



ISSN Print: 2394-7500  
ISSN Online: 2394-5869  
Impact Factor: 5.2  
IJAR 2015; 1(7): 403-405  
www.allresearchjournal.com  
Received: 26-04-2015  
Accepted: 28-05-2015

**M. A. Sushir**  
Department of Plant  
Pathology and Agril.  
Microbiology, Mahatma Phule  
Krishi Vidyapeeth, Rahuri,  
Maharashtra, India.

**K. K. Suryawanshi**  
Department of Plant  
Pathology and Agril.  
Microbiology, Mahatma Phule  
Krishi Vidyapeeth, Rahuri,  
Maharashtra, India.

**S. P. Patole**  
Department of Plant  
Pathology and Agril.  
Microbiology, Mahatma Phule  
Krishi Vidyapeeth, Rahuri,  
Maharashtra, India.

**Correspondence:**  
**K. K. Suryawanshi**  
Department of Plant  
Pathology and Agril.  
Microbiology, Mahatma Phule  
Krishi Vidyapeeth, Rahuri,  
Maharashtra, India.

## Sensitivity of *Trichoderma harzianum* Rifai against systemic fungicides

**M. A. Sushir, K. K. Suryawanshi, S. P. Patole**

### Abstract

Sensitivity test of *Trichoderma harzianum* against systemic fungicides revealed metalaxyl MZ-02 % as the safer fungicide for mycelial growth showed 42.59 % growth inhibition with Ed<sub>50</sub> value 2553 µgml<sup>-1</sup> followed by triadimefon 0.1 % recorded 1531 µgml<sup>-1</sup>Ed<sub>50</sub> value. Whereas, benomyl, penconazole, propiconazole and prochloraz were proved highly toxic for mycelial growth with ED<sub>50</sub> values of 1 µgml<sup>-1</sup>, 11 µgml<sup>-1</sup>, 29 µgml<sup>-1</sup> and 34 µgml<sup>-1</sup> respectively.

Keywords: *Trichoderma harzianum*, metalaxyl MZ, triadimefon, benomyl, penconazole, propiconazole and prochloraz.

**Keywords:** Sensitivity, *Trichoderma harzianum*, systemic fungicides.

### 1. Introduction

The efficacy of the bioagents was found to be hampered due to poisonous nature of different pesticides viz, fungicides, insecticides, nematocides and weedicides etc. used simultaneously in crop production technology. Therefore, different workers have tested the sensitivity and tolerance of bioagent i.e. *Trichoderma* spp. against these pesticides. Vijji *et al.* (1997) [10] reported the non-target effect of systemic fungicides on the bioagent *Trichoderma* spp. Ortiz Molievo *et al.* (1996) [6] reported that there was no growth of bioagents in the presence of carbendazim and benomyl *in vitro*. Thus *in vitro* study was evaluated by testing the effect on radial growth of the bioagent by employing poisoned food technique (Grover and Moore, 1962) [4].

### Material and Methods

The systemic fungicides viz. metalaxyl MZ (Ridomil MZ 72 WP), triadimefon (Bayleton 50WP), propiconazole (Tilt 25 EL), penconazole (Topas 10 EC), prochloraz (Octare 50 WP) and benomyl (Benlate 50 WP) were used against *Trichoderma harzianum* at 25, 50, 125, 250, 500, 1000 and 2000 µg ml<sup>-1</sup> concentrations.

### Effect on radial growth

The experiment was conducted by employing poisoned food technique (Grover and Moore, 1962) [4] with PDA as basal medium. Each treatment was replicated thrice. The *Trichoderma* inoculated petri plates were incubated at 27 ± 1°C till the control plates were full with its mycelial growth. The linear mycelial growth of the bioagent in the bioagent in the treatment and in control plates was measured in two directions at right angle to each other. The per cent inhibition of the mycelial growth was calculated by using the formula of Bliss (1934) as under

$$I = \frac{C-T}{C} \times 100$$

Where I- Inhibition per cent, C- Colony diameter in control plate and T- Colony diameter in treated plate

**ED<sub>50</sub> values of systemic fungicides**

ED<sub>50</sub> values of the systemic fungicides were determined by plotting the fungicidal concentrations against percentage inhibition on a log-probit scale as described by (Horsfall, 1956)

**Results and Discussion**

The results of the study presented in Table 1 showed

**Table:** Effect of systemic fungicides with different concentrations on radial growth of *Trichoderma harzarium*

Sr. No.	Fungicides	Average radial growth (mm) Concentrations ( $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$ )							Fungicidal mean
		25	50	125	250	500	1000	2000	
1	Benomyl	0.00 (100.00)	0.00 (100.00)	0.00 (100.00)	0.00 (100.00)	0.00 (100.00)	0.00 (100.00)	0.00 (100.00)	0.00 (100.00)
2	Metalaxyl	90.00 (0.00)	90.00 (0.00)	85.67 (4.81)	81.33 (9.63)	74.33 (17.41)	64.00 (28.89)	51.67 (42.59)	76.71 (14.76)
3	Penconazole	11.33 (87.41)	7.00 (92.22)	0.00 (100.0)	0.00 (100.0)	0.00 (100.0)	0.00 (100.0)	0.00 (100.0)	2.61 (97.10)
4	Prochloraz	50.67 (43.70)	37.67 (58.14)	10.33 (88.52)	0.00 (100.00)	0.00 (100.00)	0.00 (100.00)	0.00 (100.00)	14.09 (84.34)
5	Triadimefon	90.00 (0.00)	83.67 (7.03)	78.67 (12.59)	74.67 (17.03)	70.33 (21.86)	57.33 (36.30)	33.67 (62.59)	69.76 (22.48)
	Concentration Mean	50.05 (44.38)	39.72 (55.86)	31.55 (64.94)	27.72 (69.20)	25.27 (71.92)	20.22 (77.53)	14.22 (84.20)	
	Control	90.00							
		SE $\pm$	CD at 0.05%	CV%					
	Fungicides (F)	0.10	0.31						
	Concentration(C)	0.11	0.33						
	Interaction (F $\times$ C)	0.29	0.82						
	Control Vs Rest	0.21	0.57						

\*Average of three replications

(Figures in parentheses are percent growth inhibition over control)

Among the fungicides metalaxyl MZ showed no inhibition to the bioagent upto 50  $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$  and little inhibition (<10%) upto 250  $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$ . However, it grow safely upto 2000  $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$  with radial growth of 51.67 mm and growth inhibition of 42.59 per cent.

Similarly, triadimefon was found a little inhibitory in comparison to metalaxyl MZ, wherein the bioagent growth of 57.330mm and growth inhibition of 36.30 per cent was recorded at 1000  $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$ .

However, propiconazole and prochloraz were next in order of the toxicity to bioagent is at 25  $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$  both showed 58.33 and 50.67 mm radial growth and 35.19 and 43.70% growth inhibition, respectively.

Among the fungicides tested, benomyl was found to be most toxic as no growth of bioagents was observed at any concentration tested. This was followed by penconazole wherein 11.33 mm mycelia growth with 87.41 percent growth inhibition was obtained at 25  $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$ .

In an experiment Agarwal and Tripathi (1999) [1] recorded 2.22 and 1.11 percent growth inhibition of *Trichoderma viride* at 500  $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$  of metalaxyl MZ and triadimefon respectively. Similarly, Akbari *et al* (2001) [2] isolated the strains of *Trichoderma harzarium*-II, *Trichoderma viride*-II and *Gliocladium virens* the growth of which were not inhibited by metalaxyl MZ at any of the concentrations tested.

In case of benomyl, Vijji *et al.* (1997) [10] reported, it to be

significant differences in the radial growth of *Trichoderma harzarium* due to fungicides and their concentrations revealed metalaxyl MZ as significantly superior as showed no adverse effect on radial growth (76.71 mm) followed by triadimefon (60.76 mm). Whereas, other fungicides viz. propiconazole, prochloraz, penconazole and benomyl showed different level of toxicity to the bioagent.

the most toxic as it suppressed the growth of all the bioagents viz. *Trichoderma harzianum*, *Trichoderma longibrachiatum* and *Gliocladium virens*.

Peechia (1996) [7] found many tolerant mutants of *Trichoderma harzianum* when mycelia and conidia of awild strain were exposed to propiconazole. Similarly, Roco *et al.* (1996) [8] developed UV mutants tolerant to prochloraz from a wild type isolate of *Trichoderma harzianum*.

**ED<sub>50</sub> Values for radial growth:**

ED<sub>50</sub> values (Table 2) for radial growth of *Trichoderma harzianum* indicated maximum tolerance *Trichoderma harzianum* for metalaxyl MZ at 2553  $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$ . it was followed by triadimefon 1551  $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$ , prochloraz 34  $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$ , propiconazole 29  $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$ , penconazole 11  $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$  and benomyl 1  $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$ .

Sharma *et al.* (2001) [9] reported 1050 and 2392  $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$  as ED<sub>50</sub> and ED<sub>90</sub> values of metalaxyl MZ for radial growth of *Trichoderma harzianum* respectively. While Vijji (1997) [10] found 2.0  $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$  as ED<sub>50</sub> value for MBC fungicides i.e. benomyl and carbendazim against *Trichoderma harzianum*, *Trichoderma longibrachiatum* and *Gliocladium virens*

**Conclusions**

From these studies it can be calculated that metalaxyl MZ was found to be least toxic and safer fungicide for growth of *Trichoderma harzianum* while benomyl was found highly toxic among all the fungicides tested.

**Table 2:** ED<sub>50</sub> values at systemic fungicides against *Trichoderma harzianum*

Sr. No.	Fungicides	ED <sub>50</sub> for radial growth (µg ml <sup>-1</sup> )
1	Benomyl (Benlate)	1
2	Metalaxyl MZ (Ridomil MZ)	2553
3	Penconazole (Topas)	11
4	Prochloraz (Octave)	34
5	Propiconazole (Tilt)	29
6	Triademefon (Bayleton)	1531

### References

1. Agarwal A, Tripathi HS. Biological and chemical control of botrytis gray mould of chickpea. J. Mycol. Pl. Pathol 1999; 29(1):52-56.
2. Akbari LF, Parakhia AM. Effect of fungicides on fungal bioagents, J. Mycol. Pl. Pathol 2001; 31(1):100-101.
3. Bliss CA. The methods of probit Sciences 1934; 79:39.
4. Grover RK, Moore GD. Toximetric studies of fungicides against brown spot organism *Clevotra fracticola* and *S. lura*, Phytopathology 1962; 52:876-886.
5. Horsfall JG. Principles of fungicidal action chronica Botanica Co Altham, Mass, USA, 1956.
6. Ortiz Molievo, Wrigtht PER, Deltino OSE, Grijalba PE, Lopez MV. Growth of antagonistic fungi in culture media with different dilutions of fungicides. Revasta de la facultea de Agronomia 1996; 15(1):37-42.
7. Peechia S. Selection of fungicide resistant metants from an antagonistic *Trichoderma harzianum* strain. Agricultura mediterranea 1996; 124(2-3):159-169.
8. Roca M, Cristane C, Vannacci G. Sensitivity of *Trichoderma* isolates and selected resistant mutants to DMI fungicides. Crop Protection 1996; 15(7):615-620.
9. Sharma SD, Mistra A, Pandey RN, Patel SJ. Sensitivity of *Trichoderma harzianum* to fungicides J. Mycol. Pl. Pathol 2001; 31(2):251-253.
10. Vijji G, Manibhushanrao K, Baby UI. Non- target effect of systemic fungicides on antagonistic microflora of *Rhizoctonia solani*. Indian Phytopath 1997; 50(3):324-328.