Gamage, Adv Crop Sci Tech 2025, 13:3

Advances in Crop Science and Technology

Editorial

Open Access

Bio control Agents and Nanotechnology for Crop Disease Management

Gamage Chamini*

China Sri Lanka Joint Research and Demonstration Centre for Water Technology (JRDC), Sri Lanka

Keywords: Biocontrol agents; Nanotechnology; Crop disease management; Plant pathogens; Sustainable agriculture; Nanoparticles; Bio-pesticides; Integrated pest management; Eco-friendly solutions; Agricultural innovation; Microbial inoculants; Nanoformulations; Disease suppression; Plant-microbe interactions; Nano-bio synergy; Smart agriculture; Controlled release; Pathogen inhibition; Resistance reduction; Environmental sustainability.

Introduction

Agricultural productivity is increasingly threatened by crop diseases, which are often caused by a diverse range of pathogens including fungi, bacteria, viruses, and nematodes. These diseases can lead to significant yield losses, food insecurity, and economic hardship for farmers worldwide [1]. Traditionally, the management of such diseases has relied heavily on chemical pesticides and fungicides. While effective in the short term, the overuse and misuse of these chemicals have led to the emergence of resistant strains of pathogens, contamination of water and soil, and adverse effects on non-target organisms, including beneficial microbes and pollinators [2]. Moreover, the growing awareness about the environmental impact of synthetic agrochemicals and consumer preference for pesticide-free food is driving the demand for sustainable and environmentally safe alternatives. In this landscape, biocontrol agents (BCAs) and nanotechnology have emerged as innovative and complementary tools for disease management in crops [3]. These two approaches offer the promise of reducing chemical input, enhancing crop resilience, and aligning agricultural practices with principles of sustainability and precision farming [4].

Description

Biocontrol agents are living organisms—mainly beneficial microbes such as bacteria, fungi, and viruses—that can suppress the activity of plant pathogens through various mechanisms. They function by outcompeting harmful pathogens for nutrients and space, producing antimicrobial compounds, inducing systemic resistance in plants, or directly parasitizing the pathogens [5].

Examples of well-established biocontrol agents include Trichoderma harzianum, Pseudomonas fluorescens, Bacillus subtilis, Beauveria bassiana, and various mycoviruses. These organisms can be applied to seeds, soil, or plant foliage and can colonize the rhizosphere or phyllosphere, establishing a protective barrier against disease-causing microbes. The advantages of using BCAs include their specificity to target organisms, minimal environmental impact, and compatibility with integrated pest management (IPM) systems [6].

Nanotechnology, on the other hand, deals with the manipulation and application of materials at the nanoscale level (1 to 100 nanometers). In agriculture, nanotechnology has been harnessed to develop nano-pesticides, nano-fertilizers, diagnostic tools, and smart delivery systems for agrochemicals. In the context of disease management, nanoparticles such as silver (AgNPs), copper oxide (CuO-NPs), zinc oxide (ZnO-NPs), and silica nanoparticles (SiO2-NPs) have shown strong antimicrobial properties and are effective against a wide range of plant pathogens. Nanoformulations enhance the solubility, stability, and bioavailability of active ingredients. They enable controlled and targeted release, which not only improves efficacy but also reduces the quantity of pesticide required, thereby minimizing environmental contamination. Additionally, nanoparticles can be functionalized with biomolecules to increase their specificity and performance in field conditions [7].

Discussion

The integration of biocontrol agents with nanotechnology—often termed "nano-biotechnology" in agriculture—represents a significant advancement in sustainable crop protection. When biocontrol agents are encapsulated in nanocarriers or nanoformulations, they are shielded from environmental stresses such as UV radiation, temperature fluctuations, and desiccation [8]. This improves their shelf life, enhances field efficacy, and allows for more precise delivery at the site of infection. For instance, nano-encapsulation of *Trichoderma* spores or *Bacillus* formulations ensures gradual and sustained release of the microbes into the rhizosphere, maintaining high populations over time and providing continuous protection against root pathogens. Moreover, the use of biodegradable nanopolymers in such systems ensures that the carriers do not persist in the environment, aligning with green chemistry principles. In addition to enhancing biocontrol efficiency, nanotechnology also enables the development of diagnostic tools and nanosensors for early disease detection. These sensors can detect pathogen presence at molecular levels even before symptoms appear, facilitating timely and targeted intervention. Furthermore, nanoparticles can disrupt the communication signals between pathogens (quorum sensing), thereby preventing biofilm formation and reducing virulence. In some studies, nanomaterials have also been shown to trigger systemic resistance in plants, much like certain BCAs, suggesting that they could function as plant immunity boosters [9].

Despite these promising developments, the integration of BCAs and nanotechnology still faces several challenges. Regulatory uncertainties, lack of field-level data, cost of nanoformulation processes, and public perception regarding nanomaterials in food systems are critical barriers to adoption. There is also a need for detailed ecotoxicological assessments to understand the long-term impacts of nanoparticles on soil health, microbial diversity, and non-target organisms. Ensuring biosafety through thorough risk assessment and developing clear

***Corresponding author:** Gamage Chamini, China Sri Lanka Joint Research and Demonstration Centre for Water Technology (JRDC), Sri Lanka. E-mail: gamagechamini124@gmail.com

Received: 01-Mar-2025, Manuscript No: acst-25-164270, **Editor Assigned:** 03-Mar-2025, Pre QC No: acst-25-164270 (PQ), **Reviewed:** 17-Mar-2025, QC No: acst-21-164270, **Revised:** 23-Mar-2025, Manuscript No: acst-25-164270 (R), **Published:** 28-Mar-2025, DOI: 10.4172/2329-8863.1000794

Citation: Gamage C (2025) Bio control Agents and Nanotechnology for Crop Disease Management. Adv Crop Sci Tech 13: 794.

guidelines for use will be essential to build trust among stakeholders. Research must also focus on developing scalable and cost-effective production techniques for nano-biological products so they can be accessible to smallholder farmers, especially in developing countries where crop diseases often have the most devastating impact [10].

Conclusion

Biocontrol agents and nanotechnology represent two of the most promising tools in the modern agricultural arsenal for managing crop diseases sustainably and effectively. While biocontrol agents offer a natural and eco-friendly mechanism for disease suppression, nanotechnology enhances their efficiency through smart delivery, protection, and precision targeting. The fusion of these approaches can overcome many limitations of traditional pesticides, reduce environmental footprints, and improve overall plant health and productivity. For this potential to be fully realized, interdisciplinary collaboration between microbiologists, nanotechnologists, agronomists, and policymakers is necessary. Ongoing research, awareness campaigns, and policy support will be crucial to ensuring safe, effective, and widespread adoption of these technologies. As we move toward a future of climate-smart and sustainable agriculture, the synergy between biocontrol agents and nanotechnology will play a pivotal role in ensuring food security, environmental integrity, and economic resilience for farming communities around the world.

References

1. Ashby JA (2009) The impact of participatory plant breeding. Plant breeding and farmer participation, 649-671.
2. Bellon MR (1991) The ethno-ecology of maize variety management: a case study from Mexico. Human Ecology 19:389-418.
3. Qazi HA, Rao PS, Kashikar A, Suprasanna P, Bhargava S (2014) Alterations in stem sugar content and metabolism in sorghum genotypes subjected to drought stress. Funct Plant Biol 41:954-962.
4. Biggs S (2008) The lost 1990s? Personal reflections on a history of participatory technology development. Development in Practice 18:489-505.
5. Ceccarelli S, Grando S (2019) From participatory to evolutionary plant breeding. In Farmers and Plant Breeding 231-244.
6. Ceccarelli S (2012) Landraces: importance and use in breeding and environmentally friendly agronomic systems. Agrobiodiversity conservation: securing the diversity of crop wild relatives and landraces. CAB International 103-117.
7. Ceccarelli S, Grando S, Tutwiler R, Baha J, Martini AM, et al. (2000) A methodological study on participatory barley breeding I. Selection phase. Euphytica 111:91-104.
8. Ceccarelli S, Guimarães EP, Weltzien E (2009) Plant breeding and farmer participation. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy.
9. Chiffoleau Y, Desclaux D (2006) Participatory plant breeding: the best way to breed for sustainable agriculture? Int J Agric Sustain 4:119-130.
10. Cleveland DA, Daniela S, Smith SE (2000) A biological framework for understanding farmers' plant breeding. Economic Botany 54:377-394.