Screening of different fungicides and biocontrol agents against *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *vasinfectum* (FOV) under pot condition
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**Abstract**

Cotton (*Gossypium spp.*) is one of the most important fiber crops playing a key role in economic and social scenario of the globe. It is oldest among the commercial crops of the world providing fiber for clothing of the mankind. A pot experiment was conducted to test the efficacy of the fungicides and bioagents under *in vitro* condition. Among these, soil drenching with 0.20% pyraclostrobin 5%+ mitiram 55% (84.07%) proved effective which is followed by 0.20% captan 70%+ hexaconazole 5% (80.52%) in managing the wilt of cotton.
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**Introduction**

Cotton production has great importance in India due to its economic and social impact and because it plays an important role in crop rotation, production and others. Cotton is one of the most important fiber and cash crop of India which plays a significant and dominant role in the industrial and agricultural economy of our country. It provides the basic raw materials such as cotton fiber to cotton textile industry. In India, there are ten major cotton growing states which are divided into three zones, viz., North zone, Central zone and South zone. North zone consists of Punjab, Haryana and Rajasthan. Central zone includes Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Gujarat. South zone comprises Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Karnataka and Tamil Nadu. The crop is affected by abundant pests, diseases and weeds etc causing serious economic losses in a crop. The low productivity of cotton is mainly due to high incidence of insect pests and diseases caused by fungal, bacterial and viral pathogens. Among foliar diseases; Bacterial blight, Alternaria leaf spot and grey mildew are the most important and now the Corynespora is also taking place. Similarly, the soil borne diseases is also important as Wilt, Root rot and Para wilt (Physiological disorder) etc. In North India, the cotton leaf curl disease (CLCuD) caused by gemini virus and transmitted by whitefly *Bemisia tabaci* (Gennadius) has become a serious threat to cotton cultivation due to development of new recombinant strains and introduction of a number of susceptible *Bt* cotton hybrids in north zone (Monga *et al.*, 2011) [6]. In India, foliar diseases (fungal, bacterial and viral boll rot) have been estimated to cause yield losses up to 20 to 30% (Mayee and Mukewar, 2007) [4]. Under favourable conditions, losses to the tune of 26.59 % (Monga *et al.*, 2013) [5] and 38.23% (Bhattiprolu and Prasada Rao, 2009) [1] were recorded due to fungal diseases, leaf spot/blight caused by *Alternaria macrospora* Zimm. So in this context, alternative products for cotton disease management need to be developed. In this experiment, biocontrol agents along with the fungicides and combi products of fungicides were tested in the pot condition to find out promising options for alternative and sustainable disease management.

**Material and Method**

A pot experiment was conducted to test the effectiveness of fungicide and bioagents during its respective tests. The fungicide *viz.*, mancozeb, thiram, propiconazole, carbendazim, pyraclostrobin + mitiram, captan + hexaconazole and antagonists *viz.*, *Trichoderma harzianum* and *T. viride* were tested in pots separately for the management of the wilt of cotton under net house condition.
The cotton seeds (GN Cot. 25) were treated with respective fungicide and bioagents whereas control with only distilled water. The drenching was initiated at the time of appearance of disease.

**Design:** CRD  
**Repetition:** 3

**Treatments:** Two biocontrol agents, two systemic, two non-systemic and two combiproducts were tested along with control.

**Method:** Seed treatment and soil drenching of given respective treatments. For soil inoculation, the fungus was multiplied on sand maize meal medium (SMMM) for preparation of mass inoculums in the laboratory. It was prepared in 250ml flasks using 90g fine sieved sand, 10g of maize meal and 20ml of distilled water just enough to moisten the mixture properly. The medium in flasks were then sterilized in autoclave at 15lb psi (1.036kg/cm²) for 30minutes for three consecutive days. These flasks were inoculated with 5mm mycelia disc of actively growing fungal culture and incubated at 27±2°C in an incubator for ten days. After ten days, the mycelium covered entire surface of medium. The culture was then used for inoculation. Each pot were sown with the five g of seed and other plants were removed. The cotton plants were irrigated as and when required and required quantity of fertilizer was added in the pot for proper growth and development. Inoculum of the said pathogen was applied in the soil at a rate of 10g/kg of soil (Elsalam et al., 2014) \[2\]. A control treatment was maintained without inoculum. Observation on per cent disease incidence was recorded by using following formula given by Wheeler (1969) \[7\].

Number of infected plants/pot  
\[\text{PDI} = \frac{\text{Total number of plants/pot}}{\text{x 100}}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Fungicides and Biocontrol agents</th>
<th>Conc.</th>
<th>Wilt incidence on plant (%)</th>
<th>Disease control over check (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Mancozeb (75WP)</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>5.582 (30.67)**</td>
<td>59.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Thiram (75WP)</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>5.275 (27.33)</td>
<td>63.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Propiconazole (25EC)</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>4.563 (20.33)</td>
<td>73.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Carbendazim (50WP)</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>4.100 (16.33)</td>
<td>78.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Pyraclostrobin 5% + Mitiram 55%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>3.534 (12.00)</td>
<td>84.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Captan 50% + Hexaconazole 5%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>3.891 (14.67)</td>
<td>80.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Trichoderma harzianum</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5.016 (24.67)</td>
<td>67.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Trichoderma viride</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6.337 (39.67)</td>
<td>47.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.708 (75.33)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                   | CD at 5%     | CV %    |
|                   |             |         |
| S. Em. ±          | 0.08        |         |
| CV %              | 0.24        |         |

*Figures outside the parentheses indicate √x + 0.5 transformation values  
**Figures in parentheses indicate original values

**Result and Discussion**

With aim to find out an effective integration of various methods for the management of cotton wilt, a pot culture experiment was carried out. The data presented in Table 2 and depicted in Plate 1 revealed that wilt incidence was observed significantly lower in all the treatments. Among these, pyraclostrobin 5% + mitiram 55% proved 84.07 per cent effectiveness in managing the wilt disease at 0.20% and it was statistically significant over the control. Next best treatment in order of merit was captan 70% + hexaconazole 5% (82.52%) at 0.20%, carbendazim (50WP) (78.32%) at 0.005%, propiconazole (25EC) (73.01%) at 0.025% over control which was followed by Trichoderma harzianum (67.25%) at 5% concentration. Per cent wilt incidence was minimum when the soil was drenched with 0.20% pyraclostrobin 5% + mitiram 55% (12.00%), the next best results were found with the treatment of 0.20% captan 50% + hexaconazole 5% (14.67%), 0.005% carbendazim (16.33%), 0.025% propiconazole (20.33%) and 5% Trichoderma harzianum (24.67%), while remaining other treatments showed more than 50% disease control of wilt. These results are in agreement with the results obtained by Kushawah (2015) \[3\] who reported that pyraclostrobin 5% + mitiram 55% at 0.20% proved effective in control of wilt of cluster bean in pot condition.

**Table 1:** List of fungicides and biocontrol agents tested against Fusarium oxysporum f. sp. vasinfectum in pot condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treat. No.</th>
<th>Fungicides and Biocontrol agents</th>
<th>Conc. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Mancozeb (75WP)</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Thiram (75WP)</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Propiconazole (25EC)</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Carbendazim (50WP)</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Pyraclostrobin 5% + Mitiram 55%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Captan 50% + Hexaconazole 5%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Trichoderma harzianum</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Trichoderma viride</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2:** Testing of fungicides and biocontrol agents in pot condition against Fusarium wilt of cotton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Fungicides and Biocontrol agents</th>
<th>Conc.</th>
<th>Wilt incidence on plant (%)</th>
<th>Disease control over check (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Mancozeb (75WP)</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>5.582 (30.67)**</td>
<td>59.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Thiram (75WP)</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>5.275 (27.33)</td>
<td>63.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Propiconazole (25EC)</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>4.563 (20.33)</td>
<td>73.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Carbendazim (50WP)</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>4.100 (16.33)</td>
<td>78.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Pyraclostrobin 5% + Mitiram 55%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>3.534 (12.00)</td>
<td>84.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Captan 70% + Hexaconazole 5%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>3.891 (14.67)</td>
<td>80.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Trichoderma harzianum</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5.016 (24.67)</td>
<td>67.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Trichoderma viride</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6.337 (39.67)</td>
<td>47.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.708 (75.33)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                   | CD at 5%     | CV %    |
|                   |             |         |
| S. Em. ±          | 0.08        |         |
| CV %              | 0.24        |         |

*Figures outside the parentheses indicate √x + 0.5 transformation values  
**Figures in parentheses indicate original values
Plate 1: Testing of fungicides and bioagents for control of cotton wilt in pot conditions
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