

Evaluation of fungicides and biological agents for the management of mango anthracnose

R. G. Bhagwat¹, B. P. Mehta², V. A. Patil³

Dept. of Plant Pathology, N. M. College of Agriculture, Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari.396 450

Abstract— Mango is an important fruit crop in area and production in Gujarat also, where it is cultivated over an area of about 130.1 thousand hectares with annual production of 911.3 thousand tones with productivity of 7.01 tones/ha. Its plantation has become quite popular in the districts of Valsad, Junagadh, Navsari, Kutch, Surat, Amreli and Bhavnagar because of favourable agro-climate condition. Mango is affected by number of diseases at all the stages of its development right from plant in nursery to the fruit in storage or transit. Mango is prone to many fungal diseases like Anthracnose, Rhizopus rot, Stem end rot, Penicillium rot, Black mould rot, Mucor rot, Phyllosticta rot, Pestalotiopsis rot, Macrophoma rot and powdery mildew, leading to heavy loss in yield. Among these diseases, anthracnose is the major disease of mango as it occurs at all the growing parts including leaves, twigs, flowers, fruits except root and trunk throughout the year. Anthracnose caused by *Glomerella cingulata* (Stoneman) Spauld and H Schrenk (anamorph: *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides* (Penz.)) appear to be more severe causing devastation of mango fruits during grading, packing, transportation, storage and marketing (Pathak, 1980).

Keywords— Mango, Anthracnose, fungicides and botanicals.

I. MATERIAL AND METHOD

Considering the importance of the disease and variation in the recommendations of different fungicides/bioagents available in the market for the control of anthracnose disease of mango, a field experiment was laid out with the chemicals/bioagents which were found effective under laboratory condition in controlling Anthracnose disease of mango during 2011-12 and 2012-13. The experiment was laid out in randomized block design with six chemical fungicide and two bioagents keeping three replications. The efficacy of each fungicide was compared with control plant which was sprayed with water only.

TABLE: 1

LIST OF SYSTEMIC, NON SYSTEMIC, COMBINE FUNGICIDE AND BIOAGENTS TESTED UNDER FIELD CONDITION

| Sr. No. | Technical Name of fungicides | Trade Name | Quantity of fungicides used in g or ml/lit water |
|---------|--------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 1 | Propiconazole | Tilt (25% E. C.) | 1 ml |
| 2 | Hexaconazole | Contaf (5% E. C.) | 1 ml |
| 3 | Carbendazim | Bavistin (50 WP) | 1 gm |
| 4 | Flusilazole | Nustar(40% E.C) | 0.5ml |
| 5 | Kresoxim methyl | Ergon (43% E. C.) | 1 ml |
| 6 | Pyraclostrobin + Metiram | Cabriotop (5+55% WP) | 1 gm |
| 7 | <i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> | Navsari native | 6ml |
| 8 | <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> | Navsari native | 6ml |
| 9 | Control spraying with water | — | |

Three sprays of fungicides and bio agents were carried out with respect to location. For this, 27 plants were selected. First spray was given in November, second spray was given one month after first spraying and third spray was given one month after second spray. Normal agronomic practices were adopted. The Per cent Disease index (PDI) of each treatment was calculated after final spray in each year. Observations were recorded at 15 days interval. Per cent disease intensity and per cent disease control of anthracnose was recorded. The disease rating was done by using 0-5 scale and Per cent Disease Index was calculated by adopting the formula given in 3.1.

The disease control DC(%) was calculated by using formula of Das and Raj (1995)

$$DC \% = \frac{\text{Disease \% in control} - \text{Disease \% in treatment}}{\text{Disease \% in control}} \times 100$$

II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The hazardous effects of chemicals used in plant disease management have diverted plant pathologists to find out an effective alternative method with little or no adverse effect on environment. Hence for considering the necessity, this present study tried to found out the effectiveness of chemicals against *C.gloeosporioides* causing anthracnose disease of mango. Six fungicides and two antagonists were evaluated at mentioned concentrations under field condition for their efficacy against mango anthracnose in two different locations (Paria and Waghai) during 2011-12 and 2012-13. The results presented in Table- 4.11 [Plate-VI] depicted graphically in Fig-4 indicated that fungicides were varied efficacy against mango anthracnose

2.1 Pooled 2011-12 and 2012-13, location Paria

All the fungicides and antagonists were found significantly effective in reducing mango anthracnose disease incidence. Out of this, Pyraclostrobin + Metiram (0.1%) and Propiconazole (0.1%) recorded significantly minimum per cent disease intensity (7.56 and 9.83%) and highest per cent disease control (79.08 and 72.79%) of mango anthracnose. The next best in order of merit were Hexaconazole (0.1%), Carbendazim 0.1%), Flusilazole (0.05%) and Kresoxim methyl (0.1%) with 11.13, 13.9, 16.76 and 17.39 per cent disease intensity and 69.20, 61.53, 53.63 and 51.88 per cent disease control, respectively. While, *Pseudomonas fluorescens* and *Bacillus subtilis* reported less effective with with 20.31 and 21.9 per cent disease intensity and 43.79 and 39.40 per cent disease control, respectively of mango anthracnose (Table- 2).

TABLE: 2
EFFICACY OF FUNGICIDES AND BIO-AGENTS FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF MANGO ANTHRACNOSE UNDER FIELD CONDITION AT PARIA

| Tre. No. | Common Name | Per cent disease intensity | | | Efficacy over control % |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| | | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | Pooled | |
| T ₁ | Propiconazole 25% E. C. | 1.86 (10.11) | 1.82 (9.56) | 1.84 (9.83) | 72.79 |
| T ₂ | Hexaconazole 5% E. C. | 1.99 (11.63) | 1.91 (10.63) | 1.95 (11.13) | 69.20 |
| T ₃ | Carbendazim 50 WP | 2.23 (14.71) | 2.11 (13.1) | 2.17 (13.9) | 61.53 |
| T ₄ | Flusilazole 40% E.C | 2.43 (17.54) | 2.32 (15.97) | 2.38 (16.76) | 53.63 |
| T ₅ | Kresoxim methyl | 2.47 (18.1) | 2.37 (16.67) | 2.42 (17.39) | 51.88 |
| T ₆ | Pyraclostrobin + Metiram 5+55% WP | 1.68 (8.11) | 1.57 (7.01) | 1.62 (7.56) | 79.08 |
| T ₇ | <i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> | 2.64 (20.72) | 2.59 (19.9) | 2.61 (20.31) | 43.79 |
| T ₈ | <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> | 2.76 (22.74) | 2.66 (21.06) | 2.71 (21.9) | 39.40 |
| T ₉ | Control spraying with water | 3.52 (37.17) | 3.42 (35.10) | 3.47 (36.14) | --- |
| SEm ± | | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.04 | --- |
| CD (P = 0.05) | | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.12 | --- |
| CV % | | 3.56 | 3.73 | 2.98 | --- |

*Figure in the parenthesis are original value and those outside are arc sin transformed value

The results in terms of fruits yield (kg/plant) showed that Pyraclostrobin + Metiram (0.1%), Propiconazole (0.1%), Hexaconazole (0.1%) and Carbendazim (0.1%), recorded significantly highest fruits yield 88.06, 84.64, 82.57 and 79.38 kg, respectively of mango. While, Flusilazole (0.05%) and Kresoxim methyl (0.1%), *Pseudomonas fluorescens* and *Bacillus subtilis* recorded less fruit yield 68.39, 66.51, 66.36 and 64.16 kg, respectively of mango (Table- 3).

TABLE 3
EFFECT OF FUNGICIDES AND BIO-AGENTS ON FRUIT YIELD AGAINST ANTHRACNOSE DISEASE OF MANGO
UNDER FIELD CONDITION AT PARIJA

| Sr. No. | Common Name | Fruit yield (kg/plant) | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|---------|--------|
| | | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | Pooled |
| T ₁ | Propiconazole 25% E. C. | 82.47 | 86.80 | 84.64 |
| T ₂ | Hexaconazole 5% E. C. | 81.43 | 83.70 | 82.57 |
| T ₃ | Carbendazim 50 WP | 78.16 | 80.60 | 79.38 |
| T ₄ | Flusilazole 40% E.C | 65.48 | 71.30 | 68.39 |
| T ₅ | Kresoxim methyl 43% E. C. | 64.81 | 68.20 | 66.51 |
| T ₆ | Pyraclostrobin + Metiram 5+55% WP | 86.22 | 89.90 | 88.06 |
| T ₇ | <i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> | 65.22 | 67.50 | 66.36 |
| T ₈ | <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> | 63.22 | 65.10 | 64.16 |
| T ₉ | Control spraying with water | 39.36 | 42.10 | 40.73 |
| | SEm ± | 4.69 | 4.72 | 4.70 |
| | CD (P = 0.05) | 14.05 | 14.15 | 14.10 |
| | CV % | 11.66 | 11.23 | 11.44 |

2.2 Pooled 2011-12 and 2012-13, location- waghai

All the fungicides and antagonists were found significantly effective in reducing mango anthracnose disease incidence. Out of this, Pyraclostrobin + Metiram (0.1%) and Propiconazole (0.1%) recorded significantly minimum per cent disease intensity (6.90 and 8.55%) and highest per cent disease control (74.68 and 68.62%) of mango anthracnose. The next best in order of merit were Hexaconazole (0.1%), Carbendazim (0.1%), Flusilazole (0.05%) and Kresoxim methyl (0.1%) with 9.47, 11.97, 13.89 and 14.70 per cent disease intensity and 65.25, 56.07, 49.03 and 46.07 per cent disease control, respectively. While, *Pseudomonas fluorescens* and *Bacillus subtilis* reported less effective with 16.21 and 19.20 per cent disease intensity and 40.53 and 29.54 per cent disease control, respectively of mango anthracnose (Table- 4).

The result in terms of fruits yield (kg/plant) showed that The result in terms of fruits yield (kg/plant) showed that Pyraclostrobin + Metiram (0.1%), Propiconazole (0.1%), Hexaconazole (0.1%) and Carbendazim (0.1%), recorded significantly highest fruits yield 93.9, 88.7, 87.4 and 82.4 kg, respectively of mango. While, Flusilazole (0.05%) and Kresoxim methyl (0.1%), *Pseudomonas fluorescens* and *Bacillus subtilis* recorded less fruit yield 71.4, 67.4, 64.9 and 62.8 kg, respectively of mango (Table- 5).

TABLE 4
EFFICACY OF FUNGICIDES AND BIO-AGENTS FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF MANGO ANTHRACNOSE UNDER
FIELD CONDITION AT WAGHAI

| Tre. No. | Common Name | Per cent disease intensity | | | Efficacy over control % |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| | | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | Pooled | |
| T ₁ | Propiconazole 25% E. C. | 1.77 (9.10) | 1.67 (8.00) | 1.72 (8.55) | 68.62 |
| T ₂ | Hexaconazole 5% E. C. | 1.93 (10.83) | 1.68 (8.11) | 1.81 (9.47) | 65.25 |
| T ₃ | Carbendazim 50 WP | 2.04 (12.17) | 2.01 (11.77) | 2.02 (11.97) | 56.07 |
| T ₄ | Flusilazole 40% E.C | 2.23 (14.7) | 2.11 (13.08) | 2.17 (13.89) | 49.03 |
| T ₅ | Kresoxim methyl 43% E. C. | 2.26 (15.06) | 2.21 (14.33) | 2.23 (14.70) | 46.07 |
| T ₆ | Pyraclostrobin + Metiram 5+55% WP | 1.58 (7.10) | 1.54 (6.70) | 1.56 (6.90) | 74.68 |
| T ₇ | <i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> | 2.40 (17.02) | 2.28 (15.39) | 2.34 (16.21) | 40.53 |
| T ₈ | <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> | 2.62 (20.4) | 2.46 (18.00) | 2.54 (19.20) | 29.54 |
| T ₉ | Control spraying with water | 3.09 (28.61) | 2.94 (25.89) | 3.02 (27.25) | --- |
| | SEm ± | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.06 | --- |
| | CD (P = 0.05) | 0.18 | 0.16 | 0.17 | --- |
| | CV % | 4.68 | 4.32 | 4.48 | --- |

TABLE 5
EFFECT OF FUNGICIDES AND BIO-AGENTS ON FRUIT YIELD AGAINST ANTHRACNOSE DISEASE OF MANGO
UNDER FIELD CONDITION AT WAGHAL.

| Tre. No. | Common Name | Fruit yield (kg/plant) | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|---------|--------|
| | | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | Pooled |
| T ₁ | Propiconazole 25% E. C. | 87.1 | 90.3 | 88.7 |
| T ₂ | Hexaconazole 5% E. C. | 86.2 | 88.6 | 87.4 |
| T ₃ | Carbendazim 50 WP | 81.9 | 83.0 | 82.4 |
| T ₄ | Flusilazole 40% E.C | 70.7 | 72.0 | 71.4 |
| T ₅ | Kresoxim methyl | 66.5 | 68.3 | 67.4 |
| T ₆ | Pyraclostrobin + Metiram 5+55% WP | 92.7 | 95.0 | 93.9 |
| T ₇ | <i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> | 63.5 | 66.3 | 64.9 |
| T ₈ | <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> | 61.5 | 64.0 | 62.8 |
| T ₉ | Control spraying with water | 42.2 | 46.1 | 44.2 |
| | SEM \pm | 5.71 | 5.57 | 5.64 |
| | CD (P = 0.05) | 17.11 | 16.70 | 16.91 |
| | CV % | 13.64 | 12.89 | 13.26 |

These results are in harmony with earlier workers *viz.*, Gud and Raut (2008) who reported that thiophanate methyl (0.2%), M.E.M.C. (Emisan 0.2%) and propiconazole 0.1% were the most effective fungicides totally inhibiting the mycelial growth of mango anthracnose. Joshi *et al.* (2010) revealed that Tricyclazole (0.1%) and Prochloraz (0.125%) were found most promising fungicides which recorded 50.38 and 48.78 per cent disease control over untreated control. These fungicides were proved to be promising as alternatives to the recommended fungicides *viz.* Carbendazim (0.1%) and Mancozeb (0.25%). Sharma *et al* (2010) demonstrated that spraying of Saaf (carbendazim 12% + mancozeb 63%) @ 0.2% was the most promising fungicide in fields and this can be recommended for the control of mango anthracnose.

Haggag *et al.* (2011) found that spray application of bacterial filtrate (*Streptomyces aureofaciens*) on mango trees provided greater efficacy for controlling anthracnose disease suggested that the bacteria produce some antifungal enzymes for protecting the fruit against the pathogen.

The present findings are more or less in agreement with the findings of the above workers. New product Pyraclostrobin + Metiram 5+55% WP and Propiconazole 20% E. C. are found superior.

REFERENCES

- [1] Das, S. and Raj, S. K. (1995). Management of root rot of sugarbeet (*Beta vulgaris*) caused by *sclerotium rolfsii* in field through fungicides. Indian J. Agri. Sci., 65 (7): 543-546.
- [2] Gud, M. A. and Raut, S. P. (2008). Control of mango anthracnose and stem end rot fungi by fungicides and bioagent. J. Maharashtra Agri. Uni., 33(1): 120-122.
- [3] Haggag, W. M.; Mohamed, E. M. and Azzazy, A. M. E. (2011). Optimization and production of antifungal hydrolysis enzymes by *spreptomyces aureofaciens* against *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides* of mango. Agric. Sci., 2 (2): 146-157.
- [4] Joshi, M. S.; Gadre, U. A.; Kadam, J. J. and Borkar, P. G. (2010). Comparative efficacy of existing and modified fungicide formulations for control of anthracnose of mango caused by *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides* penz. Pestology, 34(10) 10:38-39.
- [5] Pathak, V. N. (1980). Diseases of fruit crops. Oxford and IBH publication Co. Ltd. New Delhi PP.5-37.