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## INSECT PEST RISK ANAYLISIS OF CUTFLOWERS IN BANGLADESH


#### Abstract

The study was conducted in the 20 upazilla of 10 selected major flower growing districts of Bangladesh during the period from December 2016 to February 2017 to find out the present status and diversity of insect pests of cutflowers, their risks and management options. The data were collected through interview of 500 cutflower farmers considering 25 cutflower farmers from each upazilla and 60 field level officers of DAE including one UAO, one AEO and one SAAO from each upazilla. The data were analyzed using computer program SPSS 20.0 version. The major sources of flowers seeds were the self produced seeds, seed retailer and local nursery. Most of the flowers farmers $(90.20 \%)$ faced problems with diseases infection of the produced flowers. Other majors problems faced during flowers cultivation were insect pest, lack of propagating materials and weed attack. The rose and marigold were the most susceptible flowers types to insect pest and diseases. Most of the flowers ( $94.82 \%$ ) was infested in field by aphid. Among these insect pests, aphid and red mite were identified as major pests in field and caused damage with high infestation intensity, respectively. Other was identified as minor insect pests of flowers caused damaged with low infestation intensity. Leaves and flowers are the most vulnerable parts of flower plants which were infested by aphid, whitefly, red mite and thrips. To control insect pests in flower fields, $99.80 \%$ farmers used to apply insecticides. Additionally, other control options like application of irrigation, hand picking and IPM in the fields were observed specially for controlling insect and mite pests. So for, $95 \%$ flower farmers got assistance and advices from pesticides dealers while controlling these pests. Moreover, DAE, NGO's and neighboring experienced and skill farmers were also helped in flower production.
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## CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

Flower is the symbol of beauty and serenity. Flowers have been regarded as an embodiment of human taste and aesthetics. This unique and unparalleled nature of flowers has given rise to its commercial transaction all over the world. Bangladesh is a country of cultural heritage and not far behind in promoting this agricultural product. With the rising demand of flower cultivation is increasing in this country. Thus, Bangladesh has ventured to enter this growing export market. Flowers and foliage are flowers or flower buds (often with some stem and leaf) and leaves, branches etc that have been cut from the plant bearing it. It is usually removed from the plant for indoor decorative use. Typical uses are in vase displays, wreaths and garlands. Bangladesh is highly suitable for flowers and foliage production due to its favorable climate, topography and other conditions like labor cost and relatively low capital investment in contrast with high value addition, the cultivation of flower for the purpose of commercial use was started in a large scale from the early 80 's. Growth of commercial flower production can be traced back to the early 70 s that got impetus in the mid 80 s when large-scale commercial production started in Jhikargachaupazila of Jessore district (Sultana, 2003). Till then the traditional flower marketing system is increasing, many shops have been established, but the scenery of flower business is very poor. The substantial amount of flower cultivation is now still limited to the area of panishara and its adjacent places in Jessore (Hossain and Rahman, 1994). According to the Bangladesh Flower Growers and Exporters Association (BFA), around 10,000 hectares of land are under flower cultivation in our country (Hossain and Rahman, 1994).

Cut flowers and foliage preferably are orchid, rose, gerbera, tuberose, gladiolus, carnation, lily, chrysanthemum, marigold etc. (Mitul, 2011). Rose is the principal cut flower grown all over the country. These are used for offerings at places of worship, for the extraction of essential oils and also used in garlands. Gladiolus is the next most important cut flower crop in the country. Gladiolus is planted in a phased manner so that harvest can be done continuously. In some fields, old plants are left for bulb production; generally yellow, pink, red and dark red varieties are popular (Dahlani, 1997). Gerbera is also an important commercial cut flower in Bangladesh. In recent production of this flower is increasing. Tuberose, a very popular cut flower crop in Bangladesh, is grown mainly in Jessore. In Jessore, about 80 percent of total flower cultivated area is occupied by only tuberose. Both single land double flower varieties are equally popular. Other main cut flower item is orchid. Its production is confined mainly in the Mymensingh and Savar. Among the traditional crops grown for loose flowers, the largest area is under marigold, grown all over the country. In most parts of the country only local varieties are grown in generations.

To satisfy the market demand, various flowers, such as chrysanthemum, tuberose, and gladiolus have been imported from India and orchids, gerbera, anthurium and thai rose from Thailand every year. In 2012, there is demand for Cut flowers, worth about USD 8.0 million, in Bangladesh of which USD 5.0 million is locally produced and rest of the amount is imported mainly from China and Indonesia. Besides, Bangladesh imports a huge amount of artificial flowers per year to meet local demands. Artificial flowers are imported mainly from China and India (AER, 2010).

Flowers are infested by arrange of insect pests which can affect the production and quality of flowers as well as the cost of production of the flowers. The introduction of
insect pests, plant diseases, weeds and other pest associated with the commodity is brought about mainly during the accelerated agricultural development in different countries, when plants and plant materials were brought into, or sent out with little or no concern for the insect pests, diseases, weeds and other pests that were transported along with them. The type and severity of infestation differs from season to season, category of flowers and between different regions. The most significant insect pests of flowers are aphid (Macrosiphum rosae), rose flower beetle (Euphoria sepulcralis), thrips (Scirtothrips dorsalis), tortryx moth (Lozotaenia forsterana), metallic flea-beetles (Altica spp), japanese beetles (Popillia japonica), scale insect (Aulacaspis rosae) etc (Ali et al., 2016).

The introduction of insect pests is brought about mainly during the accelerated agricultural development in different countries, when plants and plant materials were brought into, or sent out with little or no concern for the insect pests, that were transported along with them. There are many instances of accidental introductions of insect pests from one country to another. Extensive damages, often sudden in nature, have been caused not by indigenous pests, but with exotic ones introduced along with plants, plant parts or seeds in the normal channel of trade or individual interest. But there is no comprehensive list of insect pests of in different flowers along with the status and damage intensity in Bangladesh. Therefore, the incidence, distribution and infestation severity are need to be investigated. In this context, the insect pest risk analysis of flowers in Bangladesh is indispensable. Thus, the assignment on insect pest risk analysis of flowers in Bangladesh will be conducted aiming to identify pests for the flowers grown areas and evaluate their risk as well as to identify risk management options.

## Objectives of the Research Work

Considering the above facts and points, the present research program has been designed with the following objectives:

1. To record the major and minor insect pests of cutflowers;
2. To conduct risk analysis for insect pests of cutflowers in Bangladesh;
3. To document the control measures against insect pests of cutflowers practiced by the farmers.

## CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Cutflowers: A Cutflowers can simply be defined as any flower that is cut from the plant, thorns trimmed, and are ready to be used in a fresh flower arrangement. Cutflowers are available at the florist or can be cut from the home garden.

At present, the vast majority of cutflowers are imported from overseas. Leading producers include the Netherlands, Columbia, Kenya, and Israel. Flowers imported from overseas are largely roses, carnations, gerbera daisies, garden mums, and orchids. These flowers ship reasonably well and make up the bulk of the flowers used in arrangements by most florists. Most of the flowers that local growers focus on are those that do not ship well or have shorter postharvest vase lives. These flowers have come to be termed "specialty cut flowers." Examples of specialty flowers include sunflowers, zinnia, lisianthus, dahlia, ageratum, and peonies to name but a few on this long list. Local growers can readily develop a market niche with these flowers by using the advantage of longer vase life if produced locally, higher percentage of usable flowers, and a wider choice of colors and varieties.

Increasing demand for a wide variety of locally grown, fresh-cut flowers has kept this market growing in volume for years. Producing fresh-cut flowers is not for everyone, however, as they have special production requirements, as well as a fairly short shelf life. Any grower considering flower production should also be aware of the relatively short field growing and marketing season, especially those in the northern United States.

People all over the world realize that flowers enhance the quality of life and influence human feelings more than words or other gifts. Globalization, cultural exchanges, and celebrations enhancing fraternity such as New Year, Valentine's Day, Memorial Day, Mothers' Day, Fathers' Day, Christmas, and weddings have induced people globally to
use flowers as a means of sharing their feelings. Above all, these celebrations have acquired one to one pairing with flowers in some cases, e.g. roses to Valentine's Day and carnations to Mother's Day. Increased use of flowers and ornamental plants makes marketing of flowers a lucrative business (Belwal and Chala, 2008)

### 2.1 General review on cutflowers

A common use is for floristry, usually for decoration inside a house or building. Typically the cut flowers are placed in a vase. A number of similar types of decorations are used, especially in larger buildings and at events such as weddings. These are often decorated with additional foliage. In some cultures, a major use of cut flowers is for worship; this can be seen especially in south and Southeast Asia. Sometimes the flowers are picked rather than cut, without any significant leaf or stem. Such flowers may be used for wearing in hair, or in a button-hole. Masses of flowers may be used for sprinkling, in a similar way to confetti. 27 garlands (especially in south Asia), and wreaths (in Europe and the Americas) are major derived and value added products.

### 2.2. Origin and distribution of cutflowers

Rose has been symbols of love, beauty, war, and politics. The rose is, according to fossil evidence, 35 million years old. In nature, the genus rosa has some 150 species spread throughout the Northern Hemisphere, from Alaska to Mexico and including northern Africa. Garden cultivation of roses began some 5,000 years ago, probably in China. The rose have a cosmopolitan distribution (found nearly everywhere except for Antarctica), but are primarily concentrated in the Northern Hemisphere in regions that are not desert or tropical rainforest. Tuberose is a native of Mexico from where it spread to different parts of the world during 16th Century. Tuberose is grown commercially in a number of countries including India, Kenya, Mexico, Morocco, France, Italy, Hawaii, South Africa, Taiwan, North Carolina, USA, Egypt, China and many other tropical and subtropical
areas in the world. Gladiolus (from Latin, the diminutive of gladius, a sword) is a genus of perennial cormous flowering plants in the iris family (Iridaceae) (Manning and Goldblatt, 2008). The genus occurs in Asia, Mediterranean Europe, South Africa, and tropical Africa. The center of diversity is in the Cape Floristic Region (Manning and Goldblatt, 1998). The genera Acidanthera, Anomalesia, Homoglossum, and Oenostachys, formerly considered distinct, are now included in Gladiolus (Goldblatt, 1989). About 10 species are native to Eurasia. There are 160 species of Gladiolus endemic in southern Africa and 76 in tropical Africa. Gerbera, a genus of plants in the Asteraceae (daisy family. Gerbera is native to tropical regions of South America, Africa and Asia. The first scientific description of a Gerbera was made by J. D. Hooker in Curtis's Botanical Magazine in 1889 when he described Gerbera jamesonii, a South African species also known as Transvaal daisy or Barberton Daisy. Chrysanthemums, sometimes called mums or chrysanths, are flowering plants of the genus Chrysanthemum in the family Asteraceae. They are native to Asia and northeastern Europe. Most species originate from East Asia and the center of diversity is in China. Common marigold plants in the genus Tagetes. Tagetes is a genus of annual or perennial, mostly herbaceous plants in the sunflower family (Asteraceae or Compositae. It was described as a genus by Linnaeus in 1753. The genus is native to North and South America, but some species have become naturalized around the world. One species, T. minuta, is considered a noxious invasive plant in some areas (Arora and Sing, 1980). Most species of lily are native to the temperate northern hemisphere, though their range extends into the northern subtropics. The range of lilies in the Old World extends across much of Europe, across most of Asia to Japan, south to India and east to Indochina and the Philippines. In the New World they extend from southern Canada through much of the United States. Aster is a genus of flowering plants in the family Asteraceae. The genus Aster once contained nearly 600
species in Eurasia and North America, but after morphologic and molecular research on the genus during the 1990s, it was decided that the North America species are better treated in a series of other related genera (Arora and Saini, 1976).

### 2.3. Flowers in Bangladesh

Flowers and foliage are flowers or flower buds (often with some stem and leaf) and leaves, branches etc that have been cut from the plant bearing it. It is usually removed from the plant for indoor decorative use. Typical uses are in vase displays, wreaths and garlands. This unique and unparalleled nature of flowers has given rise to its commercial transaction all over the world. Bangladesh is not far behind in promoting this agricultural product. People purchase flower in various occasion. With the rising demand of flower cultivation is increasing in this country. Thus, Bangladesh has ventured to enter this growing export market.

Today the trade of flowers is a promising trade and a number of florists have sprung up who sell flowers. In view of marketing prospect of flowers, a vast agricultural land has been turned into a flower growing area and the farmers are now in a position to make available any quantum of flowers for export according to the market requirements. In Bangladesh, the cultivation of flower for the purpose of commercial use was started in a large scale from the early 80 's. Till then the traditional flower marketing system is increasing, many shops have been established, but the scenery of flower business is very poor. The substantial amount of flower cultivation is now still limited to the area of panishara and its adjacent places in Jessore (Hossain and Rahman, 1994). Before 1983, the space in front of the High Court Mazar was the venue for the flower trade. Now it has spread too many other specific areas of the Dhaka city. In 1999 there were 530 flower shops in Dhaka city. At present the number of flower shops is more than a thousand throughout the country. Moreover, there are a good number of hawkers and none descript youngsters selling the flowers in different places of Dhaka and other big cities on temporary basis to maintain their livelihood. A good number of flower shops are also
established in district towns. At least 26 business enterprises and 6 associations are directly engaged in growing and export of flowers in Bangladesh. This number has increased now days. Two decades have passed, but flower marketing cannot progress at expected rate. Many underdeveloped countries like Kenya earns more than 40 million US dollar from exporting flower. On the other hand, Bangladesh has huge potentiality to export flower besides domestic production and sales. Now the study will be developed for the purpose of drawing current condition, prospect and problem of flower marketing. Based on prior research, it is found that there is huge potentiality in flower business in Bangladesh although several constraints are responsible to hinder the business.

### 2.4. Species of flowers cultivated in Bangladesh

Several species of flowers are grown in the world. These differ in appearance, petal structure, size and color, time of maturity, cooking and marketing qualities, yield, and resistance to pests and diseases. A species that grows well in one area may do poorly in another.

There had been cultivated different types of flowers in Bangladesh. The major types of cutflowers are Rose, Orchid, Gerbera, Tuberose, Gladiolus, Carnation, Lily, Chrysanthemum, Marigold, Gypsophila, Aster, Dalhia, Jesmine (Ali, et al., 2016).

### 2.5. Production areas and major flowers and foliages in Bangladesh

According to the Bangladesh Flower Growers and Exporters Association (BFA), around 10,000 hectares of land are under flower cultivation in our country. It was also reported that Jessore is the region which accounts for the maximum volume of flower cultivation. Tuberose, rose, orchid and marigold are among the major flowers that make up Bangladesh's floral basket for exports.

Flowers are now cultivated in about 10 thousand hectares of land, mainly in the Godkhali union of Zikorgasa upzilla under Jessore district. About 4000 farmers produce mainly various types of rose, tube rose, gerbera, gladiolus and some orchids. In Godkhali, the cultivation of flowers was started in 1983. Most of the tuberose and rose supplies come
from Jhikargachha of Jessore and Savar of Dhaka, marry gold from Chuadanga and orchid from Mymensingh and Manikganj district. Cut flowers give three to four times’ higher return than any other crop. Currently about 1,50,000 people are directly involved in flower cultivation or business in Bangladesh.

Bangladesh is highly suitable for cut flower and foliage production due to its favorable climate, topography and other conditions like labour cost and relatively low capital investment in contrast with high value addition.

Table 2.1. Name of flowers and main production areas in Bangladesh

| Name of flowers | Scientific name | Family | Production area |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Orchid | Vanda teres, <br> Aerides spp. | Orchidaceae | Hilly areas of Chittagong <br> Hill Tracts, Mymensingh <br> and Sylhet |
| Rose | Rosa spp. | Rosaceae | Gazipur, Savar, Jesshore, <br> Dhaka, Satkhira. |
| Gerbera | Gerbera jamesonii | Asteraceae | Jessore |
| Tuberose | Polianthes tuberose | Asparagaceae | Jessore, Satkhira, Bogra, <br> Comilla, and Chittagong |
| Gladiolus | Gladiolus dalenii | Iridaceae | Dhaka, Jesshore, Gazipur, |
| Carnation | Dianthus <br> caryophyllus | Caryophyllaceae | Savar, Gazipur |
| Lily | Lilium candidum | Liliaceae | Narshingdi |
| Chrysanthemum | Chrysanthemum <br> indicum | Asteraceae | Savar, Gazipur |
| Marigold | Tagetes patula | Asteraceae | Jessore, Narayanganj, <br> Savar |
| Gypsophila <br> (Baby's breath) | Gypsophila <br> paniculata | Caryophyllaceae | Savar, Gazipur |
| Aster | Aster spp. | Asteraceae | Savar, Gazipur |
| Dahlia | Dahlia pinnata | Asteraceae | Dhaka, Savar, Gazipur, <br> Bogra |
| Jasmine | Jasminum <br> officinale | Oleaceae | Jessore, Narayanganj, <br> Savar |

Source: Mitul, 2011

### 2.6. Flower trades in Bangladesh

Today the trade of flowers is a promising trade and a number of florists have sprung up who sell flowers. Before 1983, the space in front of the High Court Mazar was the venue for the flower trade. Now it has spread too many other specific areas of the Dhaka city. A
little distance away from the Shahbagh road corner towards the west lays the Katabon area which has the biggest concentration of flowers shops in the city. Not only smallscale flower vendors are now widespread and visible at several shops with neatly displayed flowers in shelves are found throughout the country particularly in Dhaka and other division and few district cities.

The flowers are kept either at the trader's homes or in the closets behind the foot-paths. Suppliers bring truckloads of flowers to Dhaka from Jessore, Savar and other places every morning. Some flowers are imported from India and Thailand.

The traders said some 20 types of flowers are available at Shahbagh .The local ones include rose, tuberose (Rajanigandha), marigold (Gada), Lotus, Gladiolus and Chandramallika. The imported ones are ones are Jarbera and Orchid.

In 1999 there were 530 flower shops in Dhaka city. At present the number of flower shops is more than a thousand throughout the country. A good number of flower shops are also established in district towns. At least 26 business enterprises and 6 associations are directly engaged in growing and export of flowers in Bangladesh. This number has increased now days. The important flower shops and nurseries in Dhaka are given below:

Table 2.2. Important flower shops and nurseries in Dhaka

| Name of flower shops | Address |
| :--- | :--- |
| Chameli | Katabon, Dhaka University Market, Dhaka |
| GolapBitan | Savar Bus stands |
| Karabi | Shahbag, Dhaka |
| Madukari | Shahbag, Dhaka |
| Sunflower | Shahbag, Dhaka |
| Madhabi | Shahbag, Dhaka |
| Chanchal | Mirpur road, Dhaka |

### 2.6.1. Domestic market of flowers in Bangladesh

The demand for flowers in the domestic market is increasing. The current volume of production is inadequate to meet the demand for domestic consumption. Several varieties of flowers such as chrysanthemums, tuberoses, gladioluses, orchids, gerberas, anthuriums, and Thai-roses are imported. BDT 2-3 million are spent every year to import flowers, ornamental foliage etc. Flower imports increased 5-folds between 2002 and 2007, and the trend is expected to continue unless domestic production can keep pace with the increasing domestic demand. The demand-supply gap of $30 \%$ is mainly for the upscale urban population of Dhaka. To meet the demand of this high-end clientele, retailers prefer imported flowers. Therefore, there are ample opportunities for local flowers to meet the demand of domestic consumption (Khan, 2013).

### 2.6.2. International Market of flowers

India, Pakistan, Italy, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, the United States, South Korea, the Philippines, Singapore, Japan, Germany, Britain, Denmark and France. Our stake in the global trade of Cut flowers is negligible i.e. 0.3 per cent. We have good potential in the production of Cut flowers due to favorable environment and fertile land; it's a cash cow crop for the farmers. The global-market of floriculture is currently facing a $6 \%$ annual growth rate, rising from a USD 100 billion dollar industry in 2003 to around USD 181 billion dollars by 2014. The floral export basket for Bangladesh consists of tuberoses, roses, orchids, and other types (BBS, 2014). Currently, country's flower market is estimated to be valued at about EUR 95 million. According to a report by Bangladesh Sangbad Sangstha (BSS), the industry exceeded its target by $10.6 \%$ during the FY201112, earning USD 35.02 million. According to Bangladesh Export Promotion Bureau (BEPB), this growth-rate for FY2013-14 exceeded $15 \%$.

In Bangladesh, export of cut flower and foliage has exceeded the target by over 10 per cent as entrepreneurs found it to be an emerging industry of high potentials that widens the export market. "Export of flowers and floral products has seen an impressive growth over the years contributing to the GDP (gross domestic product) as the entrepreneurs are trying to tap a strong demand for the non-conventional product in global market," as reported by Export Promotion Bureau (EPB). EPB also reported that the country exported cut flowers and foliage worth $\$ 35.02$ million during July-March 2011-12 financial year an amount which was 10.6 per cent more that the export target.

Dhaka Flower Merchant Welfare Association (DFMWA) reported that appropriate training for the people involved in flower production, cutting, packaging and preservation and marketing could boost the industry provided cold storage, air conditioned vehicles for flower transports and subsidy in air cargo freight charges were provided. The DFMWA also reported "There is no slab system in Biman for flowers and ornamental plants though it is available for vegetables, sometimes flowers are damaged before reaching destination as Biman often does not maintain its proper flight schedule".

### 2.7. Import of flowers into Bangladesh

To satisfy the market demand, various flowers, such as chrysanthemum, tuberose and gladiolus have been imported from India and orchids, gerbera, anthurium and Thai rose from Thailand every year. Bangladesh has to spend roughly Tk. 2-3 million in importing flowers and ornamental plants from abroad.

Larger share of export receipts of cut flowers and ornamental foliage, live trees and plants by Bangladesh in 2009-2010 was from European countries, while larger share of import expenses for the same period was from China and Indonesia. Table 2.3 shows country-wise import expenses (from FY 2005-06 to 2009-10) of Cut Flowers and Ornamental Foliage, Live trees and Plants by Bangladesh.

A study conducted in 2012 shows that, there is demand for Cut flowers, worth about USD 8.0 million, in Bangladesh of which USD 5.0 million is locally produced and rest of the amount is imported mainly from China and Indonesia. Besides, Bangladesh imports a huge amount of artificial flowers per year to meet local demands. Artificial flowers are imported mainly from China and India.

Table 2.3. Country-wise import Expense of cut flowers and ornamental foliage, live trees and plants of Bangladesh

| Country | Year-wise import (Taka in thousands) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5 - 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6 - 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}-\mathbf{0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 - 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 - 1 0}$ |
| China | 24 | 501 | 473 | 2378 | 7944 |
| Germany | 0 | 2737 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hong Kong | 0 | 7160 | 0 | 0 | 132 |
| India | 857 | 1282 | 537 | 5762 | 5732 |
| Indonesia | 472 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Japan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5142 | 0 |
| Netherlands | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1849 |
| Korea, | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 0 |
| Republic of |  |  |  |  |  |
| Malaysia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4654 | 0 |
| Pakistan | 525 | 1348 | 644 | 3999 | 801 |
| Singapore | 0 | 0 | 0 | 606 | 0 |
| Thailand | 2596 | 1116 | 2030 | 10587 | 2473 |
| UK | 0 | 2781 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| USA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 |
| Total | 4474 | 16925 | 3684 | 33257 | 19056 |

Source: Annual Import Payments 2005-06 to 2009-10, Statistics Department, Bangladesh Bank

### 2.8. Insect pests of flowers in Bangladesh

The fifteen arthropod pests including 14 insect and one mite pests as pest for Bangladesh. The insect pests flowers included the flower aphid (Macrosiphum rosae), whitefly (Bemisia tabaci), scale insect (Aulacaspis rosae), flower mealybug (Pseudococcus spp.), thrips (Scirtothrips dorsalis), leaf miner (Liriomyza sativae Blanchard), flower gall midge (Cotarinia spp.), june beetle (Melolontha melolontha), metallic flea beetle (Altica spp.), flower beetle (Euphoria sepulcralis), leaf eating beetle (Macrodactylus subspinosus), leaf eating bee (Megachile spp.), bristly rose slug/sawfly (Cladius spp.), tobacco caterpillar
(Spodoptera litura), two-spotted spider mite (Tetranychus urticae). But the incidence of Japanese beetle (Poppilla japonica), and tortryx moth (Lozotaenia forsterana) were not reported by the farmers and other experts in Bangladesh. Among these insect and mite pests of flowers, aphid, thrips and two spotted spider mite are more damaging than others. The pest status of all these insect and mite pests was minor and caused low level of infestation.

### 2.9. Insect pests of flowers in worldwide

A number of insect pests have been reported damaging cut flower and foliages. Among these the important pests are aphid, rose flower beetle, Japanese beetle, june beetle, metallic flea beetle, cut worm, rose slug sawfly, leaf miner, tortrix moth, scale insect, thrips, mealy bug, white fly, red spider mites.

Western flower thrips (Frankliniella occidentalis) is distributed in many Asian countries including India (CABI/EPPO, 1999; EPPO, 2014; Kaomud Tyagi and Vikas Kumar, 2015), Thailand, Sri Lanka (CABI/EPPO, 1999; EPPO, 2014), Japan (Nakahara, 1997; CABI/EPPO, 1999; EPPO, 2014), China (EPPO, 2014; Reitz et al., 2011; Zhang et al., 2003), Iran (EPPO, 2014).F. occidentalis is naturally abundant in many wild flowers throughout western North America from southern California (and presumably Mexico) into Canada. In the late 1970s and 1980s, it spread across the USA and Canada. It reached the Netherlands in 1983 and then spread outwards across Europe (Kirk and Terry, 2003). The main host of F. occidentalis includes orchid, safflower, Chrysanthemum morifolium, roses, Gerbera, gypsophila, Zinnia, Begunia, Poinsettia, balsam. F. occidentalis reproduces throughout the year producing as many as 12-15 generations per year. Each female lays between 20 and 40 eggs. The eggs are inserted in the parenchyma cells of leaves, flower parts and fruits, and hatch in about 4 days at $27^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Adult thrips have been observed entering closed chrysanthemum buds, presumably to lay eggs, a behavior pattern which makes control very difficult (Bryan \& Smith, 1956; Lublinkhof\& Foster, 1977)

Chrysanthemum leaf miner (Liriomyza trifolii) has presented all the countries bordering the Mediterranean. L. trifolii originates in North America and spread to other parts of the
world and in India, it was first reported in 1991 (EPPO, 2014). A detailed review of its spread is given in Minkenberg (1988). The main host of L. trifolii includes Ageratum, Aster, marigold, Callistephus, safflower, Chrysanthemum morifolium, Dahlia, Gerbera (barbeton daisy), sunflower, carnation, gypsophila (baby's breath), Zinnia, salvia (sage), garlic, Begunia. Peak emergence of adults occurs before midday (Musgrave et al. 1975). Female flie puncture the leaves of the host plants causing wounds which serve as sites for feeding or oviposition. Feeding punctures cause the destruction of a larger number of cells and are more clearly visible to the naked eye. About $15 \%$ of punctures made by $L$. trifolii contain viable eggs (Parrella et al., 1981). Eggs are inserted just below the leaf surface. Carnation tortrix moth (Cacoecimorpha pronubana) is indigenous to the Mediterranean region. C.pronubana presents in France, Germany (intercepted only), Greece, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland (unconfirmed), Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, UK (including Guernsey and Jersey), Japan (Carter, 1984; EPPO, 2014; CABI/EPPO, 2014), Azerbaijan (Maharramova, 2011; CABI/EPPO, 2014), Israel (Wysoki,, 1989; EPPO, 2014; CABI/EPPO, 2014) and Turkey (Kaça and Ulusoy, 2008; EPPO, 2014; CABI/EPPO, 2014). The large-bodied females cannot fly easily and only males are normally active. Eggs are laid on smooth surfaces, especially glass, the first batch, usually of 150-250 eggs, being the most important. The larvae emerge within a few seconds and, being positively phototactic, quickly move or are carried in wind to the young growing points or flowers. Here, they spin silk around two to three terminal leaves or petals, and feed on the upper surface, so making numerous holes; the parenchyma may be mined. By the end of the third larval instar, the whole leaf is attacked and surrounded by a dense.

## CHAPTER III

## MATERIALS AND METHOD

### 3.1. Study Area

The survey was conducted in some selected major cutflowers growing districts of Bangladesh namely Dhaka, Gazipur, Manikgonj, Narayangonj, Tangail, Mymensingh, Jessore, Jhenidah, Chuadanga and Khulna. In the survey program, at least 25 cutflowers farmers were interviewed from each upazilla of district. Thus a total of 500 farmers were interviewed for data collection.

### 3.2. Study design

The survey was conducted in the 10 major cutflowers growing districts of Bangladesh. A total of 20 upazillas were selected under 10 sampled districts and 25 flowers growers were interviewed in each upazilla through pre-tested questionnaire. Thus, a total of 500 flower growers were interviewed from 10 sampled districts. On the other hand, a total of 60 field level officers (FLO) of DAE were also interviewed through pre-designed questionnaire considering one UAO, one AEO and one SAAO from each upazilla under 10 sampled districts.

### 3.3. Study Indicators

The researcher has proposed the following variables/indicators to be considered:

1. Demographic : Name, Age, Sex
2. Social : Education, Profession
3. Study related indicators:

- Farm size, variety of flowers cultivated
- Occurrence and severity of insect pests of flowers
- Potential risk and economic damage caused by these pests
- Status of insect pests of flowers
- Effective measures practiced by the farmers in controlling the insect pests of flowers
- Suggestions for improving management options for controlling insect pests of flowers in Bangladesh.


### 3.4. Development of questionnaire/instruments for data collection

According to the sample design, 560 respondents were covered under the study, of which 500 respondents participated for face-to face interview and the selection of respondents were made on a stratified sampling technique for sampled districts and simple random sampling technique within the sampled districts. There are two types questionnaire were prepared for two types of data collection such as (a) respondents' survey for flowers farmers and (b) respondents' survey for field level officers of DAE and these are given below:

### 3.5. Respondents survey

The respondents' survey was conducted in the 20 selected upazillas under 10 selected districts of Bangladesh. The face to face interview was conducted among 500 flowers farmers and they filled up a set of pre-designed questionnaire (Appendix-1) encompassing issues about the above mentioned study indicators. The face to face interview was also conducted among 60 FLOs and they filled up a set of pre-designed questionnaire (Appendix-2).

### 3.6. Respondents distribution in the sampled upazilla and districts

The sampled 500 flowers farmers and 60 field level officers of DAE were selected from 20 upazila under 10 major flowers growing districts of Bangladesh. The distribution of sampled respondents has been presented in the following table:

Table 3.1. District and upazila wise respondent distribution in the study area

| District | Upazilla | No. of cutflowers farmers | No. of field level officers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Dhaka | 1. Savar | 25 | 3 |
|  | 2. Dhamrai | 25 | 3 |
|  | 3. Keranigonj | 25 | 3 |
| 2. Gazipur | 4. Kaligonj | 25 | 3 |
|  | 5. Sreepur | 25 | 3 |
|  | 6. Sadar | 25 | 3 |
| 3. Manikgonj | 7. Singair | 25 | 3 |
|  | 8. Sadar | 25 | 3 |
| 4. Narayangonj | 9. Sonargaon | 25 | 3 |
| 5. Tangail | 10. Modhupur | 25 | 3 |
| 6. Mymensingh | 11. Sadar | 25 | 3 |
|  | 12. Muktagacha | 25 | 3 |
| 7. Jessore | 13. Jhikorgacha | 25 | 3 |
|  | 14. Sarsha | 25 | 3 |
|  | 15. Sadar | 25 | 3 |
| 8. Jhenidah | 16. Kaligonj | 25 | 3 |
|  | 17. Court Chandpur | 25 | 3 |
| 9. Chuadanga | 18. Sadar | 25 | 3 |
|  | 19. Alamdanga | 25 | 3 |
| 10. Khulna | 20. Fultala | 25 | 3 |
| Total | 20 | 500 | 60 |

### 3.7. Data collection

Direct personal interview approach was adopted for collection of primary data. The researcher was personally contacted with the flowers farmers in the respective upazilla under 10 sampled flowers growing districts. When found the target respondents and the researcher were started interview by explaining the objectives of the study to the respondents. After getting respondents, the researcher was filled up each question of the questionnaire one by one and obtain desired information. The field level data collection was conducted for a period to be started from December 2016 to February 2017. After the completion of data collection, all filled up questionnaires were preserved according to the category of respondents for processing and data analysis.

### 3.8. Data Analysis

Data on different parameters were analyzed through computer software SPSS version 20. As soon as collected from the field, the filled up questionnaires were coded and data entry were completed using SPSS and MS Access computer packages as well as the data were analyzed for tabulation of the primary data into data tables.

## CHAPTER IV

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results obtained from the studies have been presented below sequentially in various forms and thus interpreted and discussed the findings systematically in line with the objective of the study.

### 4.1. Farmers' knowledge on insect pests of cutflowers, their risks and management

The results of the farmers' knowledge on insect pests of cutflowers and their risks have been discussed under the following sub-headings:

### 4.1.1. Gender of the farmers

The field survey was conducted among 500 cutflowers farmers in 10 major cutflowers growing districts. Out of 500 , most ( $94 \%$ ) of the cutflowers farmers were male, while only $6 \%$ cutflowers farmers participated in the study were female.


### 4.1.2. Categories of farmers

Out of 500 cutflower growers participated in the field study, maximum $40.60 \%$ of them (203) were medium farmers, whereas $37.60 \%$ farmers (188) were under small category and the lowest proportion ( $14.60 \%$ ) of cutflowers farmers were under large farmers category.

Table 4.1. Categories of the farmers participated in the survey

| Age range | Number of respondents [N=500] | \% response |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Small flower growers | 188 | 37.6 |
| Medium flower growers | 203 | 40.6 |
| Large flower growers | 73 | 14.6 |
| Flower businessmen | 36 | 7.2 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

### 4.1.3. Cultivation of flowers and income

Commonly cultivated flowers: The maximum (69.97\%) farmers of flowers cultivated rose in their field, whereas $63.07 \%$ farmers reported that they cultivated marigold. This was followed by gladiolus which was cultivated by $37.53 \%$ farmers; while $24.48 \%$ farmers cultivated chrysanthemum, $23.74 \%$ farmers cultivated tuberose, $21.90 \%$ cutflowers cultivated dahlia and only $5.52 \%$ farmers cultivated jasmine and rest of the farmers cultivated orchid in their field.

Land used for flower cultivation: The maximum land used for flower cultivation was for gladiolus and the average land size used for gladiolus cultivation was 34.84 decimal. This was followed by tuberose cultivation (16.62 decimal), rose (15.62 decimal), gerbera (15.05 decimal), marigold (13.18 decimal) and soon. The minimum land size used for flower cultivation was for aster ( 4.98 decimal).

Profit from flower cultivation: The average maximum profit per acre flower cultivation was earned by the flower farmers from gladiolus and it was about 99,860 taka per acre. This was followed by profit from gerbera ( 90,581 taka/acre), rose (77,999 taka/acre), orchid ( 66,961 taka/acre), marigold (53,436 taka/acre) and soon. On the other hand, average minimum profit was earned from lily cultivation ( 25,871 taka/acre).

Table 4.2. Commonly cultivated flowers by the farmers according to their land size and profit

| Cutflower types | \% farmers cultivated <br> each flower | Average land area <br> under cutflower <br> cultivation (decimal) | Average <br> profit <br> (Tk/acre) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gladiolus | 37.53 | 34.84 | 99860 |
| Tuberose | 23.74 | 16.62 | 59143 |
| Rose | 69.97 | 15.62 | 77999 |
| Gerbera | 27.76 | 15.05 | 90581 |
| Marigold | 63.07 | 13.18 | 53436 |
| Orchid | 5.36 | 9.01 | 66961 |
| Dalhia | 21.90 | 6.92 | 38504 |
| Jesmine | 5.52 | 6.59 | 39453 |
| Carnation | 0.86 | 6.60 | 26000 |
| Lily | 5.34 | 6.10 | 25871 |
| Chrysanthemum | 24.48 | 5.99 | 46011 |
| Aster | 11.38 | 4.98 | 61061 |

### 4.1.4 . Sources of flowers seeds/seedlings used for cultivation

The flowers farmers used seeds/seedlings from different sources for cultivation. Most (71.20\%) farmers (356) used flowers seeds by their own produced seeds and/or own grafted seedlings. Whereas, $47.40 \%$ farmers (237) collected flowers seeds/seedlings from retailer, $39.70 \%$ farmers (198) collected from local nursery; $28.40 \%$ farmer collected seeds from different companies. Other sources of flowers seeds/seedlings for cultivation were importers (22.80\%), Research Organization (18.30\%), and NGOs (6.00\%).

Table 4.3. Sources of flower seeds/seedlings usually used for cultivation

| Sources of purchasing flower seeds/seedlings | Number of respondents [ $\mathrm{N}=500$ ] | Response (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Own seeds/grafted seedling | 356 | 71.20 |
| 2. Neighbors | 101 | 20.20 |
| 3. Company | 142 | 28.40 |
| 4. Local nursery | 198 | 39.70 |
| 5. Seedlings importer from neighboring countries | 114 | 22.80 |
| 6. Research Organization | 91 | 18.30 |
| 7. NGOs | 30 | 6.00 |
| 8. Seed retailer | 237 | 47.40 |
| 9. Others | 31 | 6.20 |
| Multiple response |  |  |

### 4.1.5. Major problems faced by farmers during flowers cultivation

Most ( $90.20 \%$ ) of the flowers farmers asserted their opinion that disease infection was the major problem faced by the farmers. This was followed by insect pest attack (70.80\%) in field of flowers followed by lack of propagating materials ( $65.80 \%$ ), weed infestation (65.0\%) and lack of irrigation facilities (21.0\%). On the other hand, the lowest proportion of farmers reported that the high price of pesticides ( $0.8 \%$ ) followed by lack of farmers' training $(2.20 \%)$ and lack of flower marketing facilities ( $4.20 \%$ ) were the problems faced by the farmers during cultivation of flowers.

Table 4.4. Farmers' opinion on major problems faced during flowers cultivation

| Major problems | Response on major problems |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of respondent [N=500] | \% Response |  |
| 1. Insect pest attack in field | 354 | 70.80 |  |
| 2. Weed infestation | 325 | 65.00 |  |
| 3. Disease infection | 451 | 90.20 |  |
| 4. Lack of propagating materials | 329 | 65.80 |  |
| 5. Lack of irrigation facilities | 105 | 21.00 |  |
| 6. Lack of marketing facilities | 21 | 4.20 |  |
| 7. Lack of farmers training facilities | 11 | 2.20 |  |
| 8. High price of pesticides | 4 | 0.80 |  |
| Multiple response |  |  |  |

### 4.1.6. Susceptibility of flowers to pests

Susceptibility to insect pests: According to the farmers' opinion, maximum $71.22 \%$ farmers reported that the rose was susceptible to insect pests followed by marigold as reported by $54.81 \%$ farmers; gladiolus was susceptible to insect pests as reported only by $33.24 \%$ farmers. Whereas, only $29.16 \%$ farmers informed that the garbera was susceptible to insect pests.

## Susceptibility to diseases

Among 500 flowers farmers, maximum $64.35 \%$ farmers reported that Rose was susceptible to diseases. This was followed by Marigold as asserted by $57.30 \%$ farmers followed by gladiolus $47.73 \%$ followed by Tuberose was susceptible to diseases as reported by only $33.75 \%$ farmers which was followed by Gerbera $32.16 \%$. Whereas only $23.61 \%$ farmers reported that chrysanthemum was susceptible to diseases followed by dalhia as reported by only $22.11 \%$ farmers.

## Susceptibility to weeds

Among 500 flowers farmers, maximum $57.9 \%$ farmers reported that rose was susceptible to weeds. This was followed by marigold as asserted by $40.35 \%$ farmers followed by chrysanthemum ( $32.22 \%$ ) and gerbera ( $30.57 \%$ ) were susceptible to weeds. Whereas only $26.34 \%$ farmers reported that gladiolus was susceptible to weeds followed by dahlia (24.75\%).

Table 4.5. Farmers' response on susceptibility of different flowers to different categories of pests

| Flowers types | Status of susceptibility to pests [\%] |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Insect pests | Diseases | Weeds |
| Orchid | 12.6 | 13.71 | 9.12 |
| Rose | 71.22 | 64.35 | 57.9 |
| Gerbera | 29.16 | 32.16 | 30.57 |
| Tuberose | 19.29 | 33.75 | 17.88 |
| Gladiolus | 33.24 | 47.73 | 26.34 |
| Carnation | 7.44 | 7.41 | 12.69 |
| Lily | 8.49 | 10.65 | 16.26 |
| Chrysanthemum | 17.16 | 23.61 | 32.22 |
| Marigold | 54.81 | 57.3 | 40.35 |
| Gypsophila | 3.81 | 4.56 | 6.51 |
| Aster | 12.15 | 12.57 | 15.63 |
| Dalhia | 15.27 | 22.11 | 24.75 |
| Jasmine | 6.24 | 6.09 | 9.75 |
|  |  |  |  |

### 4.1.7. Occurrence of insect pests of flowers in field condition

### 4.1.7. 1. Occurrence of insect pests in orchid

According to the opinion expressed by the flowers farmers, out of $500,31.80 \%$ farmers (159) reported that the orchid was infested by aphid, which was followed by whitefly infestation as reported by $22.20 \%$ farmers. Whereas, $13.8 \%$ farmers reported that the orchid was attacked by scale insect, followed by red mite (12.60\%), leaf eating beetle ( $8.40 \%$ ), thrips ( $1.80 \%$ ) and metallic flea beetle ( $0.60 \%$ ).

Table 4.6. Farmers' response on occurrence of insect and mite pests of orchid in field

| Name of insect and mite pests | Response on pests incidence |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% response |
| Aphid | 159 | 31.8 |
| Whitefly | 111 | 22.2 |
| Leaf eating beetle | 42 | 8.4 |
| Thrips | 9 | 1.8 |
| Scale insect | 69 | 13.8 |
| Red mite | 63 | 12.6 |
|  |  |  |

### 4.1.7. 2. Occurrence of insect pests in rose

According to the opinion expressed by the flowers farmers, out of 500, most ( $62.80 \%$ ) of the farmers (314) reported that the rose was infested in the field by aphid, which was followed by thrips infestation ( $39.80 \%$ ). Whereas, $36.20 \%$ farmers reported that the rose was attacked by red mite, followed by rose flower beetle as reported by $34.80 \%$ farmers, followed by whitefly (32.20\%), scale insect (21.00\%), junebeetle (8.40\%), metallic flea beetle $(6.80 \%)$ and gall midge ( $0.80 \%$ ).

Table 4.7. Farmers' response on occurrence of insect pests of rose in field

| Name of pests | Response on pests incidence |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% response |
| Aphid | 314 | 62.80 |
| Rose flower beetle | 174 | 34.80 |
| Whitefly | 161 | 32.20 |
| June beetle | 42 | 8.40 |
| Metallic flea beetle | 34 | 6.80 |
| Thrips | 199 | 39.80 |
| Scale insect | 105 | 21.00 |
| Gall midge | 4 | 0.80 |
| Red mite | 181 | 36.20 |
| Multiple response |  |  |

### 4.1.7. 3. Occurrence of insect pests on tuberose

According to the opinion expressed by the flowers farmers that in tuberose cultivation thrips was the major problem. Out of 500 farmers, $49.2 \%$ farmers (246) reported that the tuberose was infested in the field by thrips, which was followed by aphid infestation as
reported by $43.2 \%$ farmers. Whereas $12.60 \%$ farmers reported that the tuberose was attacked by red mite followed by whitefly as reported by $11.4 \%$ farmers, followed by leaf miner ( $7.20 \%$ ). According to the farmers' opinion, leaf eating beetle, june beetle, scale insect and metallic flea beetle had minor infestation capacity of tuberose in field condition.

Table 4.8. Farmers' response on occurrence of insect pests of tuberose in field

| Name of insect and mite pests | Response on pests incidence |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% response |
| Aphid | 216 | 43.2 |
| Whitefly | 57 | 11.4 |
| June beetle | 3 | 0.6 |
| Metallic flea beetle | 3 | 0.6 |
| Leaf miner | 36 | 7.2 |
| Leaf eating beetle | 9 | 1.8 |
| Thrips | 246 | 49.2 |
| Scale insect | 3 | 0.6 |
| Red mite | 63 | 12.6 |
| Multiple response |  |  |

### 4.1.7. 4. Occurrence of insect and mite pests in gladiolus

According to the opinion expressed by the flowers farmers, among the insect pests thrips causes major infestation in gladiolus cultivation. Out of 500 , most $(73.20 \%)$ of the farmers (366) reported that the gladiolus was infested in the field by thrips, which was followed by leaf miner infestation as reported by $60.00 \%$ farmers. Whereas $33.6 \%$ farmers reported that the gladiolus was attacked by red mite, followed by whitefly (33.00\%) and aphid (28.20\%). On the other hand, leaf eating beetle, june beetle and scale insect had minor infestation capacity in gladiolus cultivation.

Table 4.9. Farmers' response on the occurrence of insect and mite pests of gladiolus in field

| Name of insect and mite pests | Response on pests incidence |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% response |
| Aphid | 141 | 28.2 |
| Whitefly | 165 | 33 |
| June beetle | 51 | 10.2 |
| Leaf miner | 300 | 60 |
| Leaf eating beetle | 84 | 16.8 |
| Thrips | 366 | 73.2 |
| Scale insect | 6 | 1.2 |
| Red mite | 168 | 33.6 |
|  |  |  |

### 4.1.7. 5. Occurrence of insect pests on carnation

According to the opinion expressed by the flowers farmers, aphid and thrips were major problem in carnation cultivation but all the insects had minor infestation capacity. Out of 500 farmers, most $(25.00 \%)$ of the farmers (125) reported that the carnation was infested in the field by aphid and thrips, which was followed by scale insect and gall midge infestation as reported by $9.00 \%$ farmers.

Table 4.10. Farmers' response on occurrence of insect pests of carnation in field

| Name of insect pests | Response on pests incidence |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% response |
| Aphid | 125 | 25.0 |
| Thrips | 125 | 25.0 |
| Scale insect | 45 | 9.0 |
| Gall midge | 45 | 9.0 |
|  |  |  |

### 4.1.7. 6. Occurrence of insect pests in lily

According to the opinion expressed by the flowers farmers, all the insect pests that attack lily in field condition had minor infestation capacity. Out of 500 , most $(28.80 \%)$ of the farmers (144) reported that the lily was infested in the field by aphid, which was followed by thrips infestation as reported by $15.00 \%$ farmers. Whereas, according to the opinion
expressed by the farmers that other insect pests like whitefly, scale insect and june beetle rarely infested lily in field condition.

Table4.11. Farmers' response on occurrence of insect pests of lily in field

| Name of insect pests | Response on pests incidence |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% response |
| Aphid | 144 | 28.8 |
| Whitefly | 45 | 9.0 |
| June beetle | 3 | 0.6 |
| Thrips | 75 | 15.0 |
| Scale insect | 27 | 5.4 |
|  |  |  |

### 4.1.7. 7. Occurrence of insect and mite pests in chrysanthemum

According to the opinion expressed by the flowers farmers that aphid was the major insect pest that infested chrysanthemum in field condition. Among the 500 flowers farmers, most (43.80\%) of the farmers (219) reported that the chrysanthemum was infested in the field by aphid, which was followed by leaf minor infestation as reported by $25.20 \%$ farmers, followed by thrips (24.60\%) farmers. Whereas, according to the farmers opinion all other insects like whitefly, leaf eating bee, scale insect, gall midge and red mite had little infestation in chrysanthemum cultivation.

Table 4.12. Farmers' response on occurrence of insect pests of chrysanthemum

| Name of insect and mite pests | Response on pests incidence |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% response |
| Aphid | 219 | 43.8 |
| Whitefly | 90 | 18.0 |
| Leaf miner | 126 | 25.2 |
| Leaf eating beetle | 33 | 6.6 |
| Thrips | 123 | 24.6 |
| Red mite | 30 | 6.0 |
|  |  |  |

### 4.1.7. 8. Occurrence of insect and mite pests in marigold

According to the opinion expressed by the flowers farmers that leaf minor was the major insect pest that infested marigold in field condition. Among the 500 flowers farmers,
most ( $42.80 \%$ ) of the farmers (214) reported that the marigold was infested in the field by leaf minor, which was followed by flower beetle infestation as reported by $21.40 \%$ farmers, followed by aphid (20.40\%) farmers. Whereas, according to the farmers opinion all other insects like thrips, whitefly, saw fly, leaf eating beetle and red mite had little infestation in marigold cultivation.

Table 4.13. Farmers' response on occurrence of insect pests of marigold in field

| Name of insect and mite pests | Response on pests incidence |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% response |
| Aphid | 102 | 20.40 |
| Whitefly | 52 | 10.40 |
| Saw fly | 19 | 3.80 |
| Leaf miner | 214 | 42.80 |
| Leaf eating beetle | 55 | 11.00 |
| Thrips | 67 | 13.40 |
| Red mite | 75 | 15.0 |
|  |  |  |

### 4.1.7. 10. Occurrence of insect and mite pests in aster

According to the opinion expressed by the flowers farmers that aphid was the major insect pest that infested aster in field condition. Among the 500 flowers farmers, most (48.00\%) of the farmers (240) reported that the aster was infested in the field by aphid, which was followed by thrips infestation as reported by $38.00 \%$ farmers. According to the farmers opinion all other insects like whitefly, Leaf eating beetle and red mite had little infestation in aster cultivation.

Table 4.14. Farmers' response on occurrence of insect and mite pests of aster in field

| Name of insect and mite pests | Response on pests incidence |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% response |
| Aphid | 240 | 48.0 |
| Whitefly | 45 | 9.0 |
| Leaf eating beetle | 15 | 3.0 |
| Thrips | 190 | 38.0 |
| Red mite | 45 | 9.0 |
|  |  |  |

### 4.1.7. 11. Occurrence of insect pests on dalhia

According to the opinion expressed by the flowers farmers that aphid was the major insect pest that infested dalhia in field condition. Among the 500 flowers farmers, most (51.00\%) of the farmers (255) reported that the dalhia was infested in the field by aphid, which was followed by flower beetle infestation as reported by $38.40 \%$ farmers, followed by thrips (28.20\%) farmers, followed by leaf miner (25.20\%) farmers. Whereas, according to the farmers opinion all other insects like whitefly, metallic flea beetle, leaf eating bee, leaf eating beetle and red mite had little infestation in dalhia cultivation.

Table 4.15. Farmers' response on occurrence of insect pests of dalhia in field

| Name of insect and mite pests | Response on pests incidence |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% response |
| Aphid | 255 | 51 |
| Flower beetle | 192 | 38.4 |
| Whitefly | 36 | 7.2 |
| Metallic flea beetle | 9 | 1.8 |
| Leaf miner | 126 | 25.2 |
| Leaf eating beetle | 105 | 21 |
| Thrips | 141 | 28.2 |
| Red mite | 66 | 13.2 |
|  |  |  |

### 4.1.7. 12. Occurrence of insect pests on jasmine

According to the opinion expressed by the flowers farmers that aphid was the major insect pest that infested jasmine in field condition. Among the 500 flowers farmers, most ( $26.00 \%$ ) of the farmers (130) reported that the jasmine was infested in the field by aphid, which was followed by flower beetle and leaf eating beetle infestation as reported by $18.00 \%$ farmers. Whereas, according to the farmers opinion all other insects like whitefly, metallic flea beetle and leaf miner had little infestation in jasmine cultivation.

Table 4.16. Farmers' response on occurrence of insect pests of jasmine in field

| Name of pests | Pest incidence |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% response |
| Aphid | 130 | 26 |
| Flower beetle | 90 | 18 |
| Whitefly | 50 | 10 |
| Metallic flea beetle | 40 | 8 |
| Leaf miner | 10 | 2 |
| Leaf eating beetle | 90 | 18 |
|  |  |  |

### 4.1.8. Infestation status of insect pests of flowers in field condition

According to the opinion expressed by the flowers farmers that aphid was the major insect pest in field condition. Among the 500 flowers farmers, most ( $47.41 \%$ ) of the farmers reported that aphid was major insect pest of flower cultivation in field condition, which was followed by thrips (34.83\%) and red mite (27.41\%) reported by farmers. On the other hand, $40.00 \%$ farmers reported that leaf minor was a minor insect pest of flower cultivation in field condition, which was followed by flower beetle (37.41\%) and whitefly (32.41\%).

Table 4.17. Infestation status of insect and mite pests of flowers in field condition

| Name of Insects pest | Pest status |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Major (\%) | Minor (\%) | No infestation (\%) |
| Aphid | 47.41 | 37.93 | 0.00 |
| Flower beetle | 12.41 | 37.41 | 0.17 |
| Whitefly | 20.34 | 32.41 | 0.00 |
| Leaf miner | 18.10 | 40.00 | 0.17 |
| Leaf eating bee | 17.07 | 32.24 | 0.00 |
| Leaf eating beetle | 13.62 | 29.14 | 0.69 |
| Thrips | 34.83 | 39.64 | 0.00 |
| Scale insect | 9.83 | 18.97 | 0.00 |
| Red mite | 27.41 | 32.91 | 0.17 |
| Multiple response |  |  |  |

### 4.1.9. Infestation severity of insect pests of flowers in field condition

Out of 500 farmers, majority ( $52.24 \%$ ) of them stated that aphid caused damage on flower with high infestation intensity. The flower beetle caused with low infestation as reported by $63.45 \%$ farmers. All other insects also caused damage with low infestation intensity on different flowers as reported by 37.26 to $92.24 \%$ farmers.

Table 4.18. Infestation severity of insect pests of flowers in field condition

| Name of Insects pest | Severity of infestation |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | High (\%) | Medium (\%) | Low (\%) | Total |
| Aphid | 52.24 | 22.59 | 25.17 | 100.0 |
| Flower beetle | 8.62 | 27.93 | 63.45 | 100.0 |
| Whitefly | 12.93 | 26.21 | 60.86 | 100.0 |
| June beetle | 3.62 | 4.14 | 92.24 | 100.0 |
| Metallic flea beetle | 2.24 | 7.93 | 89.83 | 100.0 |
| Saw fly | 7.07 | 6.21 | 86.72 | 100.0 |
| Leaf miner | 17.07 | 23.62 | 59.31 | 100.0 |
| Leaf eating bee | 18.62 | 14.66 | 66.72 | 100.0 |
| Leaf eating beetle | 16.03 | 18.10 | 65.87 | 100.0 |
| Thrips | 26.03 | 36.71 | 37.26 | 100.0 |
| Scale insect | 11.03 | 8.62 | 80.35 | 100.0 |
| Gall midge | 4.66 | 5.69 | 89.65 | 100.0 |
| Red mite | 30.86 | 19.98 | 49.16 | 100.0 |

### 4.1.10. Vulnerable stages of flowers plants to insect pests in field condition

According to the opinion expressed by the farmers, flowers plants were attacked in different stages by specific pest. Among the insect pests aphid and thrips attacked flowers at all stages of the flowers plants but mostly at seedling stages as reported by maximum $50.34 \%$ and $35.5 \%$ farmers, respectively. Whereas, aphid, red mite, thrips leaf miner and whitefly mostly attacked the flowers plants at vegetative stages as reported by $62.24 \%$, $55.52 \%, 53.09 \%, 52.41 \%$ and $41.72 \%$ farmers, respectively. Additionally aphid and thrips attacked flowers at it inflorescence stage reported by most (40.34\%) and (39.83\%) farmers respectively.

Table 4.19. Response on vulnerable stages of flowers plants to insect pests

| Name of Insects pest | Vulnerable stage of flower plants |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Seedling (\%) | Vegetative (\%) | Inflorescence (\%) |
| Aphid | 50.34 | 62.24 | 40.34 |
| Flower beetle | 11.90 | 27.24 | 25.52 |
| Whitefly | 25.69 | 41.72 | 16.55 |
| June beetle | 1.55 | 6.90 | 8.97 |
| Metallic flea beetle | 5.17 | 12.59 | 5.34 |
| Saw fly | 8.97 | 8.28 | 3.97 |
| Leaf miner | 38.62 | 52.41 | 6.90 |
| Leaf eating bee | 22.59 | 41.21 | 11.21 |
| Leaf eating beetle | 17.76 | 41.21 | 3.79 |
| Thrips | 35.50 | 53.09 | 39.83 |
| Scale insect | 8.97 | 22.76 | 5.69 |
| Gall midge | 6.38 | 5.34 | 5.34 |
| Red mite | 35.52 | 55.52 | 20.84 |
| Multiple response |  |  |  |

### 4.1.11. Vulnerable plant parts of flowers infested by insect pests in field condition

It was informed by the farmers that the different portion of the plants attacked by various insect pests in field condition. The leaves of flowers plants were most vulnerable for aphids, leaf miners, thrips and whitefly as reported by 65 to $44 \%$ farmers. The stems of flowers plants were most vulnerable for aphid and scale insect as reported by $29.48 \%$ and $15.34 \%$ farmers. Whereas the flower was vulnerable to aphid and thrips that were reported by $62.41 \%$ and $60.50 \%$ farmers, respectively.

Table 4.20. Vulnerable parts of flowers plants to insect pests in field condition

| Name of Insects pest | \% response on vulnerable parts of flower plants |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Leaf | Stem | Flower | Root/tuber |
| Aphid | 65.00 | 29.48 | 62.41 | 0.52 |
| Flower beetle | 16.38 | 7.07 | 38.10 | 0.00 |
| Whitefly | 44.31 | 11.90 | 27.07 | 0.00 |
| June beetle | 6.90 | 5.17 | 9.83 | 0.00 |
| Metallic flea beetle | 12.24 | 0.34 | 4.66 | 0.00 |
| Saw fly | 13.28 | 2.07 | 3.97 | 0.00 |
| Leaf miner | 51.90 | 2.41 | 24.48 | 0.00 |
| Leaf eating bee | 43.45 | 2.93 | 18.10 | 0.00 |
| Leaf eating beetle | 37.59 | 5.86 | 12.24 | 0.00 |
| Thrips | 45.84 | 9.31 | 60.50 | 0.00 |
| Scale insect | 16.21 | 15.34 | 5.86 | 0.00 |
| Gall midge | 8.10 | 4.66 | 4.66 | 0.00 |
| Red mite | 44.98 | 13.60 | 39.81 | 0.17 |
| Multiple response |  |  |  |  |

### 4.1.12. Currently more damaging insect and mite pests of flowers and ornamental plants

Majority (55.80\%) of the flowers farmers informed that aphid was more damaging insect pest of flowers in field condition than previous infestation, which was followed by red mite ( $19 \%$ ) and thrips infestation as reported by $11.2 \%$ farmers. However $26 \%$ flowers farmers did not provide any response about this issue.

Table 4.21. More damaging insect and mite pests of flowers in field condition

| Insect and mite pests | Number of respondents [N=500] | \% response |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Red mite | 95 | 19.00 |
| 2. Aphid | 279 | 55.80 |
| 3. Thrips | 56 | 11.20 |
| 4. Don't know | 130 | 26.00 |
|  | Multiple response |  |

### 4.1.13. Options for controlling insect and mite pests of flowers

Among 500 flowers farmers, $99.80 \%$ farmers reported that they applied insecticides in flowers fields to control insect pests of flowers. This control option was followed by application of irrigation ( $66.80 \%$ ). Whereas $56.80 \%$ farmers collected harmful insect pest by hand picking followed by application of insecticide with irrigation as reported by $46.00 \%$ farmers. Other methods used by the farmers to control insect pests of flowers were IPM (28.20\%) and perching (27.20\%).

Table 4.22. Options for controlling insect pests of flowers

| Control options | Number of <br> respondents [N=500] | $\mathbf{\%}$ <br> response |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Spraying of insecticides on the flower trees | 499 | 99.80 |
| Application of granular insecticide at the base of <br> the tree | 217 | 43.40 |
| Application of insecticide with irrigation | 230 | 46.00 |
| Seed treatment | 228 | 45.60 |
| Irrigation | 334 | 66.80 |
| Collect harmful insect pest by hand picking | 284 | 56.80 |
| IPM | 141 | 28.20 |
| Used of balanced fertilizer | 224 | 44.80 |
| Multiple response |  |  |

### 4.1.14. Sources of assistance and services received for controlling insect and mite pests of flowers

Source of assistance and services is the most important factor that can play the vital role in taking the appropriate and effective control options need to be applied for the control of specific insect pest problem. In this study, $95 \%$ farmers received assistance and services to control insect pests of flowers from pesticide dealers. This source was followed by DAE officials as reported by $67 \%$ farmers, neighboring farmers (54.4\%) and NGO officials (38.6\%). Whilst, the lowest proportion (5\%) of flowers farmers received assistance and services for controlling insect pests of flowers from the officials of research organization.

Table 4.23. Farmers' response on the source of assistance and services received to control insect pests of flowers

| Source of assistance and services <br> received | Response on source of assistance and services |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Frequency [N=500] | \% Response |
| 1. DAE officials | 335 | 67.00 |
| 2. Officials of research organization | 25 | 5.00 |
| 3. NGO officials | 193 | 38.60 |
| 4. Pesticide dealers | 475 | 95.00 |
| 5. Neighboring farmers | 272 | 54.40 |
| Multiple response |  |  |

4.2. Knowledge of Field level officer's on insect pests of flowers, their risks and management

The survey of the field level officer's knowledge on insect pests of flowers and their risks have been discussed under the following sub-headings:

### 4.2.1. Gender of the field level officer's

Among 60 field level officer's in 10 major flowers growing districts. $95 \%$ field level officers (57) were male, while only $5 \%$ were female.


Figure 2. Gender of the local level officers of DAE participated as respondents

### 4.2.2. Categories of field level officers

In the present study, $33.33 \%$ officer (20) were Upazilla Agriculture officer (UAO), whereas $33.33 \%$ of them (20) were Agriculture Extension Officers (AEO) and $33.33 \%$ of them (20) were Sub-Assistant Agriculture Officers (SAAO).

Table 4.24. Profession designation of the field level officers

| Designation | Number of respondents [N=60] | \% response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UAO | 20 | 33.33 |
| AEO | 20 | 33.33 |
| SAAO | 20 | 33.33 |
| Total | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0}$ |

### 4.2.3. Source of flowers seeds/seedlings used by the farmers for cultivation

Flowers farmers used seed of flowers from different sources for cultivation. Field level officers (60) reported that, among the flowers farmers, most (66.67\%) of the farmers used seeds from their own seeds and $51.67 \%$ farmers used BADC seeds. Whereas, $18.33 \%$ farmers collected seeds from neighbors, $16.67 \%$ farmers collected from local seed producer. Other sources of flowers seeds for cultivation were importer ( $15.00 \%$ ), other company seeds ( $11.67 \%$ ) and NGO ( $11.67 \%$ ).

Table 4.25. Response on the sources of purchasing seeds/seedlings of flowers usually used for cultivation by the farmers

| Sources | Number of respondents <br> [N=60] | Response (\%) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Farmers' own seed | 40 | 66.67 |  |
| 2. Neighbors | 11 | 18.33 |  |
| 3. BADC | 31 | 51.67 |  |
| 4. Other company | 7 | 11.67 |  |
| 5. Local seed producer | 10 | 16.67 |  |
| 6. Directly from importer | 9 | 15.00 |  |
| 7. Research Organization | 2 | 3.33 |  |
| 8. NGO | 7 | 11.67 |  |
| 9. Seed traders/dealers | 13 | 21.67 |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### 4.2.4. Major problems faced by farmers during flowers cultivation

Out of 60 field level officers participated in the field survey, most (93.33\%) of them replied that diseases infection was the major problem in flowers cultivation, which was followed by weed attack (76.67\%) and insect pest attack (66.67\%) in the field. Other problems for flowers cultivation were lack of propagating materials variety ( $63.33 \%$ ), lack of irrigation facilities ( $43.33 \%$ ), lack of farmers training on flowers cultivation (36.67\%), lack of marketing facilities (28.33\%), high price of pesticides (20.00\%) and pest attack after harvesting (16.67\%).

Table 4.26. Field level officials' opinion on the major problems faced by farmers for flowers cultivation

| Major problems | Response |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of respondent [N=60] | \% Response |  |  |
| 1. Insect pest attack | 40 | 66.67 |  |  |
| 2. Weed infestation | 46 | 76.67 |  |  |
| 3. Disease infection | 56 | 93.33 |  |  |
| 4. Lack of propagating materials | 38 | 63.33 |  |  |
| 5. Lack of irrigation facilities | 26 | 43.33 |  |  |
| 6. Pest attack after harvesting | 10 | 16.67 |  |  |
| 7. Lack of marketing facilities | 17 | 28.33 |  |  |
| 8. Lack of farmers training facilities | 22 | 36.67 |  |  |
| 9. High price of pesticides | 12 | 20.00 |  |  |
| Multiple response |  |  |  |  |

### 4.2.5. Occurrence of the insect pests of flowers in field condition

According to the opinion expressed by the field level officers, $100 \%$ FLO's reported that the flowers was infested in the field by both aphid and red mite, which was followed by thrips infestation as reported by $70.0 \%$ field level officers. Whereas, $15.0 \%$ FLO's reported that the flowers was attacked by leaf miner, followed by leaf eating bee and
scale insect as reported by $11.67 \%$ field level officers, followed by Leaf eating beetle (10.0\%) and whitefly (10.0\%)

Table 4.27. Field level officials' response on the occurrence status of the insect and mite pests of flowers in field condition

| Name of insect and mite pests | Response on the occurrence of pests [N=60] |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Frequency | \% response |
| Red mite | 60 | 100.0 |
| Aphid | 60 | 100.0 |
| Thrips | 42 | 70.00 |
| Leaf eating bee | 7 | 11.67 |
| Leaf miner | 9 | 15.00 |
| Leaf eating beetle | 6 | 10.00 |
| Whitefly | 6 | 10.00 |
| Scale insect | 7 | 11.67 |
|  |  |  |

### 4.2.6. Infestation status of the insect pests of flowers in field condition

According to the opinion expressed by the field level officers', out of 60 FLO's, the major insect pest of flowers in field condition was red mite stated by $87.80 \%$ FLO's. This was followed by aphid stated by $85 \%$ FLO's. On the other hand, the minor insect pests of flowers were leaf eating bee, leaf miner, whitefly and leaf eating beetle as stated by $74 \%$, $94.30 \%, 90.40 \%, 88.33 \%$, and $89.80 \%$ FLO's, respectively.

Table 4.28. Field level officials' response on the infestation status of the insect pests of flowers in field condition

| Name of insect pests | Pest status(\%response) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Major pest | Minor pest |
| Red mite | 87.80 | 12.20 |
| Aphid | 85.00 | 15.00 |
| Thrips | 26.00 | 74.00 |
| Leaf eating bee | 5.70 | 94.30 |
| Leaf miner | 9.60 | 90.40 |
| Leaf eating beetle | 11.70 | 88.33 |
| Whitefly | 10.20 | 89.80 |
|  |  |  |

### 4.2.7. Vulnerable stages of flowers plants to insect pests in field condition

According to the opinion expressed by the field level officers', vulnerable stages of flowers plants to insect pest in field condition. Among the insect pests, whitefly and scale insect attacked flowers at all stages of the flowers plants but mostly at seedling stages as reported by maximum $33.10 \%$ and $39.80 \%$ FLO's, respectively. Whereas aphid, leaf eating bee, leaf miner and leaf eating beetle mostly attacked as responded by $79.10 \%$ FLO's, respectively. On the other hand, thrips mostly attacked flowers at it flowering stage reported by $92.50 \%$ the FLO's.

Table 4.29. Response on vulnerable stages of flowers plants to insect pests

| Sl. <br> No. | Name of insects pest | Response on vulnerable stages (\%) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Seedling | Vegetative | Flowering |
| 1 | Aphid | 21.70 | 75.70 | 2.60 |
| 2 | Red mite | 54.30 | 31.0 | 14.70 |
| 3 | Thrips | 0.80 | 6.70 | 92.50 |
| 4 | Leaf eating bee | 17.70 | 78.70 | 3.60 |
| 6 | Leaf miner | 14.10 | 72.50 | 13.40 |
| 7 | Leaf eating beetle | 13.30 | 79.10 | 7.60 |
| 8 | Whitefly | 33.10 | 35.70 | 31.20 |
| 9 | Scale insect | 39.80 | 27.10 | 33.10 |
| Multiple response |  |  |  |  |

### 4.2.8. Infestation severity of flowers plants by the insect pests in field condition

The field level officers, participated in the field survey, expressed their opinion about the severity of infestation caused by insect pests to flowers in the field condition. $89.00 \%$ farmers expressed that aphid caused damage flowers in the field with high infestation intensity. Whereas, red mite caused damage flowers plants with high infestation severity as reported by $84.20 \%$ FLO's. On the other hand, flowers thrips, leaf eating bee, leaf miner, leaf eating beetle and whitefly caused damage flowers plants with low infestation severity as reported by $51.8 \%, 59.7 \%, 60.0 \%, 46.7 \%$ and $60.0 \%$ FLO's, respectively.

Table 4.30. FLO's response on the infestation severity of flowers crops by the insect pests in field condition

| Name of insects pest | Severity of infestation (\% response) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | High | Moderate | Low |
| Aphid | 89.00 | 5.30 | 5.7 |
| Red mite | 84.20 | 5.10 | 10.7 |
| Thrips | 21.20 | 27.00 | 51.8 |
| Leaf eating bee | 6.20 | 34.10 | 59.7 |
| Leaf miner | 7.90 | 32.10 | 60.0 |
| Leaf eating beetle | 12.4 | 40.90 | 46.7 |
| Whitefly | 11.30 | 28.70 | 60.0 |
| Multiple response |  |  |  |

### 4.2.9. Relationship among insect pest, disease and weed infestation in cutflowers field

Out of 60 field level officials of DAE participate in the survey study, $97 \%$ of the them expressed their positive opinion about relationship of insect pest infestation with disease and weed infestation in the cutflowers field, whereas only (3\%) respondents expressed their negative opinion.


Figure 3. Field level officials response on the relationship of insect infestation with disease and weed infestation in cutflower field

### 4.2.10. Currently occurrence of more damaging insect and mite pests of flower and ornamental plants

According to the field level officers opinion, out of 60, majority (78\%) of the FLO's reported that red mite was more damaging insect pest of flowers in field condition than previous infestation, which was followed by aphid infestation (70\%) and thrips as reported by $50 \%$ FLO's. On the other hand, $20 \%$ field level officers did not provide any response about this issue.

Table 4.31. More damaging insect and mite pests currently occurred in the field of flowers and ornamental plants

| Insect and mite pests | Number of respondents <br> $\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{6 0 ]}$ | \% response |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Red mite | 47 | 78.33 |
| Aphid | 42 | 70.00 |
| Thrips | 30 | 50.00 |
| Leaf eating bee | 13 | 21.67 |
| Don't know | 12 | 20.00 |
| Multiple response |  |  |

### 4.2.11. Options for controlling insect and mite pests of flowers

Out of 60 field level officers, participated in the field survey, most ( $80 \%$ ) of them reported that farmers applied insecticides in flowers fields to control insect pests of flowers. This control option was followed by irrigation(45\%). Whereas $30 \%$ farmers collected insect pests by hand picking method. Other methods used by the farmers to control insect pests of flowers were application of insecticide with irrigation, seed treatment and used of balanced fertilizer.

Table 4.32. Options for controlling insect pests of flowers

| Control options | Number <br> $[\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{6 0 ]}$ | \% <br> response |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Spraying of insecticides on the flower plants | 48 | 80.00 |
| Collect harmful insect pest by hand picking | 18 | 30.00 |
| IPM | 9 | 15.00 |
| Application of insecticide with irrigation | 15 | 25.00 |
| Seed treatment | 12 | 20.00 |
| Irrigation | $\mathbf{2 7}$ | 45.00 |
| Used of balanced fertilizer | 12 | 20.00 |
| Application of granular insecticide | 10 | 16.67 |
|  |  |  |



Plate 1: The flower of rose affected by aphid


Plate 3: The gerbera plant with flower


Plate 5: The leaves rose affected by leaf eating beetle


Plate 2: The flower of marigold affected by mite


Plate 4: The Chrysanthemum plants with flowers


Plate 6: The gladiolus cultivated field


Plate 7: The gladiolus field affected by diseases


Plate 9: The leaves of dahlia plant affected by insects


Plate 8: The rose field


Plate 10: The flower of rose affected by thrips

## CHAPTER V

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The study was conducted in the 20 upazilla of 10 selected major flowers growing districts of Bangladesh during the period from December 2016 to February 2017 to find out the present status and diversity of insect pests of flowers, their risks and management options. The data were collected through interview of 500 cutflower farmers considering 25 cutflower farmers from each upazilla and 60 field level officers of DAE considering one UAO, one AEO and one SAAO of DAE.

## SUMMARY

Majority ( $69.97 \%$ ) farmers used rose for cultivation in their field, whereas $63.07 \%$ farmers reported that they cultivated marigold. Most (71.20\%) of the farmers (356) used their own grafted seedling followed by from seed retailer. Other sources of flowers seed were local nursery, company and seedlings importer from neighboring countries etc.

Most $(90.20 \%)$ of the flowers farmers faced problems with disease infection of the produced flowers followed by damage caused by insect pest attack in field and weed infestation and lack of propagating materials in the field during flowers cultivation. Other major problems were lack of irrigation facilities, lack of marketing facilities, lack of farmers training facilities and high price of pesticides.

Rose and marigold were the most susceptible flowers to insect pests and diseases. Most ( $31.80 \%$ ) of the farmers reported that the orchid was infested in the field by aphid, followed by whitefly and scale insect. In rose cultivation, most (62.80\%) of the farmers reported that the rose was infested in field by aphid, followed by thrips and red mite. In tuberose cultivation, most $(49.20 \%)$ of the farmers reported that the tuberose was infested in the field by thrips, which was followed by aphid and red mite. According to the opinion expressed by the flowers farmers, mostly $73.20 \%$ farmers reported that the gladiolus was infested in the field by thrips, followed by leaf miner. Besides carnation cultivation, most $(25.00 \%)$ of the farmer reported that the carnation was infected by aphid and thrips. On the other hands, most $(28.80 \%)$ of the farmers reported that the lily was infested in the field by aphid, followed by thrips. Mostly $43.80 \%$ farmers reported that the chrysanthemum was infested in the field by aphid, followed by thrips. According to the opinion expressed by farmers, most $(42.80 \%)$ of the farmers reported that the
marigold was infested in the field by leaf miner. On the other hand in aster cultivation most ( $48.00 \%$ ) of the farmers reported that the aster was infested in the field by aphid, followed by thrips. According to the opinion expressed by the flowers farmers, most ( $51.00 \%$ ) of the farmers (255) reported that the dalhia was infested in the field by aphid, followed by flower beetle and thrips. Most (26.00\%) of the farmers (130) reported that the jesmine was infested in the field by aphid, followed by flower beetle and leaf eating beetle

Among the insect pests, aphid and thrips attacked cutflowers at all stages of the cutflowers plants, whereas aphid, leafhopper, leaf miner and whitefly mostly attacked potato plants at vegetative stages. On the other hand, aphid and thrips mostly attacked cutflowers at inflorescences stage of cutflowers. The vegetative stage of cutflowers plants were most vulnerable for aphid, red mite, thrips leaf miner and whitefly.

Most (99.80\%) of the farmers applied insecticides in cutflowers fields to control insect pests of cutflowers followed by application of irrigation and hand picking followed by IPM and perching. Most ( $95 \%$ ) of the farmers received assistance and advices for controlling insect pests of potato from pesticide dealers. Other sources of services were DAE officials, neighboring farmers and NGO officials.

## CONCLUSIONS

- The rose and marigold were most susceptible flowers species to insect pests and diseases. The major sources of flowers seeds used by the farmers for cultivation were the own produced seeds, BADC seeds, seed traders/dealers and neighboring farmers.
- Mostly $(90.20 \%)$ flowers farmers faced problems with diseases infection of the produced flowers. Other major problems faced during flowers cultivation were lack of irrigation facilities, lack of marketing facilities, lack of farmers training facilities and high price of pesticides.
- Most ( $31.80 \%$ ) of the farmers reported that the orchid was infested in the field by aphid, followed by whitefly and scale insect. In rose cultivation, most (62.80\%) of the farmers reported that the rose was infested in field by aphid, followed by thrips and red mite. In tuberose cultivation, most (49.20\%) of the farmers reported that the tuberose was infested in the field by thrips, which was followed by aphid
and red mite. According to the opinion expressed by the flowers farmers, mostly $73.20 \%$ farmers reported that the gladiolus was infested in the field by thrips, followed by leaf miner. Mostly $43.80 \%$ farmers reported that the chrysanthemum was infested in the field by aphid, followed by thrips. According to the opinion expressed by farmers, most ( $42.80 \%$ ) of the farmers reported that the marigold was infested in the field by leaf miner.
- Currently aphid and thrips were more damaging insect pest of flowers in field condition than previous infestation. Mostly (99.80\%) flowers farmers applied insecticides in cutflowers fields to control insect pests of flowers. Other important control options were application of irrigation, hand picking, and IPM.
- Most ( $95 \%$ ) of the farmers received assistance and advices for controlling insect pests of cutflowers from pesticide dealers. Other sources of services were DAE officials, neighboring farmers and NGO officials.
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## APPENDICES

## Appendix 1: Questionnaire for cutflower farmers

Department of Entomology
Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University
Sher-e-Bangla Nagar, Dhaka-1207
INSECT PEST RISK OF CUTFLOWERS IN BANGLADESH

সেট-১: ফুল চাবীদের জন্যে জরিপ প্রশ্নাবলী

| কোড: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

A. 0 ফুলচাধীর ব্যক্তিগত তথ্যাদিঃ
A. 1 উত্তর দাতার নাম: $\qquad$
A. 2 গ্রাম $\qquad$
A. 4 উপজেলা: $\qquad$
A. 6 শিক্ষাগত যোগ্যতা: $\qquad$
A. 8 পেশাগত:[কোড: ১=ক্ষুদ্র ফুলচাষী, ২=মধ্যম ফুলচাষী, ৩=বড় ফুলচাবী, $8=$ ফুল ব্যবসায়ী]
B. 0 ফুলের আবাদ ও পি.আর.এ সংক্রান্ত তথ্যাবলিঃ
B. 1 উত্তরদাতার ব্যবহৃত জমির ধরণ/ প্রকৃতি:

| ফুল চাষে ব্যবহৃত জমির ধরণ | জমির পরিমাণ (শতাংশ) |
| :--- | :---: |
| ১. এ বছর ফুল চাষ করেছেন এমন জমির পরিমান বলুন? |  |
| $২ . ~ অ ন ্ য ~ ফ স ল ে র ~ ত ু ল ন া য ় ~ এ ব ছ র ~ ফ ু ল ~ চ া ষ ে ~ ন ি য ় ে া জ ি ত ~ জ ম ি র ~ আ ন ু ম া ন ি ক ~ শ ত ক র া ~ প র ি ম া ন ~(\%) ~ ব ল ু ন ~$ |  |
| $৩ . ~ ক ত ~ ব ৎ স র ~ য া ব ৎ ~ ফ ু ল ~ চ া ষ ~ ক র ে ন ? ~$ |  |

B. 2 আপনি এবছর কোন কোন ফুল চাষ করেছেন, দয়া করে বলবেন কি?

| চাষকৃত/ব্যবহৃত ফুলের প্রকার/নাম (নীচে উল্লেখিত ফুলের কোড ব্যবহার করুন] | বিভিনু,প্রকার ফুলের চাষকৃত জমির পরিমাণ (শতাংশ) | অর্জিত আয় (হাজারটাকা/একর ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ১. |  |  |
| २. |  |  |
| ৩. |  |  |
| 8. |  |  |
| ৫. |  |  |
| ৬. |  |  |
| 9. |  |  |
| [কোড: ১= অর্কিড, ২=গোলাপ, ৩=জারবেরা, ৪=রজনীগন্ধা, ৫=গ্ন্যাডিওলাস, ৬=কার্নেশান, ৭=লিলি, ** একর = ১০০ শতক ৮=চন্দ্রমল্লিকা, ৯=গাঁদা, ১০=এ্যাস্টার, ১১=ডালিয়া, ১৩=বেলী, ১৪=অন্যান্য $\qquad$ (यদि থাকে)] |  |  |

B. 3 নিম্নলিখিত ফুলের প্রতি পোকামাকড়/রোগ/আগাছার প্রতি সংবেদনশীলতা ও কোন পোকার আক্রমন বেশী হয় উল্লেখ করুন:

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ক্রঃ } \\ & \text { নং } \end{aligned}$ | ফুলের নাম | যার প্রতি সংবেদনশীল (কোড: ১=পোকামাকড়, ২=রোগ, ৩=আগাছা, 8=কোনটাইনা)। | ডানপালের তালিকা হতে কোন কোন পোকা-মাকড় বামপাশের ফুলে আক্রমন কওে তার কোড উল্লেখ করুন | পোকা-মাকড়ের তালিকা (কোডসহ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ১. | অর্কিড |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ১=জাব পোকা, } \\ & \text { ২=ফুলের বিটল, } \\ & \text { ৩=সাদা মাছি (হোয়াইট ফ্লাই), } \end{aligned}$ |
| ২. | গোলাপ |  |  |  |
| ৩. | জারবেরা |  |  |  |
| 8. | রজনীগন্ধা |  |  |  |
| ৫. | গ্ব্যাডিওলাস |  |  | 8=জুন বিটল, |
| ৬. | কার্নেশান |  |  | ৬=স্ব-ফ্লাই, |
| १. | निलि |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ৭=পাতা সুরঙ্গকারী পোকা, } \\ & \text { ৮=পাতা খেকো মৌমাছি, } \end{aligned}$ |
| b. | চন্দ্রমল্লিকা |  |  |  |
| ৯. | গ゙ঁদা |  |  | ৯=থ্রিন্স |
| ১O | এ্যাস্টার |  |  | ১০=স্কেল ইনসেক্ট |
| 2J | ডালিয়া |  |  | ১২=অন্যান্য |
| ১২ | বেলী |  |  |  |
| ১৩ | অন্যান্য ------ |  |  |  |

B. 4 ফুল চাষের জন্যে সাধারণত: কোন কোন উৎস থেকে বীজ/চারা ক্রয়/সগ্পহ করেন?

| উৎসসমূহ | উত্তরেরধরণ (কোড: হুঁ=১, না=২)। |
| :--- | :--- |
| ১। নিজের তৈরী বীজ/চারা |  |
| ২। প্রতিবেশী কৃষকের কাছ থেকে সংগৃহীত |  |
| ৩। অন্য কোন কোম্পানীর বীজ/চারা/কন্দ |  |
| ৪। স্থানীয়বীজ/চারাউ ৎপাদনকারী নার্সারী থেকে |  |
| ৫। আমদানীকারকের নিকট থেকে সংগৃহীত |  |
| ৬। গবেষনাপ্রতিষ্ঠান থেকে সংগৃহীত |  |
| ৭। এনজিও হতে |  |
| ৮। ফুলবীজ/চারাব্যবসায়ীর নিকট হতে সংগৃহীত |  |
| ৯। অন্যান্য (যদি থাকে)------------ |  |

B. 5 ফুলের ক্ষতিকর পোকামাকড়ের আক্রমনের অবস্থা, গাছের ঝুঁকিপূণ ধাপসমূহ, পোকাক্রান্ত গাছের অংশ এবং আক্রমনের তীব্রতা কেমন?

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ক্রঃ } \\ & \text { নং } \end{aligned}$ | পোকার নাম | আক্রমনের অবস্থা: (১=মূখ্য, ২=গৌণ, ৩=আক্রমন হয় ना)। | ফুল গাছের ঝুঁকিপূণ ধাপসমূহ [১=চারা, ২=বাড়ন্তগাছ, ৩=ফুল ফোঁটা/বৃদ্ধি পর্যায়]। | পোকাক্রান্ত গাছের অংশ (কোড: ১=পাতা, ২=কান্ড, ৩=ফুল, 8=শিকড়/কন্দ)। | আক্রমনের তীব্রতা $\begin{gathered} \text { (১=বেশী, ২=মধ্যম, } \\ 8=\text { ( }) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ১ | জাব পোকা |  |  |  |  |
| २ | ফুলের বিটল |  |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ | সাদা মাছি (হোয়াইট ফ্লাই) |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | জুন বিটল |  |  |  |  |
| 『 | মেটালিক ফ্মি বিটল |  |  |  |  |
| ৬ | স্ব-ফ্রাই |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | লিফ মাইনার |  |  |  |  |
| $b$ | পাতা খেকো ঢোকা |  |  |  |  |
| ৯ | থ্রিন্স |  |  |  |  |
| ১O | স্কেল ইনসেট্ট |  |  |  |  |
| ১১ | লাল মাকড় |  |  |  |  |
| ১২ | অন্যান্য---------- |  |  |  |  |

B. 6 ক. আপনার এলাকায় ফুল ক্ষেতের বাগানে বর্তমানে এমন নতুন কোন পোকা দেখা যাচ্ছে কি, যা পূর্ববর্তীসময়ে ছিল না? (কোড: হাঁঁ১, না=২)।
খ. যদি উত্তর হ্রাঁ হয়, তাহলে পোকা-মাকড়গুলো কি কি? নাম উল্লেখ করুন:
$\qquad$
২. $\qquad$ ৩. $\qquad$ 8. $\qquad$
B. 7 আপনার এলাকায় ফুল ক্ষেতের বাগানে আগের তুলনায় বর্তমানে অধিক ক্ষতি কতে এমন কতগুলো অনিষ্টকারী পোকামাকড়রের নাম বলুন?
১. $\qquad$ २. $\qquad$ ৩. $\qquad$ 8.
$\qquad$
B. 8 আপনি সাধারণত কিভাবে ফুলের ক্ষতিকর পোকামাকড়ের আক্রমণ দমন করেন? নিচের খালিঘরে কোড নাম্বার লিখুনঃ

(কোডঃ ১= ফুলগাছে কীটনাশক স্থ্রে করে, ২= ফুলের চারা/কন্দ রোপন করার সময় নালাতে দানাদার কীটনাশক প্রয়োগ, ৩=সেচের সাথে কীটনাশক প্রয়োগ করে, $8=চ$ চারা/বীজ কীটনাশক দিয়ে শোধন, ৫= সেচ প্রদান, ৬= ক্ষতিকর পোকা সমূহ হাত দিয়ে সং্পহ করে মেরে ফেলা, ৭= পাথি বসার জন্য জমিতে ฆুঁটিপুঁতে দেয়া, b= সমন্বিত বালাই পদ্ধতি (আই.পি.এম.), ৯= সুষম সার ব্যবহার, ১০= অন্যান্য -(দয়া কওে উল্লেখ করুন) ]

# Appendix 2: Questionnaire for Field Level Officers of DAE 

Department of Entomology

# Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University 

Sher-e-Bangla Nagor, Dhaka-1207

## INSECT PEST RISK OF CUTFLOWERS IN BANGLADESH

Set-A: KII Checklists for Field Level DAE Officials
$\square$

Name of Key Informant
Designation.
Organization:
Working area
Mobile:

### 1.0 INFORMATION ABOUT INSECT PESTS OF CUT FLOWERS AND FOLIAGE

1.1 What are the major insect pests that cause potential damage to flowers and foliage in your area?
1.2 What are the minor insect pests that may harm to cut flowers and foliage, if not to be controlled?
1.3 What are the insect pests of cut flowers and foliage, which incidences are being seen in recent years, but not seen earlier in your area?
1.4 What is the damage potential of mealy bug on flowers in your area? Are there any various species of mealy bug present in flowers, if yes please mention those species along with kinds of flowers.
1.5 Is there any incidence of Japanese beetle on flowers in your area? If yes, please mention the host flowers along with damage severity.
1.6 What are the effective options to control the quarantine insect pests that are found in the cut flowers and foliage field or storage in your area?
1.7 Give your suggestions for the better management of the insect pests of flowers in Bangladesh.

