



P-ISSN: 2349-8528

E-ISSN: 2321-4902

[www.chemijournal.com](http://www.chemijournal.com)

IJCS 2020; 8(3): 2341-2343

© 2020 IJCS

Received: 10-03-2020

Accepted: 12-04-2020

**TSSK Patro**

Acharya NG.Ranga Agricultural University, Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram, Andhra Pradesh, India

**KE Georgia**

Acharya NG.Ranga Agricultural University, Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram, Andhra Pradesh, India

**S Raj Kumar**

Acharya NG.Ranga Agricultural University, Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram, Andhra Pradesh, India

**N Anuradha**

Acharya NG.Ranga Agricultural University, Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram, Andhra Pradesh, India

**Y Sandhya Rani**

Acharya NG.Ranga Agricultural University, Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram, Andhra Pradesh, India

**U Triveni**

Acharya NG.Ranga Agricultural University, Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram, Andhra Pradesh, India

**Corresponding Author:****TSSK Patro**

Acharya NG.Ranga Agricultural University, Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram, Andhra Pradesh, India

## Management of finger millet blast through new fungicides

**TSSK Patro, KE Georgia, S Raj Kumar, N Anuradha, Y Sandhya Rani and U Triveni**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22271/chemi.2020.v8.i3ah.9561>

**Abstract**

The field experiment was conducted at Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram against finger millet blast caused by *Pyricularia grisea* using different fungicides. The per cent disease intensity of leaf blast ranged from 1.7 to 3.3, neck blast ranged from 7.7 to 80 and finger blast ranged from 7.0 to 80. Among all the treatments *T<sub>6</sub>* i.e., propiconazole was proved to be best with least incidence of leaf (1.7), neck (7.7) and finger blast (7.0) and also recorded highest grain and fodder yield. Treatments Tebuconazole+ Trifloxystrobin, Tricyclazole, Tricyclazole+ Mancozeb, Isprothiolane, Azoxystrobin + Difenconazole, Carbendazim + Mancozeb, Carbendazim were also found superior over control in controlling finger millet blast.

**Keywords:** new fungicides, finger millet, Agricultural Research Station

**Introduction**

Millet is one of the most important cereals food grain crops, especially grown in arid and semi arid regions of the Asia and Africa. Finger millet (*Eleusine coracana*) is popularly known as ragi. It is one of the major food crop and feed as fodder for cattle especially in tribal belt of India. It is a good source of carbohydrates and thus supplies high amounts of energy. It is also rich in sulphur containing amino acids, proteins due to its low glycemic index with high fibre. Hence, it is recommended for diabetic patients as it is very effective in controlling blood glucose levels of diabetics. High calcium, high soluble fibre, low fat, high diastatic power of malted grains renders finger millet unique. Consumption of finger millet prevents cholesterol and constipation.

However, it is traditionally grown in marginal soil conditions with low inputs. The major constraints in the millet growing regions are blast (*Pyricularia grisea*). Blast pathogen attacks all aerial parts of finger millet plant causing leaf, neck and finger blast and disease appears on leaf lamina with typical spindle shaped spots.

The blast disease in finger millet often resulting in more than 50% yield losses (Esele, 2002) [3] and it is as high as about 80-90% in endemic areas (Viswanath, 1997) [23]. Ramappa *et al.*, (2002) [18] recorded upto 70% finger blast and 50% neck blast during *kharif*, 2000 in Mandya and Mysore districts. Blast disease is considered as number one in the form of yield loss in Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Haryana, Mysore and Maharashtra. Nagaraja *et al.* (2007) reported that the ultimate loss in yield is due to enhanced spikelet sterility and reduction in grain weight and number.

The most efficient, feasible, ecofriendly and cheapest way to control the plant diseases is the host plant resistance. Efforts are being made to develop finger millet resistance lines to understand inheritance of resistance to *Pyricularia grisea*. (Patro *et al.*, 2013; Patro and Madhuri, 2014; Patro *et al.*, 2016; Patro *et al.*, 2018) [12, 13, 14, 15]. However, in rice blast disease is managed primarily through host plant resistance. As, the pathogen has the ability to develop new pathogenic races leading to breakdown of resistance within few years (Ahn, 1994) [1]. Thus, attempts have been made to manage blast disease in different crops using fungicide chemicals (Varier *et al.*, 1993; Lukose *et al.*, 2007; Narayana Swamy *et al.*, 2009; Netam *et al.*, 2014; Pagani *et al.*, 2014) [22, 6, 9, 10, 11]. Although, host plant resistance is the most economical and viable disease management strategy to control finger millet blast. In the absence of blast-resistant cultivars,

the disease can be best managed with fungicides. Hence, the present study was planned to evaluate eight fungicides against finger millet blast under *in vivo* conditions.

### Materials and Methods

The field experiments were conducted at Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram for the management of blast disease in finger millet by fungicides. The experiment was laid out in randomized block design (RBD) with three replications at spacing of 22.5×10 cm with 3×3 m plot size. Standard agronomic practices of NPK-50kg, 40kg, 25kg were followed at the time of crop growth period. A susceptible variety VR 708 was used in this experiment by imposing the following treatments (Table 1). First foliar spray of fungicides was given at the time of flowering followed by second spray at 10-15 days after first spray.

Observations were recorded for leaf, neck and finger blast separately. Leaf blast severity was recorded on 0- 5 scale (Mackill and Bonman, 1992) [7]. Whereas, neck blast and finger blast incidence was recorded by counting the number of infected panicles and fingers from total population (Mackill and Bonman, 1992) [7]. Disease severity scoring for leaf blast was recorded at seedling and booting stage, whereas for neck blast and finger blast at the physiological maturity and at harvest. The grain yield was recorded after harvesting of crop from individual plots.

**Table 1:** Treatment details

S.No.	Treatments	Dosage
1	Tebuconazole 50% + Trifloxystrobin 25 WG	0.4 g/l
2	Tricyclazole 75% WP	0.6 g/l
3	Tricyclazole 75% WP + Mancozeb 62% WP	0.5 g/l
4	Isprothiolane 40% EC	1 ml/l
5	Azoxystrobin + Difenconazole	1 ml/l
6	Propiconazole 25% EC	1 ml/l
7	Carbendazim + Mancozeb	2 g/l
8	Carbendazim 50% WP	1 g/l
9	Control	

### Results and Discussion

The data presented in Table 2 revealed that all the treatments significantly reduced the blast disease when compared to

control. The per cent disease intensity of leaf blast ranged from (1.7 to 3.3), neck blast ranged from (7.7 to 80.0) and the finger blast ranged from (7.0 to 80.0). Among all the fungicides, Propiconazole was effective in managing the blast disease with least percent disease incidence of leaf blast (1.7), neck blast (7.7) and finger blast (7.0) followed by Tebuconazole + Trifloxystrobin with leaf blast (3.0), neck blast (11.3) and finger blast(9.7). The maximum percent disease incidence was recorded in control with leaf blast (3.3), neck blast (80.0) and finger blast (80.0).

Propiconazole recorded the maximum grain yield (15.7 q/ha) and fodder yield (41.3 q/ha) followed by Tebuconazole + Trifloxystrobin with grain yield (14.5 q/ha) while the minimum grain yield (7.8 q/ha) and fodder yield (22.0 q/ha) was recorded in control. Highest cost benefit ratio was obtained in propiconazole (3.01).

New generation chemicals like Tricyclazole and Propiconazole *etc.* can provide effective control against blast disease in rice (Singh *et al.*, 2000) [20]. Raj and Pannu (2017) [17] reported that Tricyclazole followed by Propiconazole were superior in managing rice blast. Fungicides showed effective control against blast disease in rice ecosystem (Prajapati *et al.*, 2004; Dutta *et al.*, 2012; Sood and Kapoor, 1997) [16, 2, 21]. Carbendazim and Tricyclazole showed effective control against pearl millet blast under field conditions (Lukose *et al.*, 2007; Joshi and Gohel, 2015) [6, 5]. However, rice blast pathogen isolates showed differential sensitivity to Tricyclazole and Carbendazim (Yuan and Yang, 2003; Mohammad *et al.*, 2011) [24, 8]. Narayana Swamy *et al.* (2009) [9] and Ganesh Naik *et al.* (2012) [4] reported that Tebuconazole+ Trifloxystrobin have also been reported to be effective against rice blast. Sharma *et al.* (2018) [19] reported that blast disease can be effectively managed with three sprays of Tebuconazole + Trifloxystrobin or Propiconazole in pearl millet.

### Conclusion

Thus, the results of earlier workers are also in line with the results obtained in the present investigations. Hence, Propiconazole @ 1ml/l was effective in managing all the three blasts i.e., the leaf blast, neck blast and finger blast disease under *in vivo* conditions in finger millet.

**Table 2:** Efficacy of fungicides on blast disease and its effect on yield parameters and on BCR

S. No.	Treatments	Percent Disease Incidence (%)			Grain yield (q/ha)	Fodder yield (q/ha)	BCR
		Leaf blast	Neck blast	Finger blast			
1	Tebuconazole 50% + Trifloxystrobin 25 WG	3.0	11.3	9.7	14.5	37.0	2.58
2	Tricyclazole 75% WP	2.7	19.3	21.0	11.0	30.3	2.10
3	Tricyclazole 75% WP + Mancozeb 62% WP	3.3	16.3	15.7	12.3	32.2	2.07
4	Isprothiolane 40% EC	3.0	37.7	40.0	8.3	22.6	1.70
5	Azoxystrobin + Difenconazole	3.0	14.3	13.0	12.4	33.1	2.36
6	Propiconazole 25% EC	1.7	7.7	7.0	15.7	41.3	3.01
7	Carbendazim + Mancozeb	3.3	26.7	30.3	9.6	25.4	1.78
8	Carbendazim 50% WP	3.3	24.3	27.7	10.3	27.4	1.92
9	Control	3.3	80.0	80.0	7.8	22.0	1.34
	CV (%)	12.4	8.8	7.3	11.5	7.3	
	CD at 5% level	1.9	4.6	3.7	2.3	3.8	
	SEM	0.66	1.5	1.2	0.8	1.3	

### References

- Ahn SW. International collaboration on breeding for resistance to rice blast. In: Zeigler, R.S., Leong, S.A., Teng, P.S. (Eds.), Rice blast Disease. CAB International, Wallingford, UK. 1994, 137–153.
- Dutta D, Saha S, Prasad Ray D, Bag MK. Effect of different active fungicides molecules on the management of rice blast disease. *Int. J. Agric. Environ. Biotechnol.* 2012; 5:247-251.

3. Esele JP. Diseases of finger millet. A global review. Sorghum and finger millet diseases edited by Leslie JF, 2002, 19-26.
4. Ganesh Naik R, Gangadhara Naik B, Basavaraja Naik T, Krishna Naika R. Fungicidal management of leaf blast disease in rice. GJBB. 2012; 1:18-21.
5. Joshi HD, Gohel NM. Management of blast [*Pyricularia grisea* (Cooke) Sacc.] disease of pearl millet through fungicides. Bioscan. 2015; 10:1855-1858.
6. Lukose CM, Kadvani DL, Dangaria CJ. Efficacy of fungicides in controlling blast disease of pearl millet. Indian Phytopathol. 2007; 60:68-71.
7. Mackill DJ, Bonman JM. Inheritance of blast resistance in near- isogenic lines of rice. Phytopathol. 1992; 82:746-749.
8. Mohammad RG, Jagadeeshwar R, Krishna Rao V, Rahman SJ. Development of fungicidal resistance in *Pyricularia grisea* inducing rice blast to carbendazim. Indian J. Plant Protect. 2011; 39:215-218.
9. Narayana Swamy H, Sannaulla S, Dinesh Kumar M. Evaluation of new fungicides against rice blast in cauvery delta. Karnataka J Agric. Sci. 2009; 22:450-451.
10. Netam RS, Tiwari RKS, Bahadur AN, Shankar D. *In vitro* and *in vivo* efficacy of fungicides against *Pyricularia grisea* causing finger millet blast disease. Int. J Plant Protect. 2014; 7:137-142.
11. Pagani APS, Dianese AC, Café-Filho AC. Management of wheat blast with synthetic fungicides, partial resistance and silicate and phosphite minerals. Phytoparasitica. 2014; 42:609-617.
12. Patro TSSK, Anuradha N, Madhuri J, Suma Y, Soujanya A. Identification of resistant sources for blast disease in finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* Gaertn.). Varietal Improvement of Small Millets. National seminar on "Recent Advances of Varietal Improvement in Small Millets". 2013, 5-6.
13. Patro TSSK, Madhuri J. Identification of resistant varieties of finger millet for leaf, neck and finger blast. International Journal of Food, Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences. 2014; 4(2):7-11.
14. Patro TSSK, Neeraja, B, Sandhya Rani Y, Jyothsna S, Keerthi S, Bansal A *et al.* Reaction of elite finger millet varieties against blast disease incited by *Magnaporthe grisea* *in vivo*. 11. 2016; 2:209-212.
15. Patro TSSK, Meena A, Divya M, Anuradha N. Evaluation of finger millet early and medium duration varieties against major diseases. International Journal of Chemical Studies. 2018; 6(3):2184-2186.
16. Prajapati KS, Patel RC, Pathak AR. Field evaluation of new fungicides against blast of rice. Pestic. Res. J. 2004; 16:26-28.
17. Raj R, Pannu PPS. Management of rice blast with different fungicides and potassium silicate under *in vitro* and *in vivo* conditions. Journal of Plant Pathology. 2017; 99(3):707-712.
18. Ramappa HK, Ravishankar CR, Prakash P. Estimation of yield loss and management of blast disease in finger millet (ragi). Proc. Asian Cong. Mycol. Pl. Path. University of Mysore, 2002, 195.
19. Sharma R, Gate VL, Madhavan S. Evaluation of fungicides for the management of pearl millet (*Pennisetum glaucum* (L.)) blast caused by *Magnaporthe grisea*. Crop Protection. 2018; 112:209-213.
20. Singh RK, Singh US, Khush GS. Aromatic Rices, p. 300. Oxford & IBH Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, India, 2000.
21. Sood GK, Kapoor AS. Efficacy of new fungicides in the management of rice blast. Plant Dis. Res. 1997; 12:140-142.
22. Varier M, Maiti D, Shukla VD. Efficacy of combination of fungicide formulations on management of rice-blast (*Pyricularia oryzae*) in rainfed upland. Indian J. Agric. Sci. 1993; 63:386-389.
23. Vishwanath S, Mantur SG, Channamma KAL. Recent approaches in the management of finger millet diseases. In Proc. National seminar on small millets. ICAR and TNAU, Coimbatore, 1997, 27-30.
24. Yuan J, Yang XH. Rice blast fungi (*Magnaporthe grisea*) sensitivity to isoprothiolane and tricyclazole in Guizhou. Guizhou Agric. Sci. 2003; 6:011.