

Review Article

Perspective, Challenges for Biological and Chemical Management of Important Diseases of Mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L.) A: Review

ABSTRACT

A germplasm lines of mungbean were tested for resistance to *Macrophomina phaseolina* (Tassi), along with JL-781 as a susceptible check in sick plots these test lines. Among the 34 germplasm in plots and 29 were found to be resistant, 2 were moderate resistance, 1 germplasm was moderate susceptibility, 1 germplasm was susceptibility and JL-781 to highly susceptibility. A visual scoring index (VSI) was used to evaluate the signs and symptoms of MYMV infection. Compared to the primed plants, which only had 14% of the same symptoms, more than 70% of the unprimed plants had symptoms that were considered serious or deadly. Whitefly control with insecticides has been deemed helpful for managing yellow mosaic virus nonetheless; the disease is spreading as a result of vectors' emergence of pesticide resistance. The environment and human health were also negatively impacted by the over usage of chemicals. Preventive and therapeutic measures using pesticides effectively is crucial for preventing soil-dwelling and seed-borne infections across all IDM strategies. Additionally, there was insufficient data on the resistance. All of the fungicides outperformed traditional fungicides in terms of performance.

Keywords: Mungbean, Powdery mildew, Leaf Blight and *Mungbean Yellow Mosaic Virus*

1. INTRODUCTION

Mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L.) is a member of family Leguminaceae also known as greengram in India. It is much popular pulse crop among the Indian peoples because Indian diets mostly depend on veg protein. Mungbean contains approx 20-25 % protein instead of protein it contains 3.5-4.5% fibre, 3.5-4.5% ash, 1-3% fat, 50.4% carbs, 132 mg calcium, and 367 mg phosphorus per 100 grammes of seed, separately [11]. After chick pea and pigeon pea, it is the third most important legume crop for the nation's food output. Mungbean cover approx. 16 % area come under the total pulses production of the country [12]. It is originated from India although it grown in many countries of the world such as Southeast Asia, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, New Guinea, Philippines and Thailand [15], [13]. Although mung bean grown in all the states of the country but in view of cultivated area and production Rajasthan is leading in the cultivated land come under the cultivation and total production of the country 32.76% & 30.61%, respectively [19]. Yield potential of mungbean estimated up to 2.5 -3.0 t/ha, however, the mungbean has a relatively poor average production of about 0.5 t/ha. Mungbean productivity is extremely poor, and both living and non-living factors play a role in this. Mungbean productivity is extremely poor, and both living and non-living factors play a role. The major biotic factors include all insects and diseases that affect much quantity of mungbean. Similarly, several living factors affecting mungbean production that is drought, waterlogging condition, salinity of the soil and heat stress. In this article we mainly focused on diseases of mungbean. Powdery mildew, Cercospora leaf spot, dry root rot, and bacterial leaf spot are the main diseases of mungbean [23], [21], [43] [52] [31]. In view of its

importance necessary action has been taken by several scientists to maintain the stability in quantity and quality of mungbean.

1.1 Powdery mildew

The efficacy test of bio-agents viz., *Trichoderma viride* @ 2.5%, *T. harzianum* @ 2.5% and *Pseudomonas fluorescens* @ 2%, plant extracts viz., neem leaf extract at 10%, garlic extract at 10%, and carbendazim at 0.1% as a fungicide were used to combat powdery mildew (*Erysiphe polygoni*). field) in conditions. Three replications of each treatment and a randomised block design (R.B.D.) were used in the experiment



Fig- 1. Symptoms of powdery mildew of mungbean

and disease symptoms show fig-1. The most effective treatment, *T. viride* at 2.5%, was found to have the lowest disease intensity (15.98%), followed by *Pseudomonas fluorescens* at 2% (18.04%), *T. harzianum* at 2.5% (20.26%), neem leaf extract at 10% (21.55%), garlic clove extract at 10% (22.87%), and carbendazim at 0.1% (14.27%) of the total treatment dose. Used dose of *T. viride* @ 2.5% enhance the growth of plant maximum plant height recorded 42.62 cm and 65.99 cm at 45 and 75 DAS. Similarly, *T. Viride* at 2.5% had the most pods (13.30 and 14.27), followed by *P. fluorescens* (13.00% 14.07%, respectively), and the most pods per plant (8.50 and 9.60) [53]. With the application of Karathane 48 EC (@ 0.1%), a decrease in the severity of powdery mildew was seen, along with an increase in the test weight and seed yield of mungbean over the control. It was most effective, reduced the intensity least mean of powdery mildew (15.14%) and increase the grain yield and test weight was observe (1425 kg/ha) and (58.00 g) respectively. In Contaf @ 0.1% and Calixin @ 0.1%, the fungicides showed the second and third best outcomes. which also lessens the least average amount of powdery mildew, which was equal to each other at 18.43% and 18.99%, respectively.

The disease intensity was also less in plain water and botanical NSKE (33.47% and 32.51%, respectively, compared to control (54.65)). Cost-benefit analysis revealed that all of the therapies were cost-effective. Sulfex, on the other hand, had the lowest cost-to-benefit ratio (1:21.11), followed by the natural NSKE (1:12.76), Contaf (1:7.83), plain water (1:7.61), and Calixin (1:7.28) [46]. The effectiveness of various fungicides against cercospora leaf spots infection in mungbean and powdery mildew (*Erysiphe polygoni*). On the mungbean variety "K 851," these fungicidal treatments were applied twice, 15 days apart, beginning with the first signs of the illnesses. All of the fungicides outperformed traditional fungicides in terms of performance. Hexaconazole application produced the maximum yield and the least amount of illness, followed by penconazole and tridemorph [18].

1.2 Leaf Blight

The disease symptoms show fig-2 and germplasm lines of mungbean were tested for resistance to *Macrophomina phaseolina* (Tassi), along with JL-781 as a susceptible check in sick plots these test lines. Among the 34 germplasms in plots and 29 were found to be resistant, 2 were moderate resistance, 1 germplasm was moderate susceptibility, 1 germplasm was susceptibility and JL-781 to highly susceptibility [16]. The disease leaf blight has emerged as a significant barrier to the growth of mungbean and effectiveness of several



Fig-2. Symptoms of leaf blight of mungbean

botanicals investigated against the *M. phaseolina* that is the causal organisms of mungbean leaf blight diseases. Five fungicides including-Tricyclazole, Carbendazim, Captan, Benomyl and Mancozeb, were evaluated *in vitro* against *M. phaseolina*. The mycelial growth was fully suppressed by Mancozeb, Benomyl, and Tricyclazole, while in case of Thiram the mycelial growth suppressed significantly (1.8 mm), followed by Carbendazim (61.24 mm), and Captan (72.38 mm) [48]. The test pathogen was successfully defeated by all test fungicides, and they all outperformed the control by a large margin. All of the test fungicides considerably slowed the pathogen's mycelial growth in *In-vitro* experiments; the percentage of inhibition ranged from 71.90 to 94.18 %. The town of all test fungicides considerably reduced the severity of the disease. Carbendazim (0.05%), Dhoksal, however, had the fewest cases of sickness (03.46%). In the Aurangabad district, illness incidence was recorded to be 22.24 percent. The percentage ranged from 03.18 to 40.00. The two locations with the highest disease incidence were Pandhari and Bagdi (40.00% each), whereas Jamgaon, a village, had the lowest disease incidence (03.18%). The *Macrophomina* leaf blight of mungbean was most intense in the villages of Bagdi (34.90%), Adgaon (32.20%), and Jamgaon (1.23%), with Bagdi having the least disease [17a]. Preventive and therapeutic measures using pesticides effectively is crucial for preventing soil-dwelling and seed-borne infections across all IDM strategies. Additionally, there was insufficient data on the resistance [17b].

1.3 Mosaic Disease

Mungbean mosaic virus symptoms show fig-3 and most common viral diseases include *Mungbean Yellow Mosaic Virus*, *Leaf Crease*, *Mungbean Leaf Curl Virus*, and *Mosaic Mottle Disease*. The *Mungbean Yellow Mosaic Virus* causes the yellow mosaic illness in mungbeans is dangerous in terms of its rate of spread and yield loss. With a prevalence of 5-28%, the urdbean leaf crinkle virus causes leaf crinkle, which is the second most significant viral disease after MYMV, which has a prevalence of 4-40%. Bright yellow mosaic or



Fig-3. Symptoms of Yellow Mosaic Virus

golden yellow mosaic symptoms are indicative of MYMV. Mungbean leaf curl virus, which is persistently spread by Thrips (*Frankliniella schultzeia*), has the ability to damage plants. Mosaic mottle illness brought on by Bean BCMV, or the Common Mosaic Virus, is spread through sap and seed. When two or more viruses are present and the prevalence of each virus is large. The only realistic method for controlling viral infections is to include viral disease resistance into the current cultivars [42]. The disease has a severe, critical, open spread, and it annually results in significant yield losses. Normative symbols of other resistance (R) genes or R gene homologous sequences were successfully used to generate resistance-linked molecular markers. Illness incidence is non-existent, plant breeders can perform throughout the growth season, repeated genotyping by using linked marker- aided genotyping [24]. A visual scoring index (VSI) was used to evaluate the signs and symptoms of MYMV infection. Compared to the primed plants, which only had 14% of the same symptoms, more than 70% of the unprimed plants had symptoms that were considered serious or deadly. Compared to 32% of primed plants, only 9% of unprimed plants exhibited no symptoms of disease. The components of yield reflected these clear differences in illness incidence and severity amongst priming treatments. According to [37], in primed crops, there was an increase in above-ground biomass of 81% (3.3 compared to 1.9 t ha⁻¹). In all of its growing regions, the whitefly-transmitted Mungbean Yellow Mosaic Disease causes the most damage. The Mungbean Yellow Mosaic Disease severely damages the plants and causes up to 100% yield losses. There are several levels of disease management, including seed treatment, various breeding approaches, and genetic engineering [1].

2. Biological control

A bacterial disease called "halo blight," which surrounds necrotic lesions with a yellow chlorotic halo, eventually kills plants. This seed-borne infection is caused by *Pseudomonas savastanoi* pv. *phaseolicola*. It is very challenging to treat and significantly reduces yield. The large host range of halo blight, which includes numerous weed and legume species, as well as the existence of numerous epidemiologically significant strains make managing the disease more difficult [20]. More knowledge is available for managing the microorganisms that cause root rot disease in the mungbean. A number of studies has been conducted to manage foliar illnesses like *Cercospora* leaf spots, powdery mildews, and anthracnose, in mungbean through biological control agent. Only a very small number of experiments were carried out in fields; most investigations were carried out in greenhouses to examine the effects of seed or soil applications as well as foliar application of bio-control agents (such as *Trichoderma* spp., *Pseudomonas*, *Bacillus*, etc.) on the reduction of root rot [40]. If chemical preventatives are not accessible or are not cost-effective, it is recommended that bio-control agents be utilised to effectively reduce soil-borne illnesses. The management of disease incidence and severity, particularly those caused by seed and soil, will then be more advantageous. In fields plagued by root rot, integrated applications of bio-control agents with organic fertilisers were recommended [34], [8], [5]. In a greenhouse trial, the root rot disease brought on by *R. solani* was decreased by 75% with the application of *T. viride* @ 8 g/kg in the soil, which also helped to promote plant growth. When *Trichoderma virens* (*Gliocladium virens*) was treated with 10 spores per millilitre per kilogramme of seeds as a seed treatment and then *Rhizoctonia* root rot was reported to have decreased by 76% [4].

Bio-products Pusa 5SD (*T. viride*) showed that root rot disease was reduced by 72% and that the yield increased by 978 kg/ha., While Pusa 5SD (*T. harzianum*) showed that there was a 71% drop in illness and 940 kg/ha of yield in fields that were infected [6]. *T. viride* reduced the occurrence of *Rhizoctonia* root rot by 54-73%, just like *T. Harzianum*. [44], [24] in green house as well as in field experiments. Bacterial strains of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Bacillus subtilis* in soil drastically fell 39% after being administered as seed dressing. Instances of *Macrophomina* root rot, *Fusarium* root rot, and 70% *Rhizocotnia* root rot in mungbean [41]. When used with talc-based bacterial strain formulations as a seed treatment and soil application *Burkholderia* spp.'s TNAU-1 decreased the occurrence of root rot by up to three times and stopped *M. phaseolina* mycelial growth in in vitro dual culture [38]. In dual culture, *M. phaseolina* growth was observed to be decreased by *Trichoderma viride* and *T. harzianum* (42-33 and 42-25 mm, respectively) [7]. [20] discovered that a combination treatment of vermin-compost (10%), bavistin (0.1%), and *T. harzianum* (4%) completely eliminated *Macrophomina* root rot. Against *M. phaseolina*, *Bacillus subtilis* and *T. longibrachyatum* exhibited antagonistic action at 64 and 63%, respectively [47]. In a greenhouse experiment, seed dressing with 4 grammes per kilogramme of *T. harzianum* and 25 kilogrammes of phosphate-solubilizing bacteria decreased the incidence of *Macrophomina* root rot by 26% [3].

3. Biological Stimulants and Botanical Fungicides

The plant parts and crucial oils, appear important toxicity to various genera of pathogenic decay, bacteria, virus, insect and pinworm [32]. Spraying neem extract (1:4 W/V) boosted mungbean crop output by 25% and reduced *Cercospora* leaf spot infestation by 65%. [49]. Powdery mildew conidial germination was reduced by 60-66% when behada leaf (*Terminali belerica*) extract, tapioca (*Manihot utilissimum*), and sadafuli (*Vinca rosea*) were combined (*E. Polygoni*) [35]. In greenhouse experiment trials, the use of leaf extract under in vitro conditions reduces the incidence of *Macrophomina* blight and *Adenocalymma alliaceum* by about 75-77% [28], [36]. In studies conducted in greenhouses, treatments combining 10% garlic extract, mancozeb (0.2%), and 10% garlic extract with zinc sulphate (0.5%) decreased the occurrence of *Macrophomina* root rot by 88-94% [46]. When *Datura metel* dry leaf manure (1.5% w/w) was utilised, *M. phaseolina*-related plant mortality was reduced by 80% [14]. In mungbean Palmarosa (*Cymbopogon martinii*) oil @ 2 per cent concentration was used for seed dressing applications to check the effect on *M. Phaseolina*. The result show that 100 per cent mycelial growth of *M. Phaseolina* checked in poison food testing and 72.33 per cent decreased in dry root rot in green house experiment trials [20b].

Few bacterial diseases associated with mungbean that includes bacterial wilt, bacterial blight, leaf spot, and halo blight. Some natural soil amendments and botanical foliar spray (Gulmohar, neem, chicken droppings, hardwood ash, and kitchen ash, neem seed, ginger stem, and bitter kola seed) were used as a control measure of above mentioned minor bacterial diseases of mungbean. Streptomycin sulphate was employed as a benchmark test while water served as the control. The leaves of neem and Gulmohar were used as organic amendments after being given time to degrade. The organic fertilisers from kitchen waste increased mungbean growth, maintained total pod production, and reduced the severity and frequency of hidden diseases. The results of a foliar spray revealed that *A. indica* was

superior to other plant extracts in terms of promoting growth, yield and reducing disease occurrence and infection severity [50].

4. Some Challenges for the Diseases Management

Variability in plant pathogen populations exist amongst various natural features; Therefore, despite the fact that early breeding lines for diseases struggle. There should be several different locations and years for screening trials. Due to increased pathogenic unpredictability and monogenic host conflict, mungbean cultivars' volatility and test for breeding strategies is the breakdown of disease resistance [29]. Agriculture officials or fungicide sellers give producers instructions on how to spray fungicides even though the chemicals are not authorised. Despite the fact that the majority of fungicides are preventive, which need treatment before pathogen infection or before the first symptoms occur, some growers fail to apply fungicides in the proper quantities and timing. Additionally, inadequate IPM knowledge and extension, farmers do not regularly rotate fungicides with varied modes of action. Since the global market for legumes is greatly concerned about fungicide resistance [2], [22], [33]) the mungbean business could be the source of the issue. Commercial mungbean use of biopesticides faces difficulties as well. Growers suspiciously utilise to the bio-pesticides items because majority they are less effective as compare to chemical fungicides in the control of diseases [10], [9]. Similarly, growers often choose bio-pesticides as a part of integrated approach because of inadequate awareness about it. When combined with other bio-control agents, the application of one is successful; however, other researchers noted that certain combinations might not always be beneficial due to antagonistic behaviour among bio-control organisms [51]. Moreover, numbers of biotic and abiotic variables reduce the field effectiveness of bio-pesticides [28], [39]. Because of the potential for bio-control agents to become crop pests, great consideration must be given to their development and evaluation. [41b]. Whitefly control with insecticides has been deemed helpful for managing yellow mosaic virus nonetheless; the disease is spreading as a result of vectors' emergence of pesticide resistance. The environment and human health were also negatively impacted by the over usage of chemicals [27].

5. CONCLUSION

Variability in plant pathogen populations exist amongst various natural features; Therefore, despite the fact that early breeding lines for diseases struggle. Few bacterial diseases associated with mungbean that includes bacterial wilt, bacterial blight, leaf spot, and halo blight. Some natural soil amendments and botanical foliar spray (Gulmohar, neem, chicken droppings, hardwood ash, and kitchen ash, neem seed, ginger stem, and bitter kola seed) were used as a control measure of above mentioned minor bacterial diseases of mungbean. The mungbean plant disease control measures are used properly natural resources. Save the soil and environment and human health.

References

1. Akbar W, Akhtar MA, Murtaza G, Hussain A, Javed HM, Arshad M, Maqbool MA. Mungbean Yellow Mosaic Disease and its Management, Journal of Agriculture and Basic Science. 2019; 4:2518-4210.
2. Chang KF, Ahmed HU, Hwang SF, Gossen BD, Strelkov SE, Blade SF. Sensitivity of field populations of *Ascochyta rabiei* to chlorothalonil, mancozeb, and pyraclostrobin fungicides, and effects of strobilurin fungicides on the progress of Ascochyta blight of chickpea. Canadian Journal of Plant Science. 2007; 87:937-944.
3. Deshmukh MA, Gade RM, Belkar YK, Koche MD. Efficacy of bio-agents, bio-fertilizers and soil amendments to manage root rot in green gram. Legume Research, 2016;39:140-144.
4. Dubey SC. Integrated management of web blight of urd/mung bean by bio-seed treatment Indian Phytopathology. 2003; 56:34-38.
5. Dubey SC, Patel B. Mass multiplication of antagonists and standardization of effective dose for management of web blight of urd and mung bean. Indian Phytopathology, 2002;55: 338-341.
6. Dubey SC, Bhavani R, Singh B. Integration of soil application and seed treatment formulations of *Trichoderma* species for management of wet root rot of mungbean caused by *Rhizoctonia solani*. Pest Management Science. 2011; 67:1163-1168.
7. Ebenezar EG, Yesuraja I. Effect of fungal and bacterial antagonist on *Macrophomina phaseolina* (Tassi) Goid causing root rot in green gram. Journal of Tropical Agriculture. 2000; 38:73-76.
8. Ehteshamul-Haque S, Abid M, Ghaffar A. Efficacy of *Bradyrhizobium* sp. and *Paecilomyces lilacinus* with oil cakes in the control of root rot of mungbean. Tropical Science. 1995; 35:294-299.
9. Felde ZA, Pocasangre LE, Carnizares Monteros CA, Sikora RA, Rosales FE, Riveros AS. Effect of combined inoculations of endophytic fungi on the bio-control of *Radopholus similis*. Info-Musa. 2006; 15:12-18.
10. Flexner JL, Belnavis DL. "Microbial Insecticides," in Biological and Biotechnological Control of Insect Pests, eds J. E. Rechcigl and N. A. Rechcigl (Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press; Lewis Publishers), 2000; 35-56.
11. Frauque A, Haraguchi T, Hirota O, Rahman MA. Growth analysis, yield, and canopy structure in maize, mungbean intercropping. Bu. Inst. of Tropical Agric. Kyushu University Fukuoka. 2000; 23:61-69.
12. Greengram outlook report- January to May 2021: Agriculture Market Intelligence Centre ANGRAU, Lam, pp1-5.
13. Haq QMI, Jyothsna P, Arif A, Malathi VG. Coat protein deletion mutation of mungbean yellow mosaic India virus (MYMIV). Journal of Plant Bio-chemistry Bio-technology, 2011; 20(2):182-189.
14. Javaid A, Saddique A. Management of *Macrophomina* root rot of mungbean using dry leaves manure of *Datura metel* as soil amendment. Spanish Journal Agriculture Research. 2011; 9:901-905.
15. Jones DR. Plant viruses transmitted by whiteflies. European. Journal of Plant Pathology. 2003; 109:195-219.

Comment [mm1]: Add references using limited
5 years ago

16. Khaire PB, Hingole DG, Gayakwad AM, Sontake PL. Field screening of mungbean genotypes against leaf blight intensity of pathogen *Macrophomina phaseolina*, International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Science. 2018; 6: 2228-2232.
17. Khaire PB, Hingole DG, Holkar SK, Pudake SP. Occurrence and distribution of *Macrophomina phaseolina* (Tassi.) Goid Causing Leaf Blight Disease in Mungbean in Maharashtra, International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2020; 11:3767-3775.
18. Khunti JP, Bhoraniya ME, Vora VD. Management of powdery mildew and Cercospora leaf spot of mungbean by some systemic fungicides. Legume Research. 2005; 28(1):65-67.
19. Kumar V, Pandey SK. Current Status of Mungbean in Madhya Pradesh - A Review. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences, 2018; 7(11): 1062-1072
20. Kumari R, Shekhawati KS, Gupta R, Khokhar MK. Integrated management against root rot of mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L. Wilczek) incited by *Macrophomina phaseolina*. Journal of Plant Pathology and Microbiology, 2012; 3:1-5.
21. Lal SS. Insect-pests of mungbean, urd, cowpea, and pea and their management. In: 32 Rao VM, Sithanatham S (eds) Plant protection in field crops. Plant Protection 33 Association of India, Hyderabad. 1987; 185-202.
22. Lonergan E, Pasche J, Skoglund L, Burrows M. Sensitivity of Ascochyta Species Infecting Pea, Lentil, and Chickpea to Boscalid, Fluxapyroxad, and Prothioconazole. Plant Disease. 2015; 99:1254-1260.
23. Madhavan NR, Pandey AK, War A, Hanumantharao B, Shwe T, Alam A, Pratap A, Malik S, Karimi R, Mbeyagala E, Douglas CA, Rane J, Schafleitner R. Biotic and abiotic constraints in mungbean production - progress in genetic improvement. Frontier Plant Science, 2019; 10:13-40.
24. Maheshwari SK, Krishna H. Field efficacy of fungicides and bio-agents against *Alternaria* leaf spot of mungbean. Annals of Plant Protection Science. 2013; 21:364-367.
25. Maiti S, Basak J, Kundagrami S, Kundu A, Pal A. Molecular marker-assisted genotyping of mungbean yellow mosaic India virus resistant germplasms of mungbean and urdbean, Molecular Bio-technology. 2011; 47:95-104.
26. Meyer SLF, Roberts DP. Combinations of bio-control agents for management of plant-parasitic nematodes and soil borne plant-pathogenic fungi. Journal of Nematology. 2002; 34:18.
27. Mishra GP, Singh B, Seth T, Singh AK, Halder J, Krishnan N. Biotechnological advancements and begomovirus management in okra (*Abelmoschus esculentus* L.): Status and perspectives. Frontier Plant Science. 2017; 8:360.
28. Murugapriya E, Alice D, Jayamani P. Antifungal activity of botanicals and micro-nutrients against *Macrophomina* leaf blight in mungbean. Journal of Food Legumes. 2011; 24:113-116.
29. Nair RM, Gotz M, Winter S, Giri RR, Boddepalli VN, Sirari A. Identification of mungbean lines with tolerance or resistance to yellow mosaic in fields in India where

- different begomovirus species and different *Bemisia tabaci* cryptic species predominate. European Journal of Plant Pathology. 2017; 149:349-365.
30. Noble TJ, Young AJ, Douglas C, Williams CA, Mundree SB. Diagnosis and management of halo blight in Australian mungbeans: a review, Crop and Pasture Science. 2019; 70:195-203.
 31. Pandey AK, Burlakoti RR, Kenyon L, Nair RM. Perspectives and 21 challenges for sustainable management of fungal diseases of mungbean [*Vigna radiata* L.) R. Wilczek var. *radiata*]: A Review. Frontier Environment Science. 2018; 6:53.
 32. Pandey AK, Tripathi NN. Aromatic plants of gorakhpur division: their anti-mycotic properties and medicinal value. Int. J. Pharm. Sci. Rev. Res. 2011; 7:142-147.
 33. Price PP, Purvis MA, Cai G, Padgett GB, Robertson CL, Schneider RW. (). Fungicide resistance in *Cercospora kikuchii*, a soybean pathogen. Plant Disease. 2015; 99:1596-1603.
 34. Raghuchander T, Samiyappan R, Arjunan G. Bio-control of *Macrophomina* root rot of mungbean. Indian Phytopathology. 1993; 46:379-382.
 35. Rakhonde PN, Koche MD, Hame AD. Management of powdery mildew of green gram. Journal of Food Legumes. 2011; 24:120-122.
 36. Rana M, Ashiq R, Virender A. Systemic opposition of green gram against leaf blight caused by *Macrophomina phaseolina*. International Journal of Mycology Plant Pathology. 2014; 1:72-77.
 37. Rashid A, Harris D, Hollington P, Ali S. On-farm seed priming reduces yield losses of mungbean (*Vigna radiata*) associated with mungbean yellow mosaic virus in the North West Frontier Province of Pakistan, Crop Protection. 2004; 23:1119-1124.
 38. Satya VK, Vijayasamundeeswari A, Paranidharan V, Velazhahan R. *Burkholderia* sp. Strain tnau-1 for biological control of root rot in mungbean (*Vigna radiata*) caused by *Macrophomina phaseolina*. Journal of Plant Protection Research. 2011; 51:273-278.
 39. Sharma M, Ghosh R. "Heat and soil moisture stress differentially impact chickpea plant infection with fungal pathogens," in Plant Tolerance to Individual and Concurrent Stresses, ed. M. Senthil-Kumar (New Delhi: Springer) 2017; 47-57.
 40. Sharma M, Tarafdar A, Ghosh R, Gopalakrishnan S. "Biological control as a tool for eco-friendly management of plant pathogens," Advances in Soil Microbiology. 2017; 153-186.
 41. Siddiqui A, Ehetshamul-Haque E, Shaikat SS. Use of *Rhizobacteria* in the control of root-rot knot disease complex of mungbean. Journal of Phytopathology. 2001; 149:337-346.
 42. Singh A, Mukherjee V, Kumar S. Viral Diseases in Mungbean and their Integrated Management, International Journal of Pure Applied Bioscience, 2018; 6(1):184-189.
 43. Singh BR, Chandra S, Ram S. (). Evaluation of mungbean varieties against 31 yellow mosaic viruses. Annals of Plant Protection Science. 2000; 8:270-271.
 44. Singh S, Chand H, Verma PK. Screening of bio-agents against root rot of mungbean caused by *Rhizoctonia solani*. Legume Research. 2008; 31:75-76.
 45. Sundaramoorthy S, Murugapriya E, Maharaja LGJ, Alice D. Induction of systemic resistant in green gram against leaf blight caused by *Macrophomina phaseolina* (Tassi.) Goid. African Journal of Microbiology Research. 2013; 7:3976-3982.

46. Suryawanshi AP, Wadje AG, Gawade DB, Kadam TS, Pawar AK. Field evaluation of fungicides and botanicals against powdery mildew of mungbean, Agriculture Science Digest. 2009; 29(3):209-211.
47. Tandel DH, Sabalpara AN, Patel RC, Prajapati VR, Patel VR. Antagonistic effect on growth and sclerotial formation of *Macrophomina phaseolina* (Tassi) goid causing green gram leaf blight. Journal of Life Science. 2014; 11:89-91.
48. Tripathy A, Khare N, Kesharwani A. (). Management of leaf blight disease of mung bean through botanicals and chemicals. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2018; 7(5):1271-1275.
49. Uddin MN, Bakr MA, Islam MR, Hossain MI, Hossain A. Bio-efficacy of plant extracts to control Cercospora leaf spot of mungbean (*Vigna radiata*). International Journal of Agriculture Research Innovation Technology. 2013; 3:60-65.
50. Umunna OE, Anselem A. Application of Organic Amendments and Botanical Foliar Sprays against Bacterial Diseases of Mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L.) in South Eastern Nigeria, Greener Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2014; 4(2):052-057.
51. Viaene NM, Abawi GS. (). *Hirsutella rhossiliensis* and *Verticillium chlamydosporium* as bio-control agents of the root-knot nematode *Meloidogyne hapla* on lettuce. Journal of Nematology. 2000; 32:85-100.
52. War AR, Murugesan S, Boddepalli VN, Srinivasan R, Nair RM. 46 Mechanism of Resistance in Mungbean [*Vigna radiata* (L.) R. Wilczek var. radiata] 47 to Bruchids, *Callosobruchus* spp. (Coleoptera: Bruchidae). Frontier Plant Science. 2017; 8:1031.
53. Yadav RK, Kakraliya SS, Bajiya MR, Abrol S. Eco-Friendly Management of Powdery Mildew of Green Gram (*Vigna radiata* L.). International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2017; 6(7):435-439.