TERMITE CONTROL STRATEGIES IN KHIVA AND KHOREZM: TRADITIONAL PRACTICES VS. MODERN APPROACHES

Z.Sh.Matyakubov
Head of Department, Khorezm Ma'mun Academy, PhD in Biology;
I.I.Abdullaev
Chairman of Khorezm Ma'mun Academy, Prof. DSc in Biology.
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17855497

Indigenous/Traditional Termite Control in Khorezm Khorezm's vernacular architecture and heritage conservation measures have long incorporated termite-resistant design. For example, historic buildings in Khiva's Itchan Kala employ baked bricks, carefully treated timber, and moisture-control techniques[1], which incidentally reduce termite infestation risk. While explicit ancient termiticides (such as plant-based fumigants or oils) are not well documented, local knowledge of durable materials clearly informed construction. In recent years Uzbek researchers have formalized such local knowledge: for instance, poplar sawdust (from native Populus trees used in village house-frames) was identified as a highly effective bait attractant[2]. From this research, "toxic bait" capsules were developed using locally-sourced cellulose feed and termiticides[2][3]. Similarly, a state-supported "biologic trap" utilizing extracts from over 40 native plants was field-tested in Khorezm with positive results[4]. In summary, traditional Khorezm practice relies on construction techniques and natural materials (bricks, treated wood, local fodder plants) to deter termites[1], supplemented by modernized plant-based baits derived from indigenous species[4][2].

Modern Global Termite Management Strategies

Modern international termite control employs multiple complementary methods:

Chemical Soil Treatments: Today's standard is a "chemical barrier" of soil-applied termiticides (especially non-repellent compounds). Products like Premise® (imidacloprid) and Termidor® (fipronil) create residual treatment zones that termites unknowingly penetrate, leading to colony suppression. Non-repellent termiticides (fipronil, imidacloprid, chlorfenapyr, chlorantraniliprole) have largely replaced older organochlorines and provide high efficacy[5]. These actives have become standard worldwide, significantly reducing retreatment rates. Chemical soil treatments act quickly and cover large areas, but may pose environmental and health risks if overused[4]. Baiting Systems: Termite baits exploit the colony's social feeding. Modern baits use slow-acting toxicants or insect-growth-regulators in a cellulose matrix. Commercial examples include Sentricon® and Trelona™, which contain chitin-synthesis inhibitors (noviflumuron, novaluron). Such baits have been shown to eliminate or suppress termite populations while limiting chemical use to targeted stations. Baits can be installed around structures or even pre-installed in new construction as preventive stations. They are favored by pest managers for ease of placement (linear spacing) compared to complex soil trenching. Limitations include the need for ongoing monitoring and the fact that colonies must forage on the stations for the method to work. Biological Controls: Entomopathogens have been investigated as eco-friendly alternatives. Entomopathogenic fungi (e.g. Metarhizium anisopliae, Beauveria bassiana) can infect and kill termites when spores are ingested or penetrate the cuticle[6]. Field trials of Metarhizium show potential, but termites' social grooming and antifungal gut bacteria often clear spores before infection. Likewise, nematodes (Steinernema, Heterorhabditis spp.) can be lethal to termites in moist soil conditions. Laboratory and some field studies have demonstrated >90% termite mortality with nematode treatments. For example, Steinernema carpocapsae achieved 96–100% kill of Coptotermes formosanus within 7–12 days in lab trials, and nematode applications in tea fields eliminated termite colonies within months. The main drawbacks are the need for specific environmental conditions (moisture, soil type) and cost of mass-producing biocontrol agents. Bacterial agents (such as Bacillus thuringiensis and Serratia marcescens) have shown some termiticidal activity, but are not widely used for structural control. Overall, biological methods are considered sustainable and target-specific, but practical implementation is still experimental in many regions. Physical Barriers and Building Design: Preventive architecture is key. This includes termite-resistant construction: physical barriers (e.g. particle-size barriers, stainless-steel mesh) placed under foundations or around penetrations to block termite entry. For instance, basaltic rock barriers (1.7–2.8 mm granules) have been proven to exclude Formosan termites. Advanced systems like Termimesh® (marine-grade stainless-steel mesh) fully enclose vulnerable points. Polymer membranes impregnated with termiticides (e.g. Impasse®) can also serve as pre-construction barriers. Such non-chemical devices provide long-term protection (e.g. >20-year warranties). However, they are expensive and require precise installation; adoption has been limited by cost and technical complexity. Alongside barriers, preventive measures such as good drainage, removal of wood debris, and routine building inspections are advocated[7]. Integrated Pest Management (IPM): Current best practice is an IPM approach, which combines the above tools to optimize efficacy and minimize environmental impact. IPM emphasizes first reducing termite conducive conditions (moisture, food sources) and then applying the least-toxic control (barriers, baits, spot-treatments) before resorting to full-area chemicals. Globally, IPM programs aim to use non-chemical methods for prevention and monitoring, deploying termiticides and baits only when infestation is confirmed. This holistic paradigm is reflected in international guidelines and research, and is increasingly promoted in Central Asia as well[5][7].

Comparison: Local (Khorezm) vs. Global Techniques

Efficacy: Conventional chemicals (soil termiticides) provide near-immediate colony suppression in treated zones[5], whereas traditional Khorezm methods (building with brick, sealed foundations) offer passive, long-term protection. Local biological baits (poplar-sawdust toxic baits) have shown high efficacy in trials[2], but cover limited areas. In practice, government-led campaigns in Khiva have eradicated termites from specific monuments (e.g. Itchan Kala during 2014–2017), but re-infestation occurred when surrounding dwellings were untreated. By contrast, global IPM strategies aim for area-wide protection. Notably, professional baits and termiticides worldwide can achieve structural protection claims (often ≥90% efficacy)[5], but absolute elimination of all colonies is rare without rigorous follow-up. Sustainability: Local/traditional approaches are generally eco-friendly: using natural materials and minimal synthetic chemicals. For example, plant-derived baits and wood preservation are biodegradable and target-specific[2]. In contrast, heavy reliance on broad-spectrum insecticides can harm non-target organisms and lead to soil contamination (as observed in early Uzbek termite programs)[4]. Biological control methods (nematodes, fungi) offer sustainable alternatives but may require careful formulation to overcome termite defenses. Modern global IPM tries to balance efficacy with sustainability by favoring baits and barriers over blanket spraying[7]. Cost: Traditional local strategies often use low-cost materials (mud bricks, local timber, plant extracts), keeping expenses minimal for rural communities. However, they may incur hidden costs if termite damage goes undetected. Modern chemical treatments and barriers are costly: professional soil treatments and stainless-steel meshes run into hundreds or thousands of dollars per structure. The high cost of exotic barriers and proprietary baits has limited their use in Uzbekistan. Government-funded programs have mitigated this for cultural sites, but widespread homeowner uptake remains low without subsidies. In summary, local methods have low initial cost but may require more frequent vigilance, whereas global high-tech solutions have high upfront cost but longer guaranteed protection. Limitations: No method is foolproof. Local/traditional measures in Khorezm depend on community adoption; for example, termite re-entry into monuments occurred once funding and homeowner compliance lapsed. Plant-based or repellent strategies may work only for certain species. Modern methods have their own drawbacks: chemical termiticides can lead to resistance and collateral damage; bait stations must be regularly serviced or termites may bypass them.

Physical barriers, though effective, can fail if not perfectly installed (termites can circumvent gaps). Overall, integration is key: relying on a single tactic (local or global) often leaves vulnerabilities.

Scientific Advances and Control Programs in Uzbekistan

In Uzbekistan, scientific institutions have developed advanced termite control solutions. The Institute of Zoology (Academy of Sciences) and its Republican Center for Termite Control (established 2012) coordinate national efforts[3][8]. This Center produces patented toxic baits tailored to Anacanthotermes termites, which are widely deployed across the country[3]. For example, proprietary "antitermite" feed baits made from local cellulose and termiticide are manufactured (≈6,000 units/year) to treat infested homes and monuments[3]. In parallel, Uzbek researchers have secured patents on wood-preservation techniques; one grant funded the development of termite-resistant timber treatments (2012–2013). Monitoring data highlight the urgency: surveys by the Republican Center show infested residential buildings rising from ~2,500 in 2009 to ~19,000 by mid-2022, affecting Khorezm heavily. In scholarly work, local entomologists (e.g. Rustamov et al.) have characterized regional termite ecology, noting that A. turkestanicus and A. ahngerianus are the dominant pests in Khorezm. Uzbek scientists also collaborate internationally on biocontrol research. These combined programs – from fundamental laboratory studies to practical bait deployments – reflect a growing emphasis on science-based termite management in Uzbekistan.

Conclusion

Termite infestations pose a serious threat to Khorezm's agriculture, infrastructure, and cultural heritage. Indigenous practices in Khorezm (durable construction, use of local materials, empirical plant remedies) have provided a baseline defense, but they are insufficient alone to halt modern infestations. By contrast, modern global methods (chemical barriers, baits, biocontrols, IPM) offer powerful tools but must be adapted for local contexts. The most effective strategy blends both worlds: employing traditional knowledge (e.g. using termite-resistant materials and eco-friendly baits[1][2]) alongside proven modern tactics (non-repellent termiticides, IGR baits, physical barriers). Uzbekistan's scientific community is actively advancing this integrated approach[3][5]. Continued investment in research (e.g. new baits, genomic studies of termites) and public education will be essential. With such combined efforts, Khorezm can develop sustainable, cost-effective termite management that honors its heritage while leveraging global innovations.

References:

1. [1] Itchan Kala - UNESCO World Heritage Centre https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/543/
2. nveo.org https://www.nveo.org/index.php/journal/article/download/2611/2273/2661
3. Republican Center for Termite Control – Institute of Zoology https://izoology.uz/en/%D1%80%D0%B5%D1%81%D0%BF%D1%83%D0%B1%D0%BB%D0%B8%D0%BA%D0%B0%D0%BD%D1%81%D0%BA%D0%BE%D0%B3%D0%BE-%D1%86%D0%B5%D0%BD%D1%82%D1%80%D0%B0-%D0%B1%D0%BE%D1%80%D1%8C%D0%B1%D1%8B-%D1%81-%D1%82%D0%B5%D1%80/
4. About 30,000 houses in Uzbekistan are infected with termites — UzDaily.uz https://www.uzdaily.uz/en/about-30000-houses-in-uzbekistan-are-infected-with-termites/
5. A Review of the Evolution of Termite Control: A Continuum of Alternatives to Termiticides in the United States with Emphasis on Efficacy Testing Requirements for Product Registration https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4450/13/1/50
6. https://updatepublishing.com/journal/index.php/cb/article/download/7021/5831
7. ebofjournals.com https://webofjournals.com/index.php/12/article/download/1899/1882/3724
8. Laboratory of antiparasitic preparations – Institute of Zoology https://izoology.uz/en/laboratories/anti-parasite/