

Evaluation of fungicides and bio-agents against *Ascochyta* blight (*Ascochyta rabiei*) of chickpea under dryland conditions of Kashmir, India

ABSTRACT

Five non-systemic fungicides, ~~viz., Chlorothalonil~~ chlorothalonil, carbendazim (12%)+mancozeb (63%), captan 50WP, dodine 65WP and copper oxychloride 50WP and four systemic fungicides, ~~viz.,~~ difenoconazole 25EC, carbendazim 50WP, hexaconazole 5EC and mycobutanil 10WP were evaluated against *Ascochyta* blight of chickpea caused by *Ascochyta rabiei*. The ~~in-vitro~~ evaluation of non-systemic fungicides through poisoned food technique at five different concentrations ~~of viz.,~~ 50, 100, 250, 500 and 1000 µg ml⁻¹ fungicides showed that carbendazim(12%)+mancozeb(63%) proved most effective and resulted in highest mycelial growth inhibition (82.27%) of the pathogen followed by dodine with mycelial growth inhibition of 67.99% ~~per cent~~. The least efficacious fungicide was copper oxychloride with only 29.81% ~~per cent~~ mycelial growth inhibition. Among the systemic fungicides evaluated at concentrations ~~of viz.,~~ 25, 50, 100, 200 and 500 µg ml⁻¹, carbendazim proved to be the most effective and caused highest mycelial growth inhibition of 90.23% ~~per cent~~ followed by difenconazole with 71.24% ~~per cent~~ mycelial growth inhibition. Myclobutanil 10WP was least efficacious among the systemic fungicides and resulted in only 52.76% ~~per cent mean inhibition of~~ mycelial growth ~~inhibition~~. Among the three methods used for evaluation of efficacy of fungicides and bio-agents, revealed that the seed treatment with carbendazim (12%) + mancozeb (63%) proved most effective with lowest disease incidence (15.0%) and disease intensity (4.02%). Among the biological control agents used, seeds treated with *Bacillus subtilis* proved most effective which resulted in disease incidence and intensity of 32.25 and 20.04% ~~per cent~~, respectively. Combination treatment comprising of seed treatment with *Bacillus subtilis* ~~@at concentration of~~ 10⁹ spores ml⁻¹ and foliar spray with mancozeb 63% WP+carbendazim 12% WP ~~@-at concentration of~~ 2.5% was most efficacious and resulted in lowest disease incidence (7.80 %) and disease intensity of (4.82%) while seed treatment with *Bacillus subtilis* ~~@at concentration of~~ 10⁹ spores ml⁻¹ alone was least efficacious and resulted in highest disease incidence of 53.80% ~~per cent~~ with disease intensity of 37.25% ~~per cent~~. It was, however superior than control where disease incidence and intensity was 80.00% and 51.34% ~~per cent~~, respectively.

KEYWORDS ~~Key words:~~ *Ascochyta* ~~Ascochyta~~, *Bio-agents* ~~Bio-agents~~, *Chickpea* ~~Chickpea~~, *Disease incidence* ~~Disease incidence~~, *Fungicides* ~~Fungicides~~, *Seed treatment* ~~Seed Treatment~~

INTRODUCTION

Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) is an important pulse crop ~~widely grown through~~ world-wide and is ~~ranked third after beans and lentils (ref....). most important pulse crop. It belongs to family Fabaceae and after French beans (Phaseolus vulgaris L.) and dry peas (Pisum~~

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

*sativum*L.). India is the largest producer, consumer and importer of the chickpea in world, contributing 71% ~~per cent~~ in area and 71.95% ~~per cent~~ in production (ref....). Chickpea contributes nearly 48% ~~to 52% per cent~~ of total pulse production in India (ref...). The total area under its cultivation in India is about 10.56 million hectares with annual production of 11.23 million tonnes and an average productivity of 1063 kg ha⁻¹ (Anonymous, 2018). The land placed under production of chickpea in Jammu and Kashmir during the year 2012-13 was 2000ha^e with average production of 1000 tonnesha⁻¹ and yield of 542 kg ha⁻¹ (Anonymous, 2016).

Comment [NRM1]: Replace this one the substantive citation

Comment [NRM2]: This one is not clear. It requires re-writing and use substantive citation

Chickpea crop is affected by several pathogens, pests and poor management practices resulting in heavy yield losses. Amongst them, diseases play important role in reducing yield potential of chickpea (ref...). Nearly about 50 diseases have been reported to affect chickpea with huge economic importance. These include wilt [*Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *Cicero* (Padwick) Synd & Hans.], black root rot [*Fusarium solani*(Mart.)Sacc.], wet root rot [*Rhizoctonia solani*Kuhn.], dry root rot [*Rhizactonia bataticola*(Taub.) Butler], Aschochyta blight [*Aschochyta rabiei*(Pass.) Lab.], Pythium root and seed rot (*Pythium ultimum* Trow.) and collar rot (*Sclerotium rolfsii*Sacc.). Aschochyta blight (*Aschochyta rabiei*) is one of the most destructive diseases of chickpea and is wide spread in its distribution (Ahmad *et al.*, 2013). Symptoms begin to appear after 4-6 days after the spores infect the plant. Lesions can occur on leaves, leaflets, stems, pods and seeds. Conidia are exuded from fruiting body called pycnidia in a sticky spore mass and are spread to the nearby plants during rain-splashes (ref...). The pathogen survives on diseased crop debris and on diseased seeds in the form of pycnidia containing conidia. Primary infection takes place through conidia and causes necrotic spots which develop into conidia at the centre. These conidia work as inoculum for secondary infection during rains (Shtienberg, 2010). Chickpea-Aschochyta blight is mainly controlled through with fungicides and bio-agents (ref.....). ~~therefore the use of fungicides and bio agents are most effective and reliable methods of controlling the disease.~~

Comment [NRM3]: Use most recent reference

Fungicides with novel chemistry are being introduced and evaluated before their application can be recommended to farmers. Therefore, *in-vitro* and *in-vivo* evaluation of these fungicides is of paramount importance. There is constant need to watch and evaluate new fungicides along with some compatible bio-agents for controlling fungal ~~this~~ diseases such as aschochyta blight. Hence, the present study ~~was~~ ~~ere~~ carried out to evaluate non-systemic and systemic fungicides and some bio-control agents against ~~the disease~~ aschochyta blight of chickpea ~~and the results are presented herein.~~

Materials and methods

Formatted: Default Paragraph Font, Font: (Default) +Body, 11 pt, Not Bold

Five non-systemic fungicides, ~~viz.~~ chlorothalonil, carbendazim (12%) + mancozeb (63%), captan 50WP, dodine 65WP and copper oxychloride 50WP and four systemic fungicides, ~~viz.~~ difenoconazole 25EC, carbendazim 50WP, hexaconazole 5EC and mycobutanil 10WP were evaluated against ascochyta blight of chickpea ~~using -caused by Ascochyta rabiei through~~ poisoned food technique (Carpenter, 1942) ~~where using~~ potato dextrose agar ~~was~~ medium. The non-systemic fungicides were evaluated at ~~different concentrations of~~ 50, 100, 250, 500 and 1000 µg ml⁻¹ and systemic fungicides at ~~concentrations of~~ 25, 50, 100, 200 and 500 µg ml⁻¹. Different concentrations of fungicides were prepared by adding appropriate quantity of fungicides to sterilized molten potato dextrose agar (PDA) medium in conical flasks. ~~On Twenty-five millilitre of such PDA medium was aseptically poured in~~ sterilized ~~p~~ Petri plates, ~~25 ml of PDA medium were aseptically poured.~~ After cooling, ~~5 mm -five mm~~ diameter mycelial disc of Ascochyta blight pathogen was aseptically placed in the centre of each ~~Petri-petri~~ plate. Petri plates containing only PDA media amended with equal amount of sterilized water and inoculated with mycelial disc of such pathogen (5 mm diameter) served as check. Each treatment was replicated four times and incubated at 28±2°C for ~~next~~ 4 days. The comparative efficacy of each fungicide was calculated as per cent ~~age~~ inhibition of mycelial growth of the test pathogen in each treatment as compared to check by the formula ~~described by given by~~ Vincent (1947):

Comment [NRM4]: use most recent reference

~~Per cent~~ % mycelial growth inhibition = $\frac{C - T}{C} \times 100$

C
Where

C = Radial mycelial growth (mm) in check

T = Radial mycelial growth in the treatment (mm)

Comment [NRM5]: Use most recent reference

Comment [NRM6]: Use microsoft editor to write this formulae

The three methods, ~~viz.~~ seed treatment, soil treatment and foliar application were used for evaluation of efficacy of fungicides and bio-agents against Ascochyta blight of chickpea in three different plots. Field trials were conducted during Rabi 2018-19 at Dryland Agriculture Station, SKUAST-Kashmir, Rangreth. Field was equally divided into beds with plot size of 2m×1m, with each plot having 50 ~~stands of chickpea~~ plants. Three replications for each treatment were maintained in completely randomized block ~~designs~~. In first method (seed treatment), the chickpea seeds of susceptible variety were sown after treatment with fungicides and bio-agents. Similarly in the second method (soil treatment), soil was treated with fungicides and bio-agents at recommended concentrations and the seeds of susceptible variety ~~was~~ sown. ~~The third Again in the third~~ method ~~involved sowing~~ -susceptible chickpea

seeds and spraying done with fungicides and bio-agents were sown and the crop was sprayed after 15 days after seed of emergence with fungicides and bio-agents. Observations on Disease incidence and intensity for each treatment were recorded after 30 days after seed of crop emergence.

The bio-control agent and the fungicide which proved most effective in *in-vitro* were further evaluated under field conditions for their efficacy in controlling the disease. Further integrated management trials were conducted during Rabi 2019-20 at Dryland Agriculture Station, SKUAST-K Rangreth. Field was equally divided into beds with plot size of 2m×1m with each plot having fifty 50 stands of chick plants. Three replications for each treatment were maintained in completely randomized blocks. The chickpea seeds of susceptible variety were sown after being dressed treatment with different combinations of bio-agent and fungicides as seed treatment as well as foliar sprays. The foliar sprays were done 15 after fifteen days after seed of crop emergence. The plots where only water was sprayed served as check. Observations on disease incidence and disease intensity were recorded thirty 30 days after seed crop emergence.

Results and Discussion

In *in-vitro* evaluation of non-systemic and curative fungicides revealed that carbendazim(12%)+mancozeb(63%) proved most effective in causing the highest mycelial growth inhibition(82.27%) of the pathogen followed by dodine with mycelial growth inhibition of 67.99% per cent. The least efficacious fungicide among tested fungicide was copper oxychloride with 29.81% per cent mycelial growth inhibition, while among the systemic fungicides(Table1), carbendazim proved was most effective in causing the mycelial growth inhibition of 90.23% per cent followed by difenoconazole with 71.24% per cent mycelial growth inhibition. The least effective fungicide was myclobutanil with 52.76% per cent mycelia growth inhibition(Table2). Further, the different methods of application of fungicides, seed treatment was found effective in controlling the disease followed by foliar spray. The data revealed that the seed treatment with carbendazim(12%) + mancozeb (63%) proved most effective with lowest disease incidence (15.0%) and disease intensity(4.02%) followed by carbendazim with 16.50% and 4.82% per cent disease incidence and disease intensity. The least efficacious fungicide was copper oxychloride with 60.25% and 40.32% per cent disease incidence and intensity which is still superior than check with disease incidence and intensity of 83.33% and 71.11% per cent, respectively. The foliar spray also showed better results than soil application method, where disease incidence and disease

Formatted: Line spacing: 1.5 lines

intensity was 20.25% and 6.24% when sprayed with carbendazim (12%) + mancozeb (63%) followed by carbendazim with 25.00% and 7.15% disease incidence and intensity. Among the biological control agents used, seeds treated with *Bacillus subtilis* proved most effective and resulted in disease incidence and intensity of 32.25% and 20.04%, respectively, followed by *Pseudomonas fluorescens* with 42.00% and 25.34% disease incidence and intensity. Similarly, foliar spray with *Bacillus subtilis* also showed promising results as disease incidence and intensity was recorded 39.50% and 26.15%, respectively (Table 3).

Integrated disease management experiment conducted during Rabi 2020-21 to study the effect of some promising bio-agents and fungicides under field conditions as seed treatment and foliar spray against the ascochyta blight of chickpea at DARS, Rangreth revealed that carbendazim (12%) + mancozeb (63%) was most effective systemic fungicide (carbendazim 50 WP) and *Bacillus subtilis* was the most effective bio-agent for management of the disease. The results on disease incidence and intensity, (presented in Table 4), revealed that all the seed treatments and foliar spray were superior over the check in controlling the disease incidence and intensity. In the experiment the mean disease incidence ranged from 7.80% to 80.00% and the mean disease intensity ranged from 4.82% to 51.34%. Lowest disease incidence of 7.80% was recorded in treatment combination of seed treatment with *Bacillus subtilis* applied at concentration of 10^9 spores ml^{-1} and foliar spray with carbendazim (12%) + mancozeb (63%) WP applied at concentration of 2.5%. Highest disease incidence of 80.00% was observed in check plots. Seed treatment with *Bacillus subtilis* applied at 10^9 spores ml^{-1} and foliar spray with carbendazim 50 WP applied at concentration of 2.5% resulted in the disease incidence and disease intensity of 17.37% and 8.25% followed by foliar spray with carbendazim applied at concentration of 0.5% with disease incidence and disease intensity of 18.75 and 9.23, respectively. Among the different seed treatments, least disease incidence and intensity of 36.50% and 20.25% was observed when the seeds were treated with mancozeb 63% WP + carbendazim 12% WP applied at concentration of 2g/kg of seed.

Under field conditions, during Rabi 2020-2021 the best integrated disease management capsule option that involved was seed dressing treatment with *Bacillus subtilis* applied at concentration of 10^9 spores ml^{-1} and foliar spray with

mancozeb (63% WP)+carbendazim (12% WP) applied at concentration of @2.5% per cent, at 15 days after seed of crop emergence proved effective in managing this disease. Our results are in conformity with those reported by Abdel Kader *et al* (1989); Ahmad *et al* (2008) Chongo *et al* (2003), Gurdip and Maninder(1990). The fungicides and bio-agents which can effectively inhibit the test fungus in laboratory conditions are supposed to be effective against the same pathogen-fungal pathogen in underfield conditions. Generally, all the treatments and combinations check the activities of the inoculated fungus, *Ascochyta rabiei* and hence promote the healthy conditions of chickpea crop-plant. Although with the increase in concentrations, few fungicides completely inhibited the growth of *Ascochyta rabiei* pathogen (Sabiya *et al*, 2019). In the present investigation, *Bacillus subtilis* proved most effective in laboratory conditions and these findings were completely in agreement with many workers who found many isolates/strains of *Bacillus* isolated from the rhizosphere regions of host crop plants effective in managing the disease (Bais *et al*, 2004; Branda *et al* 2001; Chen *et al* 2012; Gong *et al* 2015; Stein, 2005).

Comment [NRM7]: Use most recent references

~~In this approach of integrating a fungicides with bio-agents eliminates the effects of *Ascochyta rabiei* through double action. The fungicides possibly eliminates the seed and soil borne inoculum, while and the a bio-agent control agent takes care of the soil-borne inoculum and increases crop productivity by improving nutrients status and soil health (Bretag *et al*, 2006; Warkentin *et al*, 1996 and 2000). The present situation demands their incorporation in management schedule for better disease management. By utilizing this strategy using fungicides in combination with bio-control agents (BCAs) to synergistically suppress the *Ascochyta* blight of chickpea will not only improve the chickpea yields in Kashmir but will also be a contributing factor in agriculture sustainability through improvement of soil fertility.~~

Comment [NRM8]: Use most recent references

Comment [NRM9]: use most recent references

Conclusions and recommendations

~~It is In the interim, it is important to integrate all available methods into a management package for to manage the diseases *Ascochyta rabiei* under chickpea production. The use of seed free of contaminating pathogens will reduce the probability of transmitting seed-borne disease to the seedlings. The present study concluded that the use of fungicide and biological agents could be two key measures for a rational integrated management of *ascochyta* blight of chickpea in sustainable cropping systems in Kashmir. In that approach, a fungicide possibly eliminates the seed and soil borne inoculum and a biocontrol agent takes care of the soil~~

borne inoculum and increases crop productivity by improving nutrients status and soil health (Bretag et al, 2006; Warkentin et al, 1996 and 2000). The present situation demands their incorporation in management schedule for better disease management. By utilizing this strategy using fungicides in combination with bio-control agents (BCAs) to synergistically suppress the *Ascochyta* blight of chickpea will not only improve the chickpea yields in Kashmir but will also be a contributing factor in agriculture sustainability through improvement of soil fertility. Inclusion of fungicides and bio-agents in the integrated management of *Ascochyta rabiei* under chickpea production in Kashmir.

Table 1: *In-vitro* evaluation of non-systemic fungicides against *Ascochyta rabiei* causing blight of chickpea during Rabi 2018-19

§ No.	Treatment	Per cent% inhibition of radial mycelial growth at concentration ($\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$)					
		50	100	250	500	1000	Mean
1.	Chlorothalonil	44.03 (41.03)	53.26 (46.87)	53.26 (46.87)	64.16 (53.23)	80.20 (63.62)	58.98
2	Carbendazim (12%)+mancozeb (63%)	61.66 (51.75)	75.33 (60.17)	81.43 (64.48)	92.96 (74.67)	100.00 (90.00)	82.27
3	Captan 50 WP	35.76 (36.76)	43.13 (41.05)	43.16 (41.06)	51.83 (46.04)	60.43 (51.02)	46.86
4	Dodine 65 WP	44.40 (41.77)	70.06 (56.84)	71.86 (57.98)	72.20 (58.20)	81.43 (64.48)	67.99
5	Copper oxychloride 50WP	25.90 (30.59)	28.33 (32.11)	27.06 (31.26)	29.56 (32.93)	38.20 (38.17)	29.81
	Mean	42.35	54.02	55.35	62.14	72.05	
CD ($pP=0.05$) Non-systemic fungicide = (2.1) Concentration = (1.9) Fungicide \times Concentration = (4.70)							

*Figures within parentheses are arc sign transformed value

Table 2: *In-vitro* evaluation of systemic fungicides against *Ascochyta rabiei* causing blight of chickpea during Rabi 2018-19

S No.	Treatment	Percent % inhibition of radial mycelial growth at concentration ($\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$)					
		25	50	100	200	500	Mean
1.	Difenoconazole 25 EC	53.80 (41.17)	61.50 (51.64)	66.60 (54.69)	74.30 (59.53)	100.00 (90.00)	71.24
2	Carbendazim 50 WP	82.00 (64.89)	84.56 (66.86)	84.60 (66.89)	100.00 (90.00)	100.00 (90.00)	90.23
3	Hexaconazole 5EC	48.66 (44.23)	56.33 (48.63)	64.10 (53.19)	66.63 (54.71)	66.70 (54.74)	64.56
4	Mycobutanil 10 WP	43.53 (41.28)	51.23 (45.70)	51.20 (45.68)	56.33 (48.63)	61.50 (51.64)	52.76
	Mean	56.99	63.40	66.62	74.31	82.05	
CD ($P \leq 0.05$) Systemic Fungicide = (1.27) Concentration = (1.25) Fungicide \times Concentration = (2.33)							

*Figures within parentheses are arc sign transformed value

Formatted Table

Formatted: Font:

Formatted: Font: Bold, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font:

Table 3: Evaluation of different fungicides and bio-control agents against Ascochyta blight of chickpea through seed treatment, soil treatment and foliar application during Rabi 2019-20

S No.	Treatment	Con. (%)	Seed treatment		Soil treatment		Foliar spray	
			Disease incidence (%)	Disease intensity (%)	Disease incidence (%)	Disease intensity (%)	Disease incidence (%)	Disease intensity (%)
1.	Chlorothalonil	0.30	35.50 (20.79)	10.75 (19.13)	49.25 (44.57)	17.37 (24.63)	43.25 (41.12)	13.24 (21.33)
2	Carbendazim (12%)+mancozeb	0.25	15.00 (22.78)	4.02 (11.56)	21.75 (27.79)	7.80 (16.21)	20.25 (26.74)	6.24 (14.46)

	(63%)							
3.	Carbendazim 50 WP	0.05	16.50 (23.96)	4.82 (12.68)	28.75 (32.42)	9.23 (17.68)	25.00 (30.00)	7.15 (15.50)
4.	Difenoconazole 25EC	0.05	23.25 (28.82)	8.52 (16.97)	36.50 (37.16)	15.54 (23.21)	27.25 (46.26)	10.14 (18.56)
5.	Hexaconazole 5 EC	0.03	37.25 (37.61)	12.15 (12.15)	51.50 (45.85)	18.75 (25.65)	45.50 (42.41)	15.11 (22.87)
6.	Captan 50 WP	0.30	44.00 (41.55)	27.88 (31.87)	60.25 (50.91)	42.27 (40.55)	48.25 (43.99)	30.12 (33.28)
7.	Dodine 65 WP	0.06	34.50 (35.97)	10.25 (18.67)	47.32 (25.60)	16.09 (23.64)	41.25 (39.96)	12.76 (20.92)
8.	Myclobutanil 10 WP	0.10	38.25 (22.48)	13.42 (21.48)	52.00 (46.14)	19.13 (25.93)	45.75 (42.56)	16.32 (23.82)
9.	Copper oxychloride	0.30	60.25 (50.91)	40.32 (39.41)	65.50 (54.02)	51.34 (45.76)	61.15 (51.44)	45.14 (42.21)
10.	<i>Trichoderma viridi</i>	0.2	44.25 (41.69)	31.13 (33.91)	52.15 (46.23)	37.11 (37.53)	47.25 (43.42)	33.42 (35.31)
11.	<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	0.2	32.25 (34.60)	20.04 (26.59)	35.75 (36.72)	28.02 (31.96)	39.50 (38.93)	26.15 (30.75)
12.	<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i>	0.2	42.00 (40.39)	25.34 (34.42)	50.75 (45.42)	35.23 (36.40)	45.15 (42.21)	25.75 (30.49)
13.	Check (Untreated)		83.33 (65.90)	71.11 (57.48)				

Table: 4 In-vivo/ field evaluation of the bio-agent and fungicide against the Ascochyta blight of Chickpea during 2020-21

S. No	Treatment	Mean disease Incidence (%)	Mean Disease Intensity (%)
T1	Seed treatment <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> @10 ⁹ spores ml ⁻¹	53.80 (41.17)	37.25 (37.61)
T2	Seed treatment with mancozeb 63% WP+ carbendazim 12% WP @ 2g/kg of seed	36.50 (37.16)	20.25 (26.74)
T3	Seed treatment with carbendazim 50WP 1g/kg of seed	44.25 (41.69)	34.50 (35.97)
T4	Seed treatment with <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> @10 ⁹ spores per ml and foliar spray with same @10 ⁹	21.75 (27.79)	16.50 (23.96)
T5	Seed treatment with <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> @10 ⁹ spores ml ⁻¹ and foliar spray with	7.80 (16.21)	4.82 (11.56)

	mancozeb 63%WP + carbendazim 12%WP @ 2.5%		
T6	Seed treatment with <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> @10 ⁹ spores ml ⁻¹ foliar spray with carbendazim 50WP @ 2.5%	17.37 (24.63)	8.25 (16.97)
T7	Foliar with <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> @10 ⁹ spores ml ⁻¹	51.50 (45.85)	31.13 (33.91)
T8	Foliar spray with mancozeb 63% WP+ carbendazim 12%WP @ 2.5%	20.25 (26.74)	13.42 (21.48)
T9	Foliar spray with carbendazim @ 0.5%	18.75 (25.65)	9.23 (17.68)
T10	Control	80.00 (64.89)	51.34 (45.76)

CD (p≤0.05) 0.34 Drenching was done after 15 days of emergence

Literature cited

- Abdel Kader, D.A., E.w. Kil A., Tohami, M.R. and Ghoniem, M.I. 1989. Effect of some agricultural practices and chemical control on the incidence of ascochyta blight of chickpea plants. *Egyptian Journal of Phytopathology* **21**(1):31-44
- Anonymous, 2016. *E- pulses Data book (Station wise)*, Directorate of Economics and statistics, Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi, powered by Indian Institute of Pulse Research Institute, Kanpur, <http://www.indiaagristat.com>
- Anonymous, 2018. *Pulses Revolution- From Food to Nutritional Security*. Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare (DAC & FW), Govt. of India, pp. 3-4.
- Ahmad, H.U., Hwang, S.F., Gossen, B.D Chang, k.F., Howard, R.J. and Burke, D. 2008. Chemical control of Ascochyta blight (*Ascochyta rabiei*) of Chickpea. *Canadian Journal of Plant Pathology* **30**(2):367-367
- Ahmad, S, M. A. Khan, S. T. Sahi and R. Ahmad 2013. Evaluation of chickpea germplasm against *Ascochyta rabiei* (Pass). *The Journal of Animal & Plant Sciences* **23**(2):440-443

Comment [NRM10]: Needs replacement with the recent reference

Comment [NRM11]: Needs replacement with the recent reference

Bais H. P., Fall R., Vivanco J. M. 2004. Biocontrol of *Bacillus subtilis* against infection of Arabidopsis roots by *Pseudomonas syringae* is facilitated by biofilm formation and surfactin production. *Plant Physiology* **134**: 307–319.

Comment [NRM12]: Needs replacement with the recent reference

Branda S. S., Gonzalez-Pastor J. E., Ben-Yehuda S., Losick R., Kolter R. 2001. Fruiting body formation by *Bacillus subtilis*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **98**: 11621–11626.

Comment [NRM13]: Needs replacement with the recent reference

Bretag T. W., Keane P. J., Price T. V. 2006. The epidemiology and control of ascochyta blight in field peas: a review. *Australian journal of Agriculture Research* **57**:883–902.

Campbell, R. 1994. Biological control of soil borne disease: some present problems and different approaches. *Crop Protection* **13**:4-13.

Comment [NRM14]: Needs replacement with the recent reference

Chen Y., Cao S., Chai Y., Clardy J., Kolter R., Guo J. H., et al. 2012. A *Bacillus subtilis* sensor kinase involved in triggering biofilm formation on the roots of tomato plants. *Molecular Microbiology* **85**:418–430.

Chongo, G., Buchwaldt, L., Gossen, B. D., Lafond, G. P., May, W. E., Johnson, E. N and Hogg, T. 2003. Foliar fungicides to manage ascochyta blight (*Ascochyta rabiei*) of chickpea in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Plant Pathology* **25**(2): 135-142

Carpenter, J. B., 1942. A toximetric study of some eradicant fungicides. *Phytopathology* **32** : 845.

Comment [NRM15]: Needs replacement with the recent reference

Gong A. D., Li H. P., Yuan Q. S., Song X. S., Yao W., He W., Jing, B. Z and Yu, C. L (2015). Antagonistic mechanism of iturin A and plipastatin A from *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* S76-3 from wheat spikes against *Fusarium graminearum*. *PLoS ONE* **10**(2):e0116871. Editor; Beom Seok Kim, Korea university, KOREA

Gurdip, S and Maninder, S. 1990. Chemical control of Ascochyta blight of chickpea. *Indian Phytopathology* **43**(1): 59-63

Comment [NRM16]: Needs replacement with the recent reference

Sabiya Bashir, M. Najeeb M, Sher. A. D, Seerat, N., Shafeeq H, Wani. R. A, Baba J. A and Mehfooza H. 2017. *In vitro* efficacy of fungicides and bio-control agents against wilt of chickpea caused by *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *ciceris* (Foc). *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences* **6**(11): 1392-1399

Stein T. 2005. *Bacillus subtilis* antibiotics: structures, syntheses and specific functions. *Molecular Microbiology* **56**: 845–857.

Shtienberg, D. 2010. Applications of epidemiology in the management of ascochyta blight in chickpea and lentil. In: *Compendium of Chickpea and Lentil Diseases and Pests*. (Chew, W., Muehlbauer, F. J., and Sharma, H. C. eds.). APS Press, St Paul, Minnesota, USA.

Vincent, J. H. 1947. Distortion of fungal hyphae in presence of certain inhibitors. *Nature* **15**: 850.

Warkentin T. D., Rashid K. Y., Xue A. G. 1996. Fungicidal control of ascochyta blight of field pea. *Canadian Journal of Plant Science* **76**: 67–71.

Warkentin T. D., Xue A. G., Mcandrew D. W. 2000. Effect of mancozeb on the control of mycosphaerella blight of field pea. *Canadian Journal of Plant Science* **80**: 403–406.

Comment [NRM17]: Needs replacement with the recent reference

UNDER PEER REVIEW