Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry

Available online at www.phytojournal.com

E-ISSN: 2278-4136
P-ISSN: 2349-8234
JPP 2018; 7(3): 2660-2663
Received: 01-03-2018
Accepted: 05-04-2018

TSSK Patro
Acharya NG Ranga Agricultural University, Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram, Andhra Pradesh, India

A Meena
Acharya NG Ranga Agricultural University, Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram, Andhra Pradesh, India

M Divya
Acharya NG Ranga Agricultural University, Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram, Andhra Pradesh, India

Anuradha
Acharya NG Ranga Agricultural University, Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram, Andhra Pradesh, India

Correspondence
TSSK Patro
Acharya NG Ranga Agricultural University, Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram, Andhra Pradesh, India

Ecofriendly management of *Rhizoctonia solani* Kuhn. Inciting banded blight using biological control agents in prose millet

TSSK Patro, A Meena, M Divya and N Anuradha

Abstract
The present study was undertaken to manage the banded blight disease of proso millet using biocontrol agents therefore, aimed towards developing a sustainable integrated disease management (IDM). The field experiment was conducted during *Kharif* 2016 and 2017, at Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram. The disease severity and yield parameters (grain yield and straw yield) were evaluated against banded blight using different combinations of potential biocontrol agents *viz*., *Bacillus subtilis*, *Pseudomonas fluorescens* and *Trichoderma asperellum* in the field during 2016 and 2017. Among all treatments applied treatment T_7 (*i.e.* Soil application of value added *P. fluorescens* + *T. asperellum* + *B. subtilis* (one kg talc formulation mixed in 25 kg FYM or vermicompost, incubated for 15 days) applied over an acre at the time of sowing) showed maximum reduction in disease intensity (15.22 %) and (50.67 %) with higher grain and fodder yield over control.

Keywords: proso millet, biocontrol, *R.solani*, IDM

Introduction
Small millet crops belonging to Poaceae have a long history of cultivation of more than 5000 years and grown in many states (Gowda *et al.* 2006) [6] due to their unique adaptation properties for poor degraded lands and ability to tolerate abiotic stress besides being high quality fodder crops and high nutritive value. In India, the antiquity of proso millet (*Panicum milliaceum* L.) is not clear. The crop is cultivated in sporadic patches from the Himalayas in the north and to Tamil Nadu in the south (Nagaraja *et al.* 2007) [12]. It is grown in Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand (Sinha and Upadhyay 1997) [18]. Incidentally, proso millet is known to be affected by several diseases.

Banded blight of proso millet incited by *Rhizoctonia solani* (Kuhn.) (Basidial stage: *Thanatephorus cucumeris* (Fr.) Donk) is one of the emerging malady in successful cultivation of proso millet. Lalu Das and Girija (1989) for the first time reported as sheath blight of ragi from Vellayani in kerala, where it occurred in a severe form. The disease was observed in severe form at the Agricultural Research Station in Vizianagaram, The widespread adoption of new, susceptible, high-yielding cultivars with large numbers of tillers, and the changes in cultural practices associated with these cultivars, favor the development of sheath blight and contribute greatly to the rapid increase in the incidence and severity of this disease in rice-producing areas throughout the world (Groth *et al*., 1991; Rush and Lee, 1992) [8, 16]. Furthermore, environmental conditions such as low light, cloudy days, high temperature and high relative humidity also favor the disease (Ou, 1985) [13]. The pathogen overwinters as soil-borne sclerotia and mycelium in plant debris; these constitute the primary inoculums. The disease is characterized by oval to irregular, light grey to dark brown lesions on the lower leaf sheath. In advanced stages, the lesions enlarge rapidly and coalesce to cover large portions of the sheath and leaf lamina. At this stage, the disease symptom is characterized by a series of copper or brown color bands across the leaves giving a very characteristic banded appearance.

Control of the pathogen is difficult because of its ecological behavior, Its extremely broad host range and the high survival rate of sclerotia under various environmental conditions (Groth *et al*., 2006) [9]. In the absence of a desired level of host resistance, the disease is currently managed by excessive application of chemical fungicides, which have drastic effects on the soil biota, pollute the atmosphere, and are environmentally harmful. Some potentially effective fungicides are highly phytotoxic to the crop and, if the disease is not severe, these fungicides may reduce yield (Groth *et al*., 1990) [7]. It is difficult to achieve control through host resistance or fungicides, therefore,

biological control may be effective in minimizing the incidence of sheath blight (Das and Hazarika, 2000) [3]. So an experiment was conducted at Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram during *Kharif* 2016 and 2017.

Materials and Methods

A field experiment was conducted at Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram for the management of banded blight disease in proso millet by using potential biocontrol agents like *Bacillus subtilis*, *Pseudomonas fluorescens* and *Trichoderma asperellum*. These isolates were collected from Department of Biological control, Vizianagaram. The experiment was laid out in randomized block design (RBD) with three replications at spacing of 22.5 × 10 cm with 3 × 3 m plot size. Standard agronomic practices of NPK–50 kg, 40 kg, 25 kg were followed at the time of crop growth period. A susceptible variety (CO 5) was used in this experiment by imposing the following treatments: (Table 1)

Two trials were also conducted during *Kharif* 2016 and 2017 for the management of banded blight disease in proso millet. Banded blight (Anon, 1996) [1] was recorded by using 0 to 9 scale (Table 2).

The disease severity and yield were recorded and the data was statistically analysed by following the standard procedures (Gomez and Gomez, 1984) [5]. The percent disease index (PDI) was calculated by using the following formula:

$$PDI = \frac{\text{Sum of all the numerical ratings}}{\text{Number of observations} \times \text{Maximum disease grade}} \times 100$$

Statistical Analysis

The data was analyzed by applying statistical tools of ANOVA (Analysis of variance) technique for drawing conclusions from the data. Critical difference (C.D) was calculated to see the significant and non-significant difference between the mean values of sheath blight PDI in all the treatments.

Results and Discussion

In *Kharif* 2016 all the treatments were found significantly superior over check in controlling the disease. Among all the treatments tested, the lowest sheath blight intensity (15.22%) was recorded in T_7 (*i.e.* Soil application of value added *P. fluorescens* + *T. asperellum* + *B. subtilis* (one kg talc formulation mixed in 25 kg FYM or vermicompost, incubated for 15 days) followed by T_5 21.28 % (*i.e.,* Soil application of value added *T.v.* (one kg talc formulation mixed in 25 kg FYM or vermicompost, incubated for 15 days) applied over an acre at the time of sowing) and highest (63.95 %) was recorded in T_2 (Seed treatment with *Pseudomonas fluorescens* @ 10 g/kg) whereas, 65.61 % was recorded in control. High grain (1552.50 kg/ha) and fodder yield (3305.56 kg/ha) was found in T_7 (Table 3).

Whereas, in *Kharif* 2017 the lowest sheath blight intensity (50.67 %) was recorded in T_7 (*i.e.* Soil application of value added *P. fluorescens* + *T. asperellum* + *B. subtilis* (one kg talc formulation mixed in 25 kg FYM or vermicompost, incubated for 15 days) followed by 53.33 % in T_4 *(i.e.,* Soil application of value added *P.f.* (one kg talc formulation mixed in 25 kg FYM or vermicompost, incubated for 15 days) applied over an acre at the time of sowing) and the highest (68.00 %) in T_6 whereas it was 93.33 % in the control. However, high grain (1573.25 kg/ha) and fodder yield (3040.74 kg/ha) was found in T_7 (Table 4).

The experiment conducted in both the seasons *Kharif* 2016 and 2017 revealed that the treatment T_7 (*i.e.* Soil application of value added *P. fluorescens* + *T. asperellum* + *B. subtilis* (one kg talc formulation mixed in 25 kg FYM or vermicompost, incubated for 15 days) was most effective and recorded (15.22%) and (50.67 %) respectively. The yield parameters like grain and fodder were also recorded highest in both the seasons

Patro and Madhuri (2014) reported that *P. fluorescens* + *T. harzianum* followed by *P. fluorescens* alone and *T. harzianum* alone are effective against *R. solani*. Pal *et al.,* (2015) revealed that seed treatment + 3 spraying with *T. viride* @ 1% was the most effective bio control treatment recording 10.93% pooled PDI against 34.41% in control plot and its performance was at par with the standard fungicide propiconazole @ 1%. The treatment also exhibited maximum increase in all the yield attributing factors recorded and gave a yield increase of 41.1% over control. The interaction between host and pathogen resulted significant changes in morphological, phenological parameters, which influence the yield and yield traits adversely, there was significant reduction in grain yield plant and fodder yield plant ranging from 2.1 to 18.5% and 8.5 to 26.6%, respectively was recorded in *Rhizoctonia solani* affected plants of little millet (Shailendra Singh Chouhan, 2014) [17]. Srinivas *et al.,* (2013) [19] depicts that all the bio-agents stopped the growth of *R. solani* after contact. The order of percent inhibition of *Trichoderma viride* (72.65%)>*Penicillium notatum* (64.07%)> *T. atroviride* (62.51%)>*T. harzianum* (42.18%)> *T. longibrachiatum* (38.29%)> *T. koninzii* (3.14%)> *Aspergillus niger* (1.57%). *T. harzianum* (ThF2-1) gave the maximum inhibition of *R. solani* 618 (Montealegre *et al*., 2014) [11]. Huang *et al* (2012) [10] reported that *B. pumilus* SQR-N43 is a potent antagonist against *R. solani* Q1. *T. harzianum* (Jn14) and *T. hamatum* (T36) were the most effective isolates to inhibit *R. solani* mycelial growth (Barakhat *et al*., 2007). *Trichoderma* strains were effective both *in vitro* and *in vivo* was reported by Das and Hazarika (2000) [3] and Tewari and Singh (2005) [20] who all found that *T. harzianum* was an effective BCA in controlling rice sheath blight.

It is also possible to state that the signs that BCAs will be able to control sheath blight are good. Supplementing biological control with other, non-chemical control methods will improve disease control still more. On the other hand, bio-logical control with the antagonists will lower the dependency on synthetic will it is hoped lead to a cleaner environment and healthier foods.

Table 1: Treatments

T1	Seed treatment with *Trichoderma asperellum* @ 10 g/kg
T2	Seed treatment with *Pseudomonas fluorescens* @ 10 g/kg
T3	Seed treatment with *Bacillus subtilis* @ 10 g/kg
T4	Soil application of value added *P.f.* (one kg talc formulation mixed in 25 kg FYM or vermicompost, incubated for 15 days) applied over an acre at the time of sowing
T5	Soil application of value added *T.a.* (one kg talc formulation mixed in 25 kg FYM or vermicompost, incubated for 15 days) applied over

	an acre at the time of sowing
T6	Soil application of value added *B.s.* (one kg talc formulation mixed in 25 kg FYM or vermicompost, incubated for 15 days) applied over an acre at the time of sowin1g
T7	Soil application of value added *P.f. + T.a. + B.s.* (one kg talc formulation mixed in 25 kg FYM or vermicompost, incubated for 15 days) applied over an acre at the time of sowing
T8	Control

Table 2: Standard Evaluation System (SES) scale for sheath blight disease

Score	Description	Reaction
0	No incidence	No disease/HR
1	Vertical spread of the lesions up to 20% of plant height	R
3	Vertical spread of the lesions up to 21-30% of plant height	MR
5	Vertical spread of the lesions up to 31-45% of plant height	MS
7	Vertical spread of the lesions up to 46-65% of plant height	S
9	Vertical spread of the lesions up to 66-100% of plant height	HS

Table 3: Management of banded sheath blight in Proso Millet *Kharif* 2016

Treatments	Sheath blight (PDI)	Grain Yield (Kg/ha)	Fodder Yield (Kg/ha)
1	51.74 (46.00)*	1391.39	3008.33
2	63.95 (53.12)	1371.39	2750.00
3	55.39 (48.10)	1374.17	2961.11
4	43.08 (41.01)	1388.06	3019.44
5	21.28 (27.41)	1446.67	3200.00
6	31.54 (34.12)	1416.11	3019.44
7	15.22 (22.95)	1552.50	3305.56
8	65.61 (54.12)	1255.72	2408.33
SEm±	1.43	43.24	135.56
CD(P≤0.05)	4.34	131.14	411.12
CV %	6.07	5.35	7.93

* Figures in parentheses are arc sine transformed values

Table 4: Management of banded sheath blight in Proso Millet *Kharif* 2017

Treatments	Sheath blight (PDI)	Grain Yield (Kg/ha)	Fodder Yield (Kg/ha)
1	64.00 (53.25)*	1333.33	2781.48
2	57.33 (49.24)	1429.63	2992.59
3	65.33 (54.02)	1314.81	2707.41
4	53.33 (46.92)	1496.30	2896.30
5	61.33 (51.59)	1381.48	2837.04
6	68.00 (55.58)	1233.33	2651.85
7	50.67 (45.37)	1573.25	3040.74
8	93.33 (75.20)	966.67	2548.15
SEm±	2.12	95.96	102.78
CD(P≤0.05)	6.41	291.02	311.70
CV %	6.80	12.39	6.34

* Figures in parentheses are arc sine transformed values

References

1. Anonymous. Standard evaluation system for rice. International Rice Testing programme. International Rice Research Institute Report, Philippines, 1996.
2. Barakat MR, Al-Mahareeq F, Ali -Shtayeh MS, AL-Masri MI. Biological Control of *Rhizoctonia solani* by Indigenous *Trichoderma* spp. isolates from Palestine. Hebron University Research Journal. 2007; 3(1):1-15.
3. Das BC, Hazarika DK. Biological management of sheath blight of rice. Indian Phytopathology. 2000; 53:433-435.
4. Divya M, Patro TSSK, Sandhya Rani Y, Triveni U, Anuradha N. Reaction of *Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn. early and medium duration varieties against major maladies. Progressive Research – An International Journal. 2017; 12(1):30-32.
5. Gomez KA, Gomez AA. Statistical procedures for Agricultural research. 2nd Edition. Pp. 680. John Wiley & Sons Publications, New York, 1984.
6. Gowda KTK, Gowda J, Ashok EG, Nagaraja A, Jagadish PS, Sashidhar VR. Technology for increasing finger millet and other small millets production in India. Project Coordinating Cell, ICAR, University of Agricultural Sciences, Gandhi Krishi Vigyan Kendra Campus, Bangalore, 2006; 41.
7. Groth DE, Rush MC, Lindberg GD. Foliar fungicides for control of rice diseases in the United States. In: *Pest Management in Rice* (B.T. Grayson, M.B. Green, L.G. Copping, ed.), Elsevier, London, UK, 1990; 31-52.
8. Groth DE, MC Rush, CA Hollier. Rice diseases and disorders in Louisiana. Louisiana State University, Agricultural Center, Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin. Baton Rouge, LA, USA, 1991; 828.
9. Groth DE, Bond JA. Initiation of rice sheath blight epidemics and effects of application timing of azoxystrobin on disease incidence, severity, yield and milling yields. Plant Disease. 2006; 90:1073-1078.
10. Huang K, Zhang N, Yong X, Yang X, Shen Q. Biocontrol of *Rhizoctonia solani* damping-off disease in cucumber with *Bacillus pumilus* SQR-N43. Microbial Research. 2012; 167(3):135-143.
11. Montealegre JR, Ochoa F, Besoain X, Herrera R, Pérez LM. In vitro and glasshouse biocontrol of *Rhizoctonia solani* with improved strains of Trichoderma spp. Ciencia E Investigacion Agraria. 2014; 41(2):197-206.
12. Nagaraja A, Kumar J, Jain AK, Narasimhudu Y, Raghuchander T, Kumar B. *et al*. Compendium of small millets diseases. Project Coordination Cell, All India Coordinated Small Millets Improvement Project, University of Agricultural Sciences, Gandhi Krishi Vigyan Kendra Campus, Bangalore, 2007, 80.
13. Ou SH. Rice Diseases. 2nd ed. Commonwealth Myco-logical Institute, Kew, UK, 1985, 380.

14. Patro TSSK, Divya M, Ashok S. Identification of resistant sources for major diseases in finger millet. Progressive Research – An International Journal. 2016; 11(4):299-301.
15. Patro TSSK, Divya M, Sandhya Rani Y, Triveni U, Anuradha N. Detection of resistant sources for major diseases in finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn.). Frontiers of Crop Improvement Journal. 2017; 5(1):43-45.
16. Rush MC, FN Lee. Sheath blight. In: *Compendium of Rice Diseases* (R.K. Webster, P.S. Gunnell, ed.), APS Press, St. Paul, MN, USA, 1992, 22-23.
17. Shailendra Singh Chouhan. Studies on banded leaf and sheath blight of little millet (*Panicum sumatrense*) caused by *Rhizoctonia solani* Kuhn. Thesis, Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh), 2014.
18. Sinha AP, Upadhyay JP. Millet ke rog. (In Hindi), Directorate of Publication, GB Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar. 1997; 263(145):180.
19. Srinivas P, Ved Ratan Narayan Reddy P, Bindu Madhavi G. In-vitro evaluation of fungicides, biocontrol agents and plant extracts against rice sheath blight pathogen *Rhizoctonia solani*. International Journal of Applied Biology and Pharmaceutical Technology. 2013; 5(1):121-126.
20. Tewari L, Singh R. Biological control of sheath blight of rice by *Trichoderma harzianum* using different delivery systems. Indian Phytopathology. 2005; 58:35-40.