Integrated Parasite Management (IPM): A Sustainable Approach

Kavita Kumari[1]*, Alka Bharia[2], Deepika[3] and Priyanka Saini[4]

[1,4]Assistant Professor, Department of Veterinary Parasitology, MJF CVAS, Chomu, Jaipur, 303702, Rajasthan
[2]Ph.D. Scholar, [3]M.V.Sc., Department of Veterinary Medicine, PGIVER, (RAJUVAS) Jaipur - 302031, Rajasthan

Corresponding Author
Kavita Kumari
Email: kavitakumari83001@gmail.com

OPEN ACCESS

Keywords

Agriculture, IPM, Sustainability

How to cite this article:

Kumari, K., Bharia, A., Deepika. and Saini, P. 2025. Integrated Parasite Management (IPM): A Sustainable Approach. *Vigyan Varta* 6 (5): 92-94.

ABSTRACT

Integrated Parasite Management (IPM) represents a sustainable and evidence-based approach for the control of parasitic infections in animals. Unlike conventional methods that rely heavily on chemical dewormers, IPM integrates biological, environmental and pharmacological strategies to reduce parasite burdens while minimizing the development of drug resistance. This article explores the concept, importance and practical components of IPM, with a special focus on its role in sustainable veterinary parasite control.

INTRODUCTION

Parasitic infections are a persistent challenge in both livestock and companion animals. Internal parasites like nematodes, trematodes and protozoans, as well as ectoparasites such as ticks and fleas, cause significant losses in animal production, welfare and public health. Traditionally, control has relied on regular administration of anthelmintic drugs. However, the overuse and misuse of these chemicals have led to the alarming rise of drug resistance (Kaplan and Vidyashankar, 2012).

To address these challenges, Integrated Parasite Management (IPM) has emerged as a holistic, eco-friendly and sustainable method of parasite control. IPM combines strategic deworming with pasture management,

nutritional support, biological control and regular parasite monitoring. Its aim is to reduce parasite burden to subclinical levels without total eradication, thus preserving the efficacy of available anthelmintics (Waller, 2006).

Principles of Integrated Parasite Management

1. **Strategic Anthelmintic Use**

Rather than blanket or routine deworming of all animals, IPM promotes **Targeted Selective Treatment (TST)**. In this method, only those animals that show clinical signs or high parasite loads are treated. This reduces drug pressure and helps maintain a population of drug-susceptible parasites in the environment (Kenyon *et al*., 2009).

Faecal Egg Count Reduction Tests (FECRT) and **FAMACHA© scoring** are common tools used to evaluate parasitic load and treatment need, particularly in small ruminants.

2. **Rotational Grazing and Pasture Management**

Proper **grazing management** plays a critical role in controlling gastrointestinal parasites. Strategies such as:

- Rotational grazing
- Mixed-species grazing (e.g., sheep and cattle)
- Avoiding overgrazing
- Providing clean, parasite-free paddocks to young or susceptible animals

can significantly reduce larval contamination of pastures (Niezen *et al*., 1996).

3. **Biological Control Methods**

Biological control involves the use of natural enemies of parasites. One promising method is the use of **nematophagous fungi**, like *Duddingtonia flagrans*, which trap and destroy nematode larvae in faeces before they reach the pasture (Waller, 2006).

These fungi can be administered orally to livestock and they pass through the gut harmlessly while maintaining their predatory effect in the dung.

4. **Nutritional Management**

Proper nutrition boosts the immune system of animals and improves their resilience to parasitic infections. Supplementation with proteins, trace minerals like **zinc and selenium** and vitamins improves the animal's ability to mount an effective immune response (Hoste *et al*., 2008).

Some plants with **anthelmintic properties**, such as tannin-rich legumes (*e.g.*, *Sericea lespedeza*), have also shown efficacy in reducing parasite loads.

5. **Genetic Selection**

Certain breeds and individual animals have **genetic resistance** to parasites. Incorporating these animals into breeding programs can lead to the development of herds or flocks that are more naturally resilient to parasitic infections (Bishop and Morris, 2007).

This long-term strategy can significantly reduce reliance on chemical treatments.

6. **Regular Monitoring and Record Keeping**

Consistent monitoring of parasitic burdens using fecal egg counts, clinical signs and production performance is essential. Keeping detailed records of treatments, pasture use and parasite patterns helps identify what works and allows for adjustments in the IPM plan.

Benefits of IPM

- **Reduces Drug Resistance**: By minimizing anthelmintic use, IPM delays the emergence of resistance.
- **Cost-effective**: Less frequent deworming and better animal productivity lower the overall cost.
- **Environmentally Friendly**: Reduces chemical runoff and environmental contamination.
- **Improves Animal Welfare**: Targeted interventions mean animals are not over-medicated or left untreated.

Limitations and Challenges

While IPM is effective and sustainable, it requires:

- Farmer education and training
- Access to diagnostic tools like fecal egg counts
- Long-term commitment
- Support from veterinarians and extension workers

Despite these challenges, IPM is increasingly recognized as the gold standard for parasite control in the 21st century.

CONCLUSION

Integrated Parasite Management is a rational, sustainable and scientific approach to controlling parasites in animals. By using a combination of strategies-rather than relying solely on drugs-IPM reduces resistance, protects the environment and enhances animal health and productivity. Its implementation requires awareness, commitment and collaboration among farmers, veterinarians and researchers.

REFERENCES

Bishop, S. C. and Morris, C. A. (2007). Genetics of disease resistance in sheep and goats. *Small Ruminant Research, 70*(1), 48–59. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j. smallrumres.2006.07.009

Hoste, H., Torres-Acosta, J. F. J., Paolini, V., Aguilar-Caballero, A. J., Etter, E., Lefrileux, Y. and Chartier, C. (2008). Interactions between nutrition and gastrointestinal infections with parasitic nematodes in goats. *Small Ruminant Research, 76*(1-2), 141–148. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.smallrumres. 2007.12.006

Kaplan, R. M. and Vidyashankar, A. N. (2012). An inconvenient truth: Global warming and anthelmintic resistance. *Veterinary Parasitology, 186*(1-2), 70–78. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2011 .11.048

Kenyon, F., Greer, A. W., Coles, G. C., Cringoli, G., Papadopoulos, E., Cabaret, J., ... and Jackson, F. (2009). The role of targeted selective treatments in the development of refugia-based approaches to the control of gastrointestinal nematodes of small ruminants. *Veterinary Parasitology, 164*(1), 3–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. vetpar.2009. 04.015

Niezen, J. H., Waghorn, T. S., Charleston, W. A. G. and Waghorn, G. C. (1996). Internal parasites and lamb production–a role for plants containing condensed tannins? *Proceedings of the New Zealand Society of Animal Production, 56*, 235–238.

Waller, P. J. (2006). Sustainable nematode parasite control strategies for ruminant livestock by grazing management and biological control. *Animal Feed Science and Technology, 126*(3-4), 277–289. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.anifeedsci.2005.08.008.