

Floral infestation of tuberose (*Aphelenchoides*) management with treatment modules.

Abstract

In the field experiment conducted on cv. Culcatta Double to observe the symptoms of floral malady and also efficacy of the treatment modules on foliar nematode population, percent infestation of plant and yield of the crops. The symptoms start with leaf and progress till flowering. The typical symptoms were browning of leaves and flowers. In serious condition, the plant becomes stunted along with prickles on stalk and flowers. The flowers were easily breakable and hard. The results of the experiment showed that the percent infested plant was directly correlated with the nematode population and it was also observed that the percent infestation as well as the population was higher in untreated plot (M7) as compared to all treated plots. It was observed that the treatment module (M4) consisting of the treatments like, overnight drenching of bulb in water followed by dipping in monocrotophos 36SL @750ppm for 4 hrs + Spraying of monocrotophos 36SL @360g a.i./ha alternated with cartap hydrochloride 50SP @375g a.i./ha at 15 days interval after onset of foliar nematode infestation in the 1st year and succeeding year crop was the most economical (ICBR 1: 8) and most effective means of restraining *Aphelenchoides besseyi* population. It also yielded greatest number of marketable flower stalks, 4, 43,908.19 numbers of stalks per hectare.

Keywords: *Aphelenchoides besseyi*, Browning of leaves and flowers, Floral malady, Tuberose.

Introduction

Tuberose (*Polianthes tuberosa* L.) is one of the most important tropical ornamental bulbous flowering plants cultivated for production of long lasting flower spikes. It is popularly known as Rajanigandha. It belongs to the family Amaryllidaceae and is native of Mexico. It is commercially cultivated in many countries of the world like Vietnam, China, Brazil, Italy, Iran, UK, USA etc. including India. Tuberose is one of the famous among the cut flowers. Usually tuberose is quite hardy plant and many pests have been reported to attack this crop. The plant parasitic nematode (PPN) is one of the most important pests attacking tuberose and is causing barrier to quality and quantity of flower production. Among the PPN, the most important are foliar nematode and Root Knot nematode infecting the tuberose crop. Mukhopadhyay (1997) reported that the nematode to cause serious problem in tuberose by reducing almost 50% of earnings of the flower growers of the state. As a result of severe infestation by nematode, the flower stalk become stunted and reduced in weight and epidermis become irregular and rugged with aging pricked on tough (Kadam *et al.*, 2019). Diagnosis of symptoms has been considered the most important part in taking any strategy for controlling the nematodes pest. Therefore, a management programme with treatment modules were taken up to managed the nematode population and to further observed the economically best treatment.

Materials and Methods:

A field experiment was carried out on cv. Culcatta Double for vigilance of symptoms development right from emergence to mature plant and then managing the foliar nematode. Progressive manifestation of symptoms in infested tuberose stalks and flowers was closely observed continuously right from emergence of the stalk head to harvesting of flower. The infected bulbs (2.0-2.5 cm diameter) of tuberose were collected from farmers field (Ranaghat, West Bengal) and soaked overnight in plain water. The plants were tag for observation of the emerging symptoms and the plant were observed meticulously in every week after emergence. The developed symptoms were recorded along with the increase in age of the plant. Again the collected infected bulbs (2.0-2.5 cm diameter) of tuberose from farmers field (Ranaghat, West Bengal) were soaked overnight in plain water and followed by soaking in nematicides at different doses and durations according to the treatment

schedule of the experiment. *Paecilomyces lilacinus* and NSKP (Neem Seed Kernel Powder) were also used as treatment bio-agent before planting and treatment after sprouting of bulbs respectively. The infected bulbs were planted in the plot size- (3 × 1.5) m² at a spacing of 50 × 37.5 cm². There were 7 treatment modules; each replicated 4 times in a Randomized Block Design. Details of the module are as follow:

M₁- a) Overnight drenching of bulb in water followed by dipping in Carbosulfan 25 EC @ 1000ppm for 4 hrs. b) Spraying of chlorfenapyr 10SC @75g a.i./ha alternated with cartap hydrochloride 50SP @375g a.i./ha at 15 days interval after onset of foliar nematode infestation in the 1st year and succeeding year crop. M₂- a) Overnight drenching of bulb in water followed by dipping in carbosulfan 25 EC @1000ppm for 4 hrs. b) Spraying of cartap hydrochloride 50SP @375g a.i./ha alternated with carbosulfan 25 EC @500g a.i./ha at 15 days interval after onset of foliar nematode infestation in the 1st year and succeeding year crop. M₃- a) overnight drenching of bulb in water followed by dipping in monocrotophos 36SL @750ppm for 4 hrs. b) Spraying of cartap hydrochloride 50SP @375g a.i./ha alternated with chlorfenapyr 10SC @75g a.i./ha at 15 days interval after onset of foliar nematode infestation in the 1st year and succeeding year crop. M₄- a) overnight drenching of bulb in water followed by dipping in monocrotophos 36SL @750ppm for 4 hrs. b) Spraying of monocrotophos 36SL @360g a.i./ha alternated with cartap hydrochloride 50SP @375g a.i./ha at 15 days interval after onset of foliar nematode infestation in the 1st year and succeeding year crop. M₅- a) Overnight drenching of bulb in water followed by dipping in *Paecilomyces lilacinus* (spore load 24×10⁷) spore suspension. b) Prophylactic spraying with NSKP @ 50g/l of water at 15 days interval after onset of foliar nematode infestation in the 1st year and succeeding year crop. M₆- a) Overnight dipping of bulbs in water. b) Spraying of water along with sticker at 15 days interval after onset of foliar nematode infestation in the 1st year and succeeding year crop. M₇- Control, DAS-Days after sowing

Sticker along with water was added during all nematicides application. Initial nematode population, nematode population per 20g of flowers from each treatment at the time of blooming, percent infested plant and yield were observed during the programme and incremental cost benefit ratio were also calculated. Initial nematode population of foliar nematode was carefully examined in 49 bulbs (7 bulbs for each treatment). The initial nematode population from infected bulb before treatments was estimated by counting the population under stereoscopic binocular microscope. The initial nematode population was extracted from the slash bulb keeping in wire gauge assembly followed by killing and fixing of the nematodes (Seinhorst, 1962). In case of population study, infested 20g of flowers were chopped into small pieces with the help of a sharp knife. Then, the chopped flowers were placed on wire gauge fitted over a petri plate containing clean water just touching the bottom of the wire gauge assembly. The assembly was covered with another petridish to prevent the water loss and was kept undisturbed for 12 hours. During the period, the nematode came out from the chopped flower materials and migrated freely in the water. Then, the prepared suspension was passed through 20 and 400 mesh sieves serially under tap water for cleaning the remaining plant toxic substances released and nematodes were collected in a beaker from the residues and subsequently killing and fixing of the nematodes (Seinhorst, 1962) were done. Estimation of nematodes was done counted with the help of multi chambered counting disc under stereoscopic binocular microscope. For the observation of percent infested plants the total number of plants were taken per plot and then out of that total plants, the nematode infested plants showing the symptoms were taken and accordingly it was calculated by using the following formula Percent Infested Plants = (numbers of nematode infested plants per plot / Total number of plants per plot) X100. The yields were taken in terms of flower stalk by harvesting the stalk and incremental cost benefit ratio was then calculated to observe the best results in terms of cost.

Results and Discussion:

Progressive manifestation of symptoms in infested tuberose stalks and flowers was closely observed continuously right from emergence of the stalk head to harvesting of flower. After planting the bulb, the growing appearances of the tuberose crops were found changing with the infestation by the nematode (*A. besseyi*), the changed on growth attributes directly affect the market value of the tuberose plant due to its unthrifty appearance comparing to the healthy tuberose crops. The symptoms on leaves initially marked by emergence of yellowish green or pale green or pale green leaves from base to tip of the leaves and later it started turning brown. Formation of prickly like structure was a very first visible morphological changes as a result of nematode infection. The prickly could be observed both on stalk as well as on flowers which is parallel to the findings by Kadam *et al.*, 2019. The nematodes while feeding entered in developed flower head and also fed on the epidermal layer of the newly formed stalk. Due to their profuse feeding on the stalk epidermis, the stalk became irregular and rugged. In the infested plant, symptom occurs just after the emergence of the stalk head. In addition to this symptoms, twisting in the stalk, the bracts were often found crinkled. The plants

thus infested at early stage, suffered seriously from retardation of growth and remain stunted ultimately. Sometimes spike developed but the flowers did not bloom whereas, development of apparently normal spike with partial blooming of either lower most or the top most few flowers was also observed. In few cases the flower stalks emerged with a blind flower head where no spike developed. But both the quality as well as quantity of the important growth attribute was better in treated plots over the untreated ones in both the years of experiment (Kadam *et al.*, 2020). Therefore, the treatments in modules were aimed towards managing foliar nematode in tuberose and it was found that incorporation of different formulations significantly reduced nematode attack as compared to untreated plots. The infestations caused by foliar nematode (*Aphelenchoidesbesseyi*) in tuberose (cv. Calcutta double) were found to be more in flowers. Percent Infested Plants (P.I.P) were restricted within 9.84-34.44 during the period from August, 1st flowering – February, 2nd year flowering (Table no 2-6) where populations of nematodes remained restricted within 500 excepting a single instance and assumed 1000 or more value in February only. That low population of nematodes as well as PIP might be due to the initial stage of the experiment at experimental location accompanied by the effect of nematode management activities and gradual reduction in atmospheric moisture and temperature from November onwards. However, in relation to both the mentioned parameters, the treatment modules had immense positive impact in general and particularly the treatment module M₄ was recorded almost the best one during this period. From March to June, 2nd year of flowering PIP in all the plots including the untreated ones showed a steady growth which was clearly observed with a sharp rise in nematode populations too. Since July onwards there was gradual declination in nematode populations consequent to which PIP in the plots from September onwards declined. This might be the reason behind of July as a rainy season an impact on nematode activity gets obstruct resulting sudden fall in PIP and nematode populations in that month. Interestingly, during this period under discussion, *i.e.*, March to November, 2nd year flowering, the treatment module M₄ was more or less the best performer among the allies. In most of the cases during the management programme, it was recorded that the nematodes population were directly correlated with the infestation. The yield results were found to be best in the treatment modules M₄ with 4,43,908.19 numbers of stalks per hactre (Table no. 7). Whereas in untreated plot, the yield obtained was very less *i.e.* 65938.56 numbers of stalks per hactre in M₇ which showed that the treatment module were found to be effective and increased the yield of the crops. Considering incremental cost benefit ratio (ICBR), the combinations module of monocrotophos 36SL and cartap hydrochloride 50SP (M₄) proved most economical (ICBR ranged from 1: 8 to 1: 1 for all treatment modules) *i.e.* M₄ (1:8.44) and this was followed by M₂ (1:6.40), M₃ (1:5.19), M₁ (1:5.07), M₅ (1:1.56) and M₆ (1:1.05). Results of two season's experiments clearly showed that despite having high nematode infestation, all the treatments in combined formed as module were quite effective and economic to improve the yield over untreated plots. From the above results regarding the percent plant infestation, we could also find that the treatments modules significantly decreased the infestation percentage as the infestation was highest in untreated plot (M₇) in almost all the months. The progresses of nematode infestation during both the season in untreated plots ranged from 9% to 74%. From this, we can also conclude that the infestation percentage increased in 2nd year crops as compared to 1st year crops which supported the observation of Khan *et al.*, 2006 where he concluded that the disease incidence was found low (3-34%) in the treated plots whereas in the untreated plots, it was ranging between 10% and 58% in first year crop, however, it was more in second year crop. Here, the conclusion can also be made that the treatment module M₄ was found to be the most effective in almost all the months during the programme to reduce the infestation caused by foliar nematode *Aphelenchoidesbesseyi* with nematode infestation ranged from 0% to 61% all together in both the year which was more or less similar with the findings of Khan *et al.*, (2005) who recorded that pre-soaking of bulbs for overnight followed by hot water treatment at 50°C for 30 minutes+dipping of bulbs in monocrotophos 36SL in 500 ppm for 6 hours+two sprayings with monocrotophos 36SL at 500 ppm in first, second and third year crop with three sprayings with monocrotophos 36SL at 500 ppm at 15 days interval (T₅) was found to be superior in terms of reduction of foliar disease with PDI value in the treated plots recorded from 2% to 66%. Khan and Ghosh, (2011) reported that among synthetic pesticides tested, monocrotophos 36 SL showed killing to the extent of 41% nematodes while cartap hydrochloride 50WP and carbosulfan 25EC had 14% killing effect at relatively higher concentration (0.2%) after 2 hrs of exposure. Kadam *et al.*, (2020) also recorded that module cobined treatment with monocrotophos 36SL @ 750, carbosulfan 25EC @ 250g and cartap hydrochloride 50SP @ 375g were found very effective in growth attribute of the crop. William and Robert, (2005) recorded that Chlorfenapyr was a foliar treatment that could be used to manage foliar (*Aphelenchoidesspp.*) nematodes whereas Rajvanshi, (2012) recorded that NSKP; Neem seed kernel powder- 10%) could gave significantly better results as compared to untreated check for controlling the nematodes. In

another finding, Nagesh *et al.*, 1998 revealed that split application of *P. lilacinus* in combination with oil cakes significantly reduced multiplication rate of nematodes, compared to the single application of *P. lilacinus*, oil cakes and their combinations at planting. The augmentation of nematodes population was found to be more in untreated plot as compare to treated plot (Khan *et al.*, 2006). The appearance of nematode was also found to be more during the month May, June, July and August due to high relative humidity and temperature in the atmosphere (Khan, 2004). It is further to be mentioned that performances of the treatment modules were assessed based on their comparative performance only and there was no such treatment module to check the growth of the nematode populations completely particularly during the periods of high humidity and temperature.

Conclusion:

Aphelenchoides being one of the most important ornamental nematode pest is also hard to manage using single method of management. This nematodes survives in bulbs of the tuberose and can remain alive for many years in inactive mode but once the bulbs is shown in the field they will get active again with the moisture present in the field and started feeding the plant tissues. Since, the manifestation can be found from the very early stages till the flowering stages and which leads to drastic economic losses. Therefore, the management were planned in modules so that it can be manage right from the sprouting till harvest of the cut or loose flowers. The hidden nature of nematodes make them stay safe from farmers eyes and many has been escape already as the peak infection can be found in flowering stages with highest population in flowers. The unwanted vision in the flowers along with stalk made it unmarketable conditions leading to big losses of the farmers. So, the module M₄- a) Overnight presoaking of bulb in water followed by dipping in monocrotophos 36SL @750ppm for 4 hrs.b) Spraying of monocrotophos 36SL @360g a.i./ha alternated with cartap hydrochloride 50SP @375g a.i./ha at 15 days interval after onset of foliar nematode infestation in the 1st year and succeeding year crop was the best for managing the foliar nematode in tuberose and economizing the farmers earning.

Table no. 1: Initial nematode population (INP) i.e before bulb treatment of tuberose (cv. Calcutta Double)

Treatment in modules*	Initial nematode population / 7 bulbs
M1	44.96
M2	62.67
M3	68.78
M4	53.44
M5	66.78
M6	62.00
M7	67.67
SEm±	4.18
CD (5%)	12.87 (S)

*In each nematocidal application sticker along with water was added

**Figure marked by common letter are not significantly different according to Duncan's Multiple Range Test at P<0.05. Figures in the parenthesis indicate angular transformed values

Table 2: Effect of the treatment modules on Percent Infested Plants (P.I.P) and population of foliar nematodes per 20g of tuberose flower (cv. Calcutta Double) during 1st year of flowering.

Treatment in modules*	P.I of flower stalk on August 1 st year	Population of nematodes/20g flower on August 1 st year	P.I of flower stalk on September 1 st year	Population of nematodes/20g flower on September 1 st year	P.I of flower stalk on October 1 st year	Population of nematodes/20g flower on October 1 st year
M1	18.75 (25.89) ^{a**}	69.37 (8.28) ^{bcd}	27.65 (31.88) ^a	57.65 (7.42) ^{ab}	31.14 (34.15) ^{ab}	142.31 (11.93) ^{abc}
M2	29.07 (31.94) ^a	38.38 (6.17) ^{ab}	26.25 (30.21) ^a	118.00 (10.59) ^{bc}	24.34(29.77) ^a	159.38 (12.38) ^{bc}
M3	15.94 (23.70) ^a	51.49 (7.20) ^{abc}	25.52 (30.24) ^a	32.74 (5.67) ^a	24.89(30.20) ^a	178.85 (13.07) ^{bc}
M4	14.93 (22.71) ^a	34.76 (4.46) ^a	16.91 (24.15) ^a	91.45 (9.24) ^{bc}	23.43 (29.21) ^a	67.25 (7.18) ^a
M5	22.06 (28.18) ^a	97.71 (9.81) ^{cd}	28.71 (32.62) ^a	100.08 (9.72) ^{bc}	27.38(31.78) ^a	91.67 (9.39) ^{ab}
M6	16.96 (24.53) ^a	99.20 (9.95) ^{cd}	34.44 (36.06) ^a	152.31 (12.32) ^c	31.39(34.05) ^{ab}	215.63 (14.52) ^c
M7	45.48 (42.67) ^b	110.58 (10.52) ^d	65.51 (55.29) ^b	136.14 (11.65) ^c	40.64 (39.89) ^b	255.54 (15.74) ^c
SEm±	3.88	1.06	4.50	1.12	2.23	1.65
CD (5%)	11.54	3.14	13.38	3.32	6.61	4.90

*In each nematocidal application sticker along with water was added. **Figure marked by common letter are not significantly different according to Duncan's Multiple Range Test at P<0.05. Figures in the parenthesis indicate angular transformed values.

Table 3: Effect of the treatment modules on Percent Infested Plants (P.I.P) and population of foliar nematodes per 20g of tuberose flower (cv. Calcutta Double) during 1st and 2nd year of flowering.

Treatments in module*	P.I of flower stalk on November 1 st year	Population of nematodes/20g flower on November 1 st year	P.I of flower stalk on January 2 nd year	Population of nematodes/20g flower on January 2 nd year	P.I of flower stalk on February 2 nd year	Population of nematodes/20g flower on February 2 nd year
M1	13.14 (21.21) ^{a**}	243.00 (14.86) ^{abc}	15.29 (23.35) ^{ab}	227.75 (15.02) ^{ab}	30.80 (33.90) ^{cd}	845.25 (28.73) ^{abc}
M2	11.65 (19.94) ^a	328.50 (17.85) ^{bc}	22.02 (28.13) ^{abc}	151.06 (10.82) ^{ab}	22.20 (28.37) ^c	1109.94 (32.67) ^{abc}
M3	12.25 (20.80) ^a	214.50 (14.61) ^{abc}	19.79 (26.30) ^{ab}	158.38 (12.29) ^{ab}	13.00 (21.12) ^{ab}	472.28 (20.85) ^a
M4	09.84 (18.58) ^a	132.00 (11.35) ^{ab}	12.14 (20.31) ^a	110.31 (10.08) ^a	10.44 (19.09) ^a	688.19 (26.20) ^{ab}
M5	15.50 (23.48) ^a	79.88 (7.86) ^a	25.33 (30.47) ^{bc}	271.69 (15.93) ^{ab}	20.81 (27.03) ^{bc}	1092.75 (30.42) ^{abc}
M6	10.44 (19.17) ^a	154.00 (10.81) ^a	32.00 (34.64) ^{cd}	282.88 (16.77) ^b	28.01 (32.18) ^{cd}	1625.00 (39.98) ^{bc}
M7	26.91 (31.56) ^b	363.00 (18.98) ^c	41.48 (40.28) ^d	585.00 (23.98) ^c	36.13 (37.22) ^d	1944.67 (42.81) ^c
SEm±	1.87	2.25	2.74	2.1	1.90	4.56
CD (5%)	5.56	6.68	8.13	6.33	5.63	13.54

*In each nematocidal application sticker along with water was added. **Figure marked by common letter are not significantly different according to Duncan's Multiple Range Test at P<0.05. Figures in the parenthesis indicate angular transformed values.

Table 4: Effect of the treatment modules on Percent Infested Plants (P.I.P)and population of foliar nematodes per 20g of tuberose flower (cv. Calcutta Double) during 2nd year of flowering.

Treatments in module*	P.I of flower stalk on March 2 nd year	Population of nematodes/20g flower on March 2 nd year	P.I of flower stalk on April 2 nd year	Population of nematodes/20g flower on April 2 nd year	P.I of flower stalk on May 2 nd year	Population of nematodes/20g flower on May 2 nd year
M1	35.53 (36.76) ^{a**}	1602.33 (39.88) ^{ab}	48.70 (44.54) ^a	1879.75 (43.28) ^a	60.33 (51.31) ^b	6489.83 (80.52) ^b
M2	38.65 (38.71) ^a	2369.25 (48.52) ^c	49.67 (45.10) ^a	1779.69 (41.85) ^a	56.78 (49.23) ^{ab}	4352.25 (65.94) ^a
M3	32.38 (34.94) ^a	2210.88 (46.85) ^{bc}	50.64 (45.65) ^a	1631.25 (39.29) ^a	51.09 (45.90) ^{ab}	6243.96 (78.91) ^b
M4	29.77 (33.26) ^a	1422.75 (37.59) ^a	52.40 (46.69) ^a	1201.38 (34.56) ^a	44.74 (42.26) ^a	4154.75 (64.46) ^a
M5	32.66 (34.96) ^a	1672.96 (40.75) ^{ab}	53.56 (47.34) ^a	1885.88 (43.01) ^a	60.15 (51.29) ^b	8050.04 (89.30) ^c
M6	32.95 (35.24) ^a	2576.54 (50.29) ^c	54.87 (48.15) ^a	1978.38 (44.29) ^a	61.24 (51.81) ^b	8482.83 (92.03) ^c
M7	52.03 (46.45) ^b	2621.79 (51.18) ^c	66.24 (54.80) ^b	2849.69 (53.38) ^b	61.86 (52.27) ^b	12612.96 (112.15) ^d
SEm±	1.53	2.35	1.75	2.94	2.03	2.54
CD (5%)	4.53	6.99	5.21	8.73	6.02	7.55

*In each nematocidal application sticker along with water was added. **Figure marked by common letter are not significantly different according to Duncan's Multiple Range Test at P<0.05. Figures in the parenthesis indicate angular transformed values

Table 5: Effect of the treatment modules on Percent Infested Plants (P.I.P) and population of foliar nematodes per 20g of tuberos flower (cv. Calcutta Double) 2nd year of flowering.

Treatment in modules*	P.I of flower stalk on June 2 nd year	Population of nematodes/20g flower on June 2 nd year	P.I of flower stalk on July 2 nd year	Population of nematodes/20g flower on July 2 nd year	P.I of flower stalk on August 2 nd year	Population of nematodes/20g flower on August 2 nd year
M1	54.99 (48.16) ^{ab**}	20468.44 (143.04) ^c	44.72 (42.24) ^a	13387.33 (115.67) ^b	61.00 (51.69) ^{ab}	9330.13 (96.35) ^d
M2	59.05 (50.54) ^{abc}	13545.94 (115.91) ^b	52.69 (46.83) ^b	16028.33 (126.57) ^c	58.86 (50.45) ^a	9503.75 (97.39) ^{bc}
M3	56.18 (48.87) ^{ab}	11113.44 (105.33) ^{ab}	49.13 (44.79) ^{ab}	9987.88 (99.76) ^a	56.45 (49.05) ^a	7221.31 (84.55) ^b
M4	47.34 (43.74) ^a	10365.00 (101.68) ^a	44.86 (42.34) ^a	10757.33 (103.67) ^a	56.02 (48.78) ^a	5710.75 (75.29) ^a
M5	57.33 (49.55) ^{ab}	13489.75 (116.10) ^b	46.66 (43.37) ^{ab}	11395.08 (106.73) ^a	59.66 (51.01) ^a	11775.94 (108.49) ^c
M6	61.92 (52.26) ^{bc}	18869.50 (136.88) ^c	50.07 (45.33) ^{ab}	19634.92 (140.09) ^d	66.91 (55.33) ^{ab}	27165.31 (164.67) ^d
M7	69.02 (56.56) ^c	20731.63 (143.88) ^c	67.94 (55.82) ^c	27528.25 (165.82) ^e	73.55 (59.49) ^b	28732.31 (169.29) ^d
SEm±	1.42	3.94	1.18	2.26	2.32	3.85
CD (5%)	4.21	11.70	3.52	6.72	6.91	11.43

*In each nematocidal application sticker along with water was added. **Figure marked by common letter are not significantly different according to Duncan's Multiple Range Test at P<0.05. Figures in the parenthesis indicate angular transformed values

Table 6: Effect of the treatment modules on Percent Infested Plants (P.I.P) and population of foliar nematodes per 20g of tuberos flower (cv. Calcutta Double) 2nd year of flowering.

Treatment in modules*	P.I of flower stalk on September 2 nd year	Population of nematodes/20g flower on September 2 nd year	P.I of flower stalk on October 2 nd year	Population of nematodes/20g flower on October 2 nd year	P.I of flower stalk on November 2 nd year	Population of nematodes/20g flower on November 2 nd year
M1	55.26(48.34) ^{ab**}	9659.44 (98.10) ^b	44.00(41.82) ^a	8498.13 (91.69) ^{ab}	38.41(38.55) ^b	4710.50 (67.71) ^d
M2	53.42(47.30) ^{ab}	4449.88 (66.54) ^a	41.37(40.31) ^a	7375.00 (85.54) ^a	43.09(41.31) ^{bc}	4221.96 (64.48) ^{ab}
M3	45.69(42.81) ^a	3884.06 (61.97) ^a	44.40(42.07) ^a	8456.92 (91.85) ^{ab}	29.25(33.00) ^a	3636.81 (60.28) ^{ab}
M4	42.87(41.13) ^a	9431.56 (96.84) ^b	49.25(44.87) ^a	6275.71 (78.58) ^a	43.49(41.52) ^{bc}	2252.38 (47.43) ^a
M5	54.18(47.69) ^{ab}	10953.75 (104.65) ^b	59.49(50.79) ^b	10642.38 (102.92) ^b	50.28(45.45) ^c	3748.13 (60.26) ^{ab}
M6	63.51(53.17) ^{bc}	27448.50 (165.60) ^c	59.94(51.03) ^b	14969.50 (121.71) ^c	48.19(44.24) ^{bc}	5462.06 (73.47) ^b
M7	70.23(57.37) ^c	30310.13 (173.59) ^c	65.98(54.72) ^b	32159.75 (179.23) ^d	61.00(51.71) ^d	5391.44 (71.66) ^b
SEM	2.41	4.02	1.93	4.51	1.55	4.75
CD (5%)	7.17	11.93	5.75	13.40	4.60	14.12

*In each nematocidal application sticker along with water was added. **Figure marked by common letter are not significantly different according to Duncan's Multiple Range Test at P<0.05. Figures in the parenthesis indicate angular transformed values

Table 7: Incremental cost benefit ratio recorded under the nematode management programme during 1st and 2nd flowering season.

Treatment in modules*	Total Nematicide cost/ ha (Rs.)	Total labour cost/ha (Rs)	Total cost (Rs)	Yield/ ha (Nos. of stalk)	Incremental yield/ha (Nos. of stalk)	Incremental gross income/ha	Incremental net income/ ha	ICBR
M1	76968.54	40404	117372.5	421879.14	355940.58	711881.16	594508.62	1:5.07
M2	49368.55	40404	89772.55	397899.45	331960.89	663921.78	574149.23	1:6.40
M3	71545.65	40404	111949.7	412319.10	346380.54	692761.08	580811.43	1:5.19
M4	39695.66	40404	80099.66	443908.19	377969.63	755939.26	675839.60	1:8.44
M5	243111.1	40404	283515.1	428937.19	362998.63	725997.26	442482.16	1:1.56
M6	25197.30	40404	65601.3	133091.23	67152.67	134305.34	68704.04	1:1.05
M7	-	-	-	65938.56				

*In each nematocidal application sticker along with water was added. Labour charges- Rs.222 per day per man and price of tuberose per stalk – Rs.2/stalk




Plate Nos. (1) Prickle on stalks (2) Prickle and ruffled on stalks. (3). Hard, pricked and stunted plant with flowers partially bloom. (4). Distorted and bending plant. (5) Comparison between nematode infested and healthy tuberose plant. (6) Yellowing and browning leaves of tuberose plant.

Reference

- Kadam, V., D. Chettri and A.K. Mukhopadhyay: Study on the symptomatology of floral malady of tuberose associated with foliar nematode infestation on the plants. *The Pharma Innovation Journal*. **8**(1), 29-32 (2019).
- Kadam, V., R.K. Patidar, R. Thangjam, M. Pathak and A.K. Mukhopadhyay Management of *Aphelenchoidesbesseyi* infecting *Polianthes tuberosa* in West Bengal, India. *Journal of Environmental Biology*. **41**, 1774-1780(2020)
- Khan, M.R and Ghosh, S. (2011). Bioefficacy of Pesticides against *Aphelenchoidesbesseyi* and Sensitivity of Tuberose Bulbs to Hot-Water. *Indian Journal of Nematology*, **41**(1): 29-33.
- Khan, M.R. (2004). Observation on foliar nematode, *Aphelenchoidesbesseyi* in tuberose (*Polianthes tuberosa* L.) in West Bengal. *Annals of Plant Protection Sciences*, **12**: 106-109.
- Khan, M.R. (2006). Managing foliar nematode- a threat to tuberose cultivation. *Indian Horticulture*, **51**:17.
- Khan, M.R., Shit, S., Pal, A.K. and Biswas, B. (2005). Integrated approach for management of foliar nematode, *Aphelenchoidesbesseyi* infecting tuberose in West Bengal, India. *International Journal of Nematology*, **15**(1): 30-34
- Mukhopadhyay, A.K (1997). *Two Decades of Nematology*, Directorate of Research ,Bidhan Chandra KrishiViswavidyalaya, West Bengal, India, 15pp.
- Nagesh, M., Reddy, P.P., Kumar, M.V.V. and Nagaraju, B.M. (1998). Management of *Meloidogyne incognita* on *Polianthes tuberosa* using parasitic fungus, *Paecilomyceslilacinus* in combination with oil cakes. Advances in IPM for horticultural crops Proceedings of the First National Symposium on Pest Management in Horticultural Crops, environmental implications and thrusts, Bangalore, India, 15 17 October-1997: 339-344.
- Rajvanshi, I. (2012). Effect of neem formulations and carbofuran on cereal cyst nematode, *Heteroderaavenae* population and yield of barley. *Current Nematology*, **23**(1/2): 73-76.
- Seinhorst, J.W.: On the killing, fixing and transferring to glycerine of nematode. *Nematologica*., **8**, 29-32 (1962).
- William, T. C. and Robert, A. D. (2005). Nematode Management for Nursery Crops (Ornamentals and Planting Stock of Fruits and Nuts) .Florida Cooperative Extension Service, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences

UNDER PEER REVIEW