

Theme 3: Biodiversity – Terrestrial, Aquatic

T3_Oral_02

AGRO-BIODIVERSITY IN SOLE AND MIXED FIELD BEAN (*LABLAB NIGER* MEDICK) AGROECOSYSTEMS IN SOUTH KARNATAKA

Raghavendra. K.T., Chakravarthy.A. K*. and Hattappa.S

Department of Entomology, University of Agricultural Sciences, GKVK,
Bangalore-560 065, Karnataka, India

*chakravarthyakshay@yahoo.com and chakravarthyakshay@gmail.com

Field studies were conducted in 1975-78 and 2009-10 to document agro-biodiversity in sole (SFB) and mixed field bean (MFB) cropping systems in and around Bengaluru ($12^0 58' N$, $77^0 35' E$). In SFB only field bean was cultivated. In MFB, traditional cultivars of finger millet (*Eleusine coracana*), fodder sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor*), castor (*Ricinus communis*), niger (*Guizotica coracana*) and field bean (*Lablab niger* Medick) were cultivated. MFB supported on an average 37 bird species with 148 individuals/km² while SFB supported 17 species with 30 individuals /km². MFB supported 13 plant species with 85250 individuals/km² compared to 10 species with 26000 individuals/ km² in SFB. MFB supported 16 butterfly species with 799 individuals/km² compared to SFB with 10 species and 557 individuals /km². MFB supported 30 beetle species with 76500 individuals/km² compared to sole crop which supported 30 species with 60250 individuals/ km².

The greater species richness at MFB was due to the greater physical habitat variability. Crop yield loss and bird species richness were negatively correlated ($r = -0.8740$), ($P < 0.5$). At study sites crop yield loss and index of species richness were inversely related. Yield loss and insect species richness were also negatively and significantly correlated ($r = -0.9130$), ($P < 0.05$). Supplementing either sole or mixed crop with bird perches (stubs), shrubs and tress along fields borders and restricted use of pesticides facilitated agro-biodiversity and mitigated problems of pests and diseases. MFB (C:B ratio 1:4.1) facilitated sustainable crop yields proving economically, environmentally and ecologically sound than SFB (1:2.3) to the growers.-