indian Subcontinent,” in *Biodiversity*, CRC Press, 2022, pp. 157–192.

[4] J. P. Baruah and J. Saikia, “Sap sucking insect (thrips, aphids, jassid) infestation on muga silkworm (antheraea assamensis) host plants on som (Persea bombycina) and soalu (Litsea polyantha): a review,” *International Journal of Agricultural Science and Research*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 211–216, 2021.

[5] Anonymous, *STATISTICAL HANDBOOK ASSAM-2023*, 55th ed. DIRECTORATE OF ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS ASSAM, 2023.

[6] M. C., M. D., C. R. Sarmah, *Pests of muga food plant, Persea bombycina (King Ex. Hook. F.) Kost. and their management.*, 5th ed. In: Barah, H., Neog, K., Hazarika, U., (Eds.), 2005.

[7] S. Subharani and P. Jayaprakash, "Biodiversity of insect pests complex in Muga ecosystem in Narayanpur, Assam, India," *Int J Curr Microbiol Appl Sci*, vol. 4, no. 12, pp. 209–214, 2015.

[8] R. N. Singh, C. M. Bajpeyi, A. Tikader, and B. Saratchandra, *Muga culture*. 2013.

[9] S. N. Chowdhury, *Muga Silk Industry*. Directorate of Sericulture, Govt. of Assam, Guwahati, 1981.