

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Evaluation of Biological Control agents against *Rhizoctonia solani* Kuhn. in Proso millet

T. S. S. K. Patro\*, M. Divya, Y. Sandhya Rani, U. Triveni and N. Anuradha

Acharya N G Ranga Agricultural University, Agricultural Research Station,

Vizianagaram 535 001, Andhra Pradesh, India

\*email: [drsamuelpatro@gmail.com](mailto:drsamuelpatro@gmail.com)

ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted during kharif 2016, at Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram for the management of banded blight disease in proso millet by using potential biocontrol agents viz., *Bacillus subtilis*, *Pseudomonas flourescens* and *Trichoderma viride*. Lowest sheath blight intensity (15.22%) was recorded in T<sub>7</sub> (i.e. Soil application of value added *P. flourescens* + *T. viride* + *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) and the highest (63.95%) in T<sub>2</sub> (i.e., Seed treatment with *Pseudomonas flourescens* @ 10 g/kg) whereas it was 65.61% in the control.

**Keywords:** Proso millet, biocontrol, *R.solani*

Received 04.11.2017

Revised 28.12.2017

Accepted 15.03.2018

**How to cite this article:**

T. S. S. K. Patro, M. Divya, Y. Sandhya Rani, U. Triveni and N. Anuradha. Evaluation of Biological Control agents against *Rhizoctonia solani* Kuhn. in Proso millet. Adv. Biores., Vol 9 [3] May 2018:38-40.

**INTRODUCTION**

Millet is one of the oldest foods known to humans and possibly the first cereal grain to be used for domestic purposes. Proso millet (*Panicum miliaceum*), commonly known as broomcorn millet, Common millet, broomtail millet, red millet and white millet. In tribal belts it is a major food crop as well as feed and fodder for livestock. It is an indispensable to Indian agriculture as a source of grain and straw in vast dry land areas. This millet is highly nutritious and even superior to rice and wheat in certain constituents. These grains are richest source of protein (12.5 g), crude fibre (5.2 g), mineral matter (2.7 g), fat (3.5 g), carbohydrates (63.8 g), calcium (8.0 g), phosphorus (283 mg) and iron (2.9 mg) per 100 grams. The grains have high dietary fibre and helps in prevention of constipation, lowering of blood cholesterol and slow release of glucose to the blood streams during digestion. Nevertheless, lower incidence of cardiovascular disease, duodenal ulcer and hyperglycemia are reported among regular millet consumers. This crop is very hardy and can tolerate drought conditions. It is known to be effected by several diseases viz., blast, banded blight, brown spot, smut, rust, foot rot and viral diseases.

Banded blight caused by *Rhizoctonia solani* (Kuhn.) is one of the emerging malady in successful cultivation of proso millet. The disease was observed in severe form at Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram, Andhra Pradesh and Berhampur, Orissa during monitoring survey causing considerable yield losses in proso millet. 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 [5, 14]. Furthermore, environmental conditions such as low light, cloudy days, high temperature and high relative humidity also favor the disease [10]. The pathogen overwinters as soil-borne sclerotia and mycelium in plant debris; these constitute the primary inoculum. 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 [6]. So far, no variety completely resistant to this fungus has been found, although evaluation of proso millet germplasm has been conducted [12, 13]. 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 [4]. It is difficult to achieve control through host resistance or fungicides, therefore, biological control may be effective in minimizing the incidence of sheath blight [2]. So an experiment was conducted at Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram during *kharif*, 2016 for the management of banded blight disease in proso millet.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted during *kharif* 2016, 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 viride*. 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:

|    |  |
|----|--|
| T1 | Seed treatment with <i>Trichoderma viride</i> @ 10 g/kg  |
| T2 | Seed treatment with <i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> @ 10 g/kg   |
| T3 | Seed treatment with <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> @ 10 g/kg   |
| T4 | Soil application of value added <i>P.f.</i> (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 <i>T.v.</i> (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 <i>B.s.</i> (one kg talc formulation mixed in 25 kg FYM or vermicompost, incubated for 15 days) applied over an acre at the time of sowing               |
| T7 | Soil application of value added <i>P.f. + T.v. + B.s.</i> (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  |

The disease severity and yield were recorded and the data was statistically analysed by following the standard procedures [3]. The percent disease index (PDI) was calculated by using the following formula:

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

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

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<sub>7</sub> (*i.e.* Soil application of value added *P. fluorescens + T. viride + B. subtilis* (one kg talc formulation mixed in 25 kg FYM or vermicompost, incubated for 15 days) followed by 21.28% in T<sub>5</sub> (*i.e.*, Soil application of value added *T. viride* (one kg talc formulation mixed in 25 kg FYM or vermicompost, incubated for 15 days) and the highest (63.95%) in T<sub>2</sub> whereas it was 65.61% in the control. And high grain (1552.50 kg/ha) and fodder yield (3305.56 kg/ha) was found in T<sub>7</sub> whereas, it was 1255.72 kg/ha and 2408.33 kg/ha in the control respectively (Table 1).

Patro and Madhuri [11] reported that *P. fluorescens + T. harzianum* followed by *P. fluorescens* alone and *T. harzianum* alone are effective against *R. solani*. *T. harzianum* (ThF2-1) gave the maximum inhibition of *R. solani* 618 [8]. Huang *et al* [7] reported that *B. pumilus* SQR-N43 is a potent antagonist against *R. solani* Q1. Naeimi *et al.*, [9] reported that *T. harzianum* AS12-2 was the most effective strain in controlling rice sheath blight. *T. harzianum* (Jn14) and *T. hamatum* (T36) were the most effective isolates to inhibit *R. solani* mycelial growth [1]. *Trichoderma* strains were effective both *in vitro* and *in vivo* was reported by Das and Hazarika [2] and Tewari and Singh [15] who all found that *T. harzianum* was an effective BCA in controlling rice sheath blight.

**Table 1: Management of banded sheath blight in Proso Millet**

| Treatments               | Sheath blight (PDI) | Grain Yield (Kg/ha) | Fodder Yield (Kg/ha) |
|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| T <sub>1</sub>           | 51.74 (46.00)*      | 1391.39             | 3008.33              |
| T <sub>2</sub>           | 63.95 (53.12)       | 1371.39             | 2750.00              |
| T <sub>3</sub>           | 55.39 (48.10)       | 1374.17             | 2961.11              |
| T <sub>4</sub>           | 43.08 (41.01)       | 1388.06             | 3019.44              |
| T <sub>5</sub>           | 21.28 (27.41)       | 1446.67             | 3200.00              |
| T <sub>6</sub>           | 31.54 (34.12)       | 1416.11             | 3019.44              |
| T <sub>7</sub>           | 15.22 (22.95)       | 1552.50             | 3305.56              |
| T <sub>8</sub> (Control) | 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

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, biological control with the antagonists will lower the dependency on synthetic will it is hoped lead to a cleaner environment and healthier foods.

## REFERENCES

- Barakat, M.R., Al-Mahareeq, F., Ali -Shtayeh, M.S and AL- Masri, M.I. (2007). Biological Control of *Rhizoctonia solani* by Indigenous *Trichoderma* spp. isolates from Palestine. *Hebron University Research Journal*. 3 (1): 1-15.
- Das B.C and Hazarika, D.K. (2000). Biological management of sheath blight of rice. *Indian Phytopathology* 53: 433-435.
- Gomez, K.A and Gomez, A.A. (1984). Statistical procedures for Agricultural research. 2nd Edition. Pp. 680. John Wiley & Sons Publications, New York.
- Groth D.E., Rush, M.C and Lindberg, G.D. (1990). 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, 31-52.
- Groth D.E., M.C. Rush and C.A. Hollier, (1991). Rice diseases and disorders in Louisiana. *Louisiana State University, Agricultural Center, Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin* No. 828. Baton Rouge, LA, USA.
- Groth D.E. and Bond, J.A. (2006). Initiation of rice sheath blight epidemics and effects of application timing of azoxystrobin on disease incidence, severity, yield and milling yields. *Plant Disease*. 90: 1073-1078.
- Huang, K., Zhang, N., Yong, X., Yang, X and Shen, Q. (2012). Biocontrol of *Rhizoctonia solani* damping-off disease in cucumber with *Bacillus pumilus* SQR-N43. *Microbial Research*. 167 (3): 135-143.
- Montealegre, J.R., Ochoa, F., Besoain, X., Herrera, R and Pérez, L.M. 2014. In vitro and glasshouse biocontrol of *Rhizoctonia solani* with improved strains of *Trichoderma* spp. *Ciencia E Investigacion Agraria*. 41(2): 197-206.
- Naeimi, S., Okhovvat, S.M., Javan-Nikkhah, M., Vagvolgyi, C., Khosravi, V and Kredics, L. 2010. Biological control of *Rhizoctonia solani* AG1-1A, the causal agent of rice sheath blight with *Trichoderma* strains. *Phytopathologia Mediterranea*. 49: 287-300.
- Ou S.H., (1985). Rice Diseases. 2nd ed. Commonwealth Mycological Institute, Kew, UK, 380 pp.
- Patro, T.S.S.K and Madhuri, J. (2014). Management of banded blight of finger millet incited by *Rhizoctonia solani* (Kuhn.). *Indian Journal of Plant Sciences*. 3 (2): 163-166.
- Patro, T.S.S.K., Divya, M., Sandhya Rani, Y., Triveni, U and Anuradha, N. (2017). Evaluation of proso millet (*Panicum miliaceum* L.) genotypes against emerging malady of sheath blight caused by *Rhizoctonia solani* Kuhn. *Progressive Research - An International Journal*. 12 (1): 119-120.
- Patro, T.S.S.K., Neeraja, B., Sandhya Rani Y and Jyothsna, S. (2015). Studies on prosomillet (*Panicum miliaceum* L.) genotypes against emerging malady banded sheath blight caused by *Rhizoctonia solani* Kuhn. *in vivo. Progressive Research - An International Journal*. 10 (4): 1916-1918.
- Rush M.C. and F.N. Lee, (1992). Sheath blight. In: *Compendium of Rice Diseases* (R.K. Webster, P.S. Gunnell, ed.), APS Press, St. Paul, MN, USA, 22-23.
- Tewari L. and Singh, R. (2005). Biological control of sheath blight of rice by *Trichoderma harzianum* using different delivery systems. *Indian Phytopathology* 58: 35-40.

**Copyright: © 2018 Society of Education.** This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.