International Journal of Chemical Studies

P-ISSN: 2349–8528 E-ISSN: 2321–4902 www.chemijournal.com IJCS 2024; 12(2): 12-15 © 2024 IJCS Received: 23-01-2024 Accepted: 24-02-2024

KH Patil

Post Graduate Institute, Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola, Maharashtra, India

Mina Koche

Post Graduate Institute, Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola, Maharashtra, India

SS Lande

Post Graduate Institute, Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola, Maharashtra, India

RB Kothikar

Post Graduate Institute, Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola, Maharashtra, India

Corresponding Author: KH Patil Post Graduate Institute, Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola, Maharashtra, India

Studies on sources of disease infection of foliar fungal pathogens of cowpea

KH Patil, Mina Koche, SS Lande and RB Kothikar

Abstract

Foliar diseases of cowpea includes Myrothecium leaf spot (Myrothecium roridum), Anthracnose (Colletotrichum lindemuthianum and C. dematium), stem and leaf blight (Macrophomina phaseolina) and web blight (Rhizoctonia solani). Macrophomina phaseolina, Colletotrichum dematium and Dreschlera tetramera were isolated from infected leaves of cowpea collected from Akola, Amravati and Washim districts of Vidarbha region of Maharashtra. Among these fungi, Macrophomina phaseolina, Myrothecium roridum and Colletotrichum dematium were found pathogenic to cowpea. To know the possible sources of diseases infection, these fungi were used for further studies by leaf, soil and seed inoculation methods. Under leaf inoculation method, symptoms were produced on leaves after 12 to 15 days from the date of inoculation. Maximum infection (80%) was observed in Colletotrichum dematium. Seed and soil inoculation method were observed to be more or less similar in both cases. Seed rot was observed in the range of 24 to 43 per cent, pre and post-emergence damping off 17.33 to 34.21 per cent and seedling blight 14.29 to 21.07 per cent. Hence, it is concluded that, seed and soil borne inoculum of these fungi are responsible for causing the diseases in cowpea. All the three foliar pathogens of cowpea were found transmissible from seed to plant showing the symptoms on cotyledons and true leaves. Blackgram, green gram and pigeonpea were infected by all the fungal pathogens whereas, Colletotrichum dematium could infect all leguminous hosts with varied range of intensity (1.19 to 4.32%). However, Macrophomina phaseolina was found non-pathogenic to lentil, pea, lathyrus and chickpea while, Myrothecium roridum was found non-pathogenic to pea and chickpea.

Keywords: Cowpea, disease, infection, fungal, foliar, pathogen

Introduction

Cowpea (Vigna unguiculata L. Walp) a dicotyledonous plant belonging to the family fabaceae, genus Vigna is of major importance to the livelihood of millions of people in the tropics. Cowpea is one of the important Kharif legumes grown in India. It is a warm season crop, well adapted to many areas of the humid tropics and subtropical zones. Cowpea is tolerant to heat and dry conditions, but is intolerant to frost (Davis et. al., 2000)^[8] and it also has the useful ability to fix atmospheric nitrogen through its root nodules. In India, cowpea is grown on about 0.5 million ha with an average productivity of 600 to 750 kg grains/ha (Ahlawat and Shivakumar, 2005)^[1]. It is grown throughout India for its long, green vegetable pods, seeds, and foliage for fodder (Mandal et al., 2009)^[14]. Now-a-days foliar disease of cowpea have become a major constraint for vegetable growers. Sometime the disease (s) cause huge crop loss. During last few years, the weather has undergone a significant change world over. This had a direct effect on bearing cowpea disease outbreak and consequently the crop losses. In India, the weather had a pronounced effect on development of new virulence of different foliar fungal pathogens. Hence, a suitable disease incidence warning system is very much essential for the vegetable growers in order to reduce the crop losses during period of severe outbreaks. Keeping these views in mind, the present investigation were undertaken with the objectives to know the various sources of infection of fungal foliar diseases of cowpea.

Materials and Methods

An experiment was conducted at Department of Plant Pathology, Post Graduate Institute, Dr. PDKV, Akola to know the sources of disease infection of foliar fungal pathogens of cowpea and host range studies. Isolation of the fungi was made from diseased material collected from Akola, Amravati and Washim districts of Vidarbha region of Maharashtra. PDA as a basal medium were used for fungal studies. The usual tissue isolation method was followed for the isolation of fungi causing leaf spot in cowpea.

Fungal cultures were observed under microscope for identification and identity of each of the isolates was confirmed by comparing the published literature. Isolates obtained above were purified by following hyphal tip transferred method. Seven days old cultures were used in further studies. Pathogenicity of all fungal isolates obtained earlier was tested on cowpea seedling grown in cage house. Three weeks old test plants were used for inoculation. After appearance of symptoms on artificially inoculated leaves, reisolation of the pathogen from infected tissue was done to confirm the identity of the pathogens, so as to prove the Koch's postulates. As regards the pathogenicity test of Macrophomina phaseolina, seven days old sclerotial culture of Rhizoctonia bataticola was used and pearlmillet leaf water agar medium (Chidambaram and Mathur, 1975)^[6] was used to induce pycnidial formation to obtain the pycnidiospores of Macrophomina phaseolina. Leaf, soil and seed inoculation method was followed to study the sources of disease infection of fungal pathogens of cowpea. Seeds of different leguminous crops viz., blackgram, greengram, lentil, pea, lathyrus, pigeonpea and chickpea were obtained from Pulse research Unit, Dr. PDKV, Akola for the study of host range of Macrophomina phaseolina, Myrothecium roridum and Colletotrichum dematium. On appearance of disease, the observations were recorded in the form of per cent disease intensity in 0 to 9 scale given by Mayee and Datar (1986)^[16] and per cent disease intensity was calculated as per following formula,

Per cent Disease Intensity = <u>Summation of all numerical ratings</u> X 100 No. of leaves observed X Maximum rating

Results and Discussions

Diseased leaves of cowpea showing small circular to irregular, redish to brown, blighted and coalesced spots were collected from Akola, Amravati and Washim districts of Vidarbha region of Maharashtra. Fungi were to be associated with these samples and the majority of isolation, yielded the fungi namely Macrophomina phaseolina, Myrothecium roridum, Colletotrichum dematium and Dreschlera tetramera. It is seen form the Table 1 that, the majority of diseased bits yielded the fungi viz., Macrophomina phaseolina (27.28 to 36.36%), Myrothecium roridum (27.27 to 30.90%) and Colletotrichum dematium (18.20 to 30.30%). However, frequency of Dreschlera tetramera was observed in the range of 14.54 to 19.08 per cent. Hence, these isolates were tested in further studies including pathogenicity. The association of these fungi with leaf spot diseases of cowpea and other leguminous host like mungbean, urdbean, gaur, mothbean, chickpea and cucurbits have been reported by Mishra et al. (1975)^[17], Sinha and Khare (1977)^[25], Laksman and Menon (1979)^[12], Jamaluddin (1979)^[11], Das and Kaushik (1981)^[7], Zote et al. (1983) ^[29], Byadgi and Hegde (1985) ^[5], Demony and Burke (1990)^[9], Prameela Devi and Singh (1998)^[20], Lenne (1992)^[13] and Seebold et al. (2005)^[21].

Pathogenicity

Pathogenicity of all the fungal isolates obtained earlier was tested on three weeks old plants of cowpea. After appearance of symptoms, the infected leaves were collected and resorted for re-isolation. Re-isolation of infected leaves yielded the same pathogens and their identity was confirmed and evident that, *Macrophomina phaseolina, Myrothecium roridum* and *Colletotrichum dematium* were pathogenic to cowpea causing leaf spot diseases and required in an average 10-15 days

initiation of symptoms (Table 2). Hooda and Grover (1982) ^[10] observed pathogenic behaviour of *Macrophomina* phaseolina (Rhizoctonia bataticola) on the foliage of mungbean and reported 26.70 to 57.50 per cent leaf blight index. Jamaluddin (1979) [11] tested the pathogenicity of Myrothecium roridumon cowpea pods by spraying the conidial suspension on uninjured pods which later on covered the whole plants (Sharma and Gupta, 1982; Udit Narain et. al., 1982 and Seebold et. al., 2005) [22, 27, 21]. Similar type of symptoms was recorded under pathogenicity test in which scattered to minute, round to irregular brownish spots were noticed on leaves of inoculated plants. Colletotrichum dematium had produced symptoms on cowpea in the form of small circular, oval reddish to brownish spots. Similar symptoms and pathogenicity of Colletotrichum capsica were reported on mungbean leaves by Beniwal et al. (1983) [3], Nath et al. (1970) [19] and Mathur and Tyagi (1982) [15] on moth bean.

Source of infection as leaf inoculation method

By leaf inoculation method (Table 3), *Colletotrichum dematium* caused maximum per cent of leaf infection (80%) and also expressed the symptoms earlier than *Macrophomina phaseolina* and *Myrothecium roridum*. Infected leaves due to *Myrothecium roridum* and *Macrophomina phaseolina* were 76 and 72 per cent, respectively. Thus, leaf inoculation of these test fungi plays an important role in causing leaf spot diseases of cowpea. These findings were similar with Laksman and Menon (1979)^[12], Jamaluddin (1979)^[11], Dass and Kaushik (1981)^[7], Sharma and Gupta (1982)^[22], Zote *et al.* (1983)^[29] and Seebold (2005)^[21].

Source of infection as soil inoculation method

Soil inoculation was done by sick soil method. Three fungal pathogens were inoculated separately in earthen pots containing sterilized soil. Highest seed rot of 40 per cent was noticed by Colletotrichum dematium. Maximum pre (34.21%) and post-emergence (23.37%) damping of was observed in Macrophomina phaseolina followed by Myrothecium roridum (27.10 and 21.38%, respectively). Minimum pre and post emergence damping off i.e., 24.45 and 19.05 per cent, respectively was observed in soil inoculated with Colletotrichum dematium. Maximum seedling blight (19.52%) was recorded in Myrothecium roridum inoculated soil followed by Macrophomina phaseolina (18.42%) and Colletotrichum dematium (16.50%) (Table 4). Efficiency of soil inoculation method was observed to be more or less similar also recorded by Baross et al. (1985)^[2], Bhardwaj and Singh (1986)^[4], Mittal (1994)^[18] and Smith *et al.* (1998)^[26].

Source of infection as seed to plant transmission

Seeds of cowpea were inoculated with the cultures of test fungi and sown in earther pots containing sterilized soil. Observations were recorded on seed rot, pre and postemergence damping off and seedling blight (Table 5) and also observed for the symptoms developed on seedlings (seedling emergence and per cent seedling showing symptoms) were recorded 10 days after sowing of seeds. From the table 5 it is noticed that, the highest seed rot was observed in *Myrothecium roridum* (43%) followed by *Macrophomina phaseolina* (40%). Maximum pre and post emergence damping off (24.76 and 23.17%) and seedling blight (21.07%) was observed in seed inoculated with *Colletotrichum dematium*. Per cent emergence was maximum in Macrophomina phaseolina inoculated seeds (74%) and minimum in Myrothecium roridum (69%). Per cent seedling showing symptoms on cotyledons/ true leaves was maximum in Macrophomina phaseolina (28.98%) and minimum in Colletotrichum dematium (23.55%). However, all the three fungal pathogens produced symptoms on cotyledons/true leaves in the range of 23.55 to 28.98 per cent (Table 6). From the infected cotyledons/ true leaves tissue isolation was done on PDA to know the responsible fungi associated with the diseased cotyledons/ true leaves. Under isolation. Macrophomina phaseolina (Rhizoctonia bataticola), Myrothecium roridum and Colletotrichum dematium were obtained from the diseased tissue of the seedlings inoculated with the cultures of respective fungi. Thus, the studies indicated that, all three fungi causing leaf spot diseases in cowpea were transmissible from seed to plant. Present findings are in line with Baross et al. (1985)^[2], Demony and Burke (1990)^[9] and Sharma and Singh (2000)^[23].

Host range studies

The studies were made to investigate the host range of test fungi on different leguminous host by artificial inoculation. The results of the host range study indicated that, all the fungal pathogens under study could infect and produced different leaf symptoms on black gram, green gram and pigeon pea with varied disease intensities whereas, *Colletotrichum dematium* infected all leguminous host. The leguminous hosts pea and chickpea were not infected by *Macrophomina phaseolina* and *Myrothecium roridum*. However, *Myrothecium roridum* was found pathogenic to lentil and lathyrus (Table 7). It confirms the results of Shivanna and Shetty (1986)^[24]. Infectivity of *Colletotrichum dematium* are in agreement to those reported by Usha Rana and Kaushal (2004) 28v who reported that, *Colletotrichum truncatum* as a host of urd and mungbean.

Table 1: Frequence	y of the funga	l pathogens c	ausing foliar	disease in cowpea
--------------------	----------------	---------------	---------------	-------------------

S. N.	Locations of the diseased	No. of bits used for	No. of bits	Per	r cent occurre	nce of fungi	
5. IN.	sample collected	isolation	yielded fungi	M. phaseolina	M. roridum	C. dematium	D. tetramera
1	Akola	45	33	27.28	27.27	30.30	15.15
2	Amravati	68	55	36.36	30.90	18.20	14.54
3	Washim	61	52	29.92	23.00	28.00	19.08

Table 2: Infected	nlants	of cownea	in nathoge	nicity test
Table 2. Infected	plants	of cowpea.	in pailoger	incity test

S. N.	Isolate	Spore load ml ⁻¹ for testing	No. of plants tested	No. of plants infected	Days to initiation of symptoms
1	Macrophomina phaseolina	5 x 10 ⁴	10	7	12
2	Myrothecium roridum	$2 \ge 10^{6}$	10	8	15
3	Colletotrichum dematium	5 x 10 ⁴	10	8	10
4	Dreschlera tetramera	2 x 10 ⁶	10	-	-

Table 3: Effect of leaf inoculation of fungal pathogens on cowpea

S. N.	Fungi	No. of leaves inoculated	No. of leaves infected	Per cent leaves infected	Days to initiation of symptoms
1	Macrophomina phaseolina	25	18	72.00	13
2	Myrothecium roridum	25	19	76.00	15
3	Colletotrichum dematium	25	20	80.00	12

Table 4: Pre and post-emergence mortality in fungus inoculated soil

S.	Number of seeds				Per cent disease observed				
Ν.	Fungi	Sown	Germinated	Seed rot	Pre-emergence damping off	Post-emergence damping off	Seedling blight		
1	Macrophomina phaseolina	100	76	24.00	34.21	23.37	18.42		
2	Myrothecium roridum	100	68	32.00	27.10	21.38	19.52		
3	Colletotrichum dematium	100	80	40.00	24.45	19.05	16.50		

Table 5: Effect of seed inoculation of fungal pathogens on co	wpea
---	------

S.	Fungi	umber of seeds Per cent disease observed					
Ν.	Fuligi	Sown	Germinated	Seed rot	Pre-emergence damping off	Post-emergence damping off	Seedling blight
1	Macrophomina phaseolina	100	60	40.00	23.34	17.33	19.33
2	Myrothecium roridum	100	57	43.00	21.38	21.33	14.29
3	Colletotrichum dematium	100	69	31.00	24.76	23.17	21.07

Table 6: Seed to	plant transmission	of foliar fungal	pathogens of cowpea
------------------	--------------------	------------------	---------------------

S. N.	Fungi	No. of seed tested	Per cent emergence	Per cent seedling showing symptoms on cotyledons, true leaves
1	Macrophomina phaseolina	100	74.00	28.98
2	Myrothecium roridum	100	69.00	25.78
3	Colletotrichum dematium	100	72.00	23.55

S. N.	Host	Per cent Disease Intensity on leaves				
5. IN.	HOSt	M. phaseolina	M. roridum	C. dematium		
1	Black gram (Vigna mungo)	4.32	4.89	4.32		
2	Green gram (Vigna radiata)	4.00	4.05	4.12		
3	Lentil (Lens culinaris)	-	1.84	2.45		
4	Pea (Pisum sativum)	-	-	1.19		
5	Lathyrus (Lathyrus sativus)	-	2.08	2.22		
6	Pigeon-pea (Cajanus cajan)	2.00	1.48	1.21		
7	Chickpea (Cicer arietinum)	-	-	1.85		

References

- 1. Ahlawat IPS, Shivakumar BG. Kharif pulses. In: Prasad R, editor. Textbook of Field Crops Production. New Delhi, India: Indian Council of Agricultural Research; c2005.
- 2. Barros ST, Menezes DE, Fernandes ML, Lira NP. Seed health testing of cowpea with special reference to anthracnose caused by *Colletotrichum lindemuthianum*. Seed Sci Technol. 1985;13(3):821-827.
- 3. Beniwal SPS, Saxena GC, Tripathi HS. Natural occurrence of anthracnose of mungbean caused by *C. capsici*. Indian J Mycol Pl Pathol. 1983;13(3):156-157.
- Bhardwaj CL, Singh BM. Strain variable in *Colletotrichum dematium* f. sp. truncatum from four leguminous hosts. Indian J Mycol Pl Pathol. 1986;16(2):139-141.
- 5. Byadgi AS, Hegde RK. Variation among the isolates of *R. bataticola* in soil. Indian Phytopath. 1985;41(1):122-127.
- 6. Chidambaram P, Mathur SB. Production of pycnia by *M. phaseolina*. Trans Br Mycol Soc. 1975;64:165-168.
- 7. Dass C, Kaushik AD. Studies on leaf blight of mung caused by *R. bataticola*. Haryana Agriculture University, Hissar. 1981, 160.
- Davis DW, Oelke EA, Oplinger ES, Doll JD, Hanson CV, Putman DH. Alternative field crops manual. [Online]; c2000. Available: http://www.hort.purdue.edu/newcrop/afcm/cowpea.html. Accessed January 20, 2000.
- 9. Demony CT, Burke DN. External infection mechanism of hypocotyls and cotyledons of cowpea seedlings by *Macrophomina phaseolina*. Pl Dis. 1990;74:720.
- 10. Hooda I, Grover RK. Effect of age, quantity of inoculum and isolates of *M. phaseolina* on the pathogenesis of mungbean and its control by chemicals. Indian Phytopath. 1982;41(1):107-117.
- 11. Jamaluddin. Studies on the control of Myrothecium rot of cowpea pods. Indian Phytopath. 1979;32:313-314.
- Laksman PMC, Menon MR. Collar rot and web blight of cowpea caused by R. solani in Kerala. Pl Dis Repotr. 1979;65(3):410-413.
- Lenne JM. Colletotricum disease of legumes. In: Colletotricum: Biology, Pathology and Control. Wallingford, UK: C.A.B. International; 1992;1:134-136.
- Mandal MK, Pati R, Mukhopadhyay D, Majumdar K. Maximising Yield of Cowpea through Soil Test-Based Nutrient Application in Terai Alluvial Soils. Better Crops – India. 2009:28-30.
- 15. Mathur AK, Tyagi RNS. Symptomatology of *Colletotrichum truncatum* leaf spot of moth bean. Indian Phytopathol. 1982;35:135.
- 16. Mayee CD, Datar VV. Phytopathometry. Parbhani, MS: Marathwada Agriculture University; c1986.

- 17. Mishra RP, Sharma MD, Joshi LK. A new disease of gram in India. Curr Sci. 1975;44(17):621-622.
- 18. Mittal RK. Fungicidal control of foliar diseases of black gram. Indian J Mycol Pl Pathol. 1994;24(1):67-68.
- 19. Nath R, Mathur SB, Neergaard F. Seed borne fungi of mung (*Phaseolus aureus* Roxb.) from India and their significance. Proc Int Seed Assoc. 1970;34(1):225-241.
- 20. Prameela Devi, Singh RH. Studies on virulence of *M. phaseolina* isolates from blackgram and greengram. J Mycol And Pl Pathol. 1998;28(2):196-201.
- 21. Seebold KW, Langston DB, Kemerait RC. First report at leaf spot and stem canker caused by Myrothecium roridum on watermelon in United States. Pl Dis. 2005;89(3):342.
- 22. Sharma JP, Gupta JS. A new leaf spot disease of moth bean. Indian Phytopath. 1982;35(1):60.
- 23. Sharma K, Singh T. Seed and seedling infection of *R. bataticola* in Vigna radiate. J Mycol Pl Pathol. 2000;30(1):15-18.
- 24. Shivanna MB, Shekara Shetty H. Myrothecium pod spot of cluster bean and its significance. Curr Sci. 1986;55(12):574-576.
- 25. Sinha DK, Khare MK. Site of infection and further development of *M. phaseolina* and *F. equiseti* in naturally infected cowpea seed. Seed Sci & Tech. 1977;5(4):721-725.
- 26. Smith E, Koresten L, Aveling TAS. Evaluation of seed treatments for reducing *Colletotricum dematium* on cowpea seed. Seed Sci & Tech. 1998;27:591-598.
- 27. Narain U, Singh SB, Prasad R. Myrothecium leaf spot of bean from India. Indian Phytopath. 1982;35:712-713.
- 28. Rana U, Kaushal RP. Colletotricum leaf spot development on urd bean. Pl Pathol. 2004;34(2):649.
- 29. Zote KK, Mandlik BP, Khalikar PV. Reaction of mung cultivars to Macrophomina blight. J Maharashtra Agric Univ. 1983;8(2):146-147.