



Optimizing Inoculation Techniques for Enhanced Rust Disease Pressure in Fig Trees: Insights on *Cerotelium fici* Multiplication and Maintenance

Lohate, S. R. ^a, Khaire, P. B ^{b*} and Bansode, G. M. ^a

^a Zonal Agricultural Research Station, Ganeshkhind, Pune (Maharashtra), India.

^b Department of Plant Pathology and Microbiology, Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth, Rahuri 413722 (Maharashtra), India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.9734/jamb/2024/v24i5827>

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/117482>

Method Article

Received: 27/03/2024

Accepted: 30/05/2024

Published: 03/06/2024

ABSTRACT

Fig rust is one of the most prevalent diseases caused by *Cerotelium fici* is an obligate parasite and it has to be maintained only on its own host. The present study was taken into consideration to check the comparative effectiveness of various inoculation methods for inducing disease symptoms, maintaining and multiplying inoculums, and examining the slow rusting mechanism. For this, a polyhouse experiment using the Pooa fig cultivar was conducted at the National Agricultural Research Project, Ganeshkhind, Pune. Ninety-days-old three fig layers, each with four to five healthy leaves, were inoculated in the evening using six different inoculation methods. The

*Corresponding author: E-mail: pravinkhaire26893@gmail.com;

suspension of urediospores used for inoculation was made with 5×10^8 spores ml⁻¹ in sterile water. The result of the study revealed that, leaf dip, micro droplet and hand inoculation methods were found most effective for mass multiplication and maintenance of *C. fici*.

Keywords: Fig disease; rust; inoculation techniques; spore dusting; disease expression.

1. INTRODUCTION

Ficus carica L., often known as the common fig, is a prominent member of the Moraceae family and has long been prized for its delicious fruits. This species of plant is native to southwest Asia and the Mediterranean. It is considered temperate. Nearly everywhere in the world, the plant is grown commercially for its dried and fresh fruits [1,2]. Although the fruits of other *Ficus* species can also be eaten, they are usually only eaten in the vicinity or used as bush food. The plant may have medical [3] and religious significance [2] in addition to its food benefits.

In Maharashtra fig is grown in Pune, Ahmednagar and Aurangabad districts where in Pune is the leading producer of fig with an area of 1052 ha with production of about 7373 metric tons and productivity of 7.0 tons/ha/year [4]. Among the several constraints for low productivity of fig the prevalence of number of destructive diseases at different stages of its growth and development. Numerous diseases can severely impair the overall growth and yield of fig plants. The most common fungi diseases seen on fig plants are canker, fruit rot, internal rot, leaf spot, limb blight, rust, and soft rot [5]. Rust is one of the most prevalent fig and other major crop diseases that can have an impact on plant production and general growth [6,7,8]. It mostly affects the fig plant's leaves, with little to no harm to the fruits. Although fig trees frequently experience defoliation, plants are rarely killed by it [9]. Initially, tiny yellow spots develop on underside of leaves. They enlarge to form reddish brown angular spots visible on lower and upper leaf surfaces. Leaves are the mainly plant part affected severely by rust. However, under congenial condition symptoms also appear on petiole, shoots and fruits. Severe disease incidence results in to yellowing and defoliation. At present, the disease has become a major limiting factor in fig cultivation. The rust is an endemic disease and severe in all parts of the state where the crop is grown. The fig growers are much worried about the worst situation caused by this disease. About 50 per cent losses have been reported by earlier workers [10,11] indicating the seriousness of rust disease in fig. The present study was undertaken to find out

comparative efficacy of different inoculation techniques to create high disease pressure, maintenance and multiplication of inoculums and also to study slow rusting mechanism.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Standardization of Inoculation Methods for *C. fici*

For this, the experiment was carried out in polyhouse at National Agricultural Research Project, Ganeshkhind, Pune on Poona fig cultivar. Ninety days old three fig layers having 4-5 healthy leaves each were inoculated in the evening hours by different methods as detailed below. The urediospores suspension used for inoculation was prepared in sterilized water containing 5×10^8 spores ml⁻¹.

Micro droplet inoculation technique (MDIT): The inoculation was done as per methodology described by Munaut et al. [12].

Spore dusting: Leaves of fig plant to be inoculated were first moistened by sprinkling distilled water and then fresh urediospores were dusted on them by tapping infected leaves on them (Fig. 1f).

Stapler method: The uniformly rusted leaves of Poona fig were collected from the field and cut in to 2 cm X 2 cm pieces. These pieces were stapled on moistened healthy fig leaves of three-month-old -plants in such a way that the ventral surface of the diseased leaf touching to the ventral as well as dorsal surface separately (Fig. 1e).

Leaf dip inoculation: The healthy leaves of fig plant grown in polyhouse were dipped in spore suspension of *C. fici* so that urediospores adhere to the leaves (Fig. 1c).

Cotton swabbing: Absorbant cotton plug having the size of 2 cm diameter was dipped in urediospores suspension (5×10^8 spores ml⁻¹) and then swabbed gently on both the surfaces of healthy leaves of fig (Fig. 1d).

Hand inoculation: The healthy leaves of fig plant grown in polyhouse were hand inoculated by freshly prepared spore suspension on the

both sides of leaves so that urediospores adhere to leaf surfaces (Fig. 1b).

Control: An uninoculated set of fig plants was maintained by spraying distilled water.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Standardization of Inoculation Methods for *C. fici*

Different methods of inoculation with urediospores of *C. fici* were evaluated to find out most effective method for production of maximum disease in order to obtain fresh mass of urediospores for using in different pathological studies under artificial epiphytotic. The data in Table 1 reveal that all the methods of inoculation were effective in inducing the rust severity more than 50 per cent. However, among the seven

methods of inoculation, leaf dip, micro droplet and hand inoculations were found most effective over all other methods wherein, significantly maximum (73.33 %) rust severity was observed with latent period of seven days. The next method in order of superiority was spore dusting inoculation (66.67 %) that was at par with above mentioned three methods and had a latent period of 7 days. It was followed by stapler method of inoculation, where the latent period was seven days with Per cent Disease Intensity of 60 per cent. Among all the methods, cotton swabbing showed more latent period (9 days) with least Per cent Disease Intensity of 53.33 per cent. Severity of rust produced by different methods of inoculations is illustrated in Fig. 1. Therefore, for all *in vivo* (pot culture) pathological trials, the simple and effective method, *i.e.* micro droplet inoculation was used.




Fig. 1. Different inoculation methods to produce high disease pressure, maintain and multiply inoculums for rust of fig incited by *Cerotelium fici* a) MDIT, b) Hand inoculation of spore suspension, c) Dipping leaves in spore suspension, d) Cotton swab invocation, e) Stapler method and f) Spore dusting

Table 1. Intensity/severity of rust caused by *C. fici* in fig as influenced by different methods of inoculation

Sr. No.	Methods of inoculation	Latent period (Days)	PDI days after inoculation									
			6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	Hand Inoculation	7	0.00	2.33	8.33	8.33	16.67	20.00	40.00	53.33	66.67	73.33
			0.00	9.72	16.59	16.59	23.84	26.55	39.22	46.90	54.97	59.19
2	Dipping leaves in spore suspension	7	0.00	5.00	8.33	16.67	16.67	30.00	53.33	60.00	66.67	73.33
			0.00	12.92	16.59	23.84	23.84	32.29	46.94	50.75	54.97	59.19
3	Micro droplet inoculation	7	0.00	2.33	6.67	16.67	16.67	23.33	33.33	53.33	60.00	73.33
			0.00	9.72	14.75	23.84	23.84	28.07	35.00	46.90	51.12	59.19
4	Cotton swabbing	9	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.33	4.00	6.67	16.67	20.00	33.33	53.33
			0.00	0.00	0.00	9.72	8.93	14.75	23.84	26.55	35.00	46.90
5	Stapler method I	7	0.00	2.33	6.67	8.33	15.00	16.67	33.33	46.67	60.00	60.00
			0.00	9.72	14.75	16.59	16.59	23.84	35.00	43.06	51.12	51.12
6	Stapler method II	7	0.00	2.33	6.67	8.33	15.00	16.67	33.33	46.67	60.00	60.00
			0.00	9.72	14.75	16.59	16.59	23.84	35.00	43.06	51.12	51.12
7	Spore dusting	7	0.00	2.33	7.33	16.67	16.67	33.33	40.00	46.67	53.33	66.67
			0.00	9.72	14.99	23.84	23.84	35.00	38.84	43.06	46.90	54.97
8	water spray	--	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	SE ±			1.32	1.65	1.18	1.42	2.80	2.47	2.35	2.91	2.88
	CD (0.05)			4.04	5.06	3.63	4.35	8.57	7.56	7.21	8.91	8.81
	CV%			35.40	30.65	12.68	13.13	21.04	13.47	10.86	11.68	10.43

Figures in bold faces are arc sin values

4. DISCUSSION

Maintenance and multiplication of inoculum of the pathogen is essential for various studies. Since the *C. fici* is an obligate parasite, it has to be maintained only on its own host. Hence, different methods of inoculation with urediospores of *C. fici* were evaluated to find out most effective method for production of maximum disease to obtain fresh mass of urediospores for using in different pathological studies under artificial epiphytotics. In present investigation, all the tested methods of inoculation were found effective in inducing the rust severity more than 50 per cent. However, among the different methods of inoculation, leaf dip, micro droplet and hand inoculations were found most effective (73.33% severity) for mass multiplication of *C. fici*. The present results are inconformity with the Singh and Thapliyal [13] and Chirme et al. [14] who suggested spraying of inoculum as a convenient method for large scale maintenance and multiplication of *P. pachyrhizi* causing rust of soybean. In addition, efficient infection of *P. pachyrhizi* was obtained through the spore dusting method on soybean leaves by some scientists [15,13] that is in accordance with present results where spore dusting method was also observed to be better (66.67 % severity) for production of good amount of rust in fig. Further, Stapler method of inoculation was also found to be successful (60.0% severity) for multiplication of rust inoculums that is in agreement with Dadke [16] who observed that stapler method was best for maintenance and multiplication of *P. pachyrhizi* [17]. The forecited investigations divulge that micro droplet method of inoculation has practical utility for mass multiplication and maintenance of fig rust inoculum for further studies.

5. CONCLUSION

It is concluded that, the leaf dip, micro droplet and hand inoculation methods were found most effective for mass multiplication and maintenance of rust inoculum.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Solomon A, Golubowicz S, Yablowicz Z, Grossman S, Bergman M, Gottlieb HE, Flaishman MA. Antioxidant activities and

- anthocyanin content of fresh fruits of common fig (*Ficus carica* L.) J. Agric. Food Chem. 2006;54:7717–7723. DOI: 10.1021/jf060497h
2. Sharma V, Mishra S, Yesudas R, Rajput RS. A Review on *Ficus religiosa* (Sacred Fig). International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews. 2019;6(2):901-906.
3. Gousia Gani1, Tabasum Fatima, Tahiya Qadri, Beenish, Nusrat Jan, Omar Bashir. Phytochemistry and pharmacological activities of fig (*Ficus carica*): A review. International Journal of Research in Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences. 2018;3(2):80-82.
4. Anonymous. Area and production of fruits in Maharashtra. Directorate of Horticulture, Maharashtra state, Pune; 2011.
5. Michailides TJ. Diseases of fig. Diseases of Tropical Fruit Crops. 2003;253-273. Available:https://doi.org/10.1079/9780851993904.0253
6. Khaire PB, Hake LG. Disease Management of Kharif Green Gram and Black Gram. Popular Kheti. 2018;6(2):96-103.
7. Vyavhare YV, Mane SS, Khaire PB, Joshi MS. Epidemiological studies on foliar diseases of groundnut in Konkan region. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry; Sp. 2020;9(5):577-581.
8. Khaire Pravin, Mane Someshree, Uikay Darshana. Management of Three Rust Diseases of Wheat Caused by *Puccinia* Pathogen. KRISHI SCIENCE – eMagazine for Agricultural Sciences. 2020;1(2).
9. Latinovic J, Radisek S, Latinovic N. Severe Infection of Figs by Fig Rust Pathogen *Cerotelium Fici* in Montenegro Agric. For. 2015;61(2):101–107. DOI: 10.17707/ AgricultForest.61.2.08
10. Gaikwad AP, Nimbalkar CA. Management of Fig rust with fungicides. J. Mycol. Plant Pathol. 2004;34(2):418-419.
11. Anonymous. Area and production of fruits in Maharashtra. Directorate of Horticulture, Maharashtra state, Pune; 2022.
12. Munaut F, Hamaide N, Maraite H. A standardized microdroplet inoculation technique for analysis of the interaction between *C. gloeosporioides* and *Stylosanthes guianensis*. Parasitica. 1997; 53(4):117-125.
13. Singh KP, Thapliyal PN. Some studies on the soybean rust caused by *Phakopsora pachyrhizi*. Indian J. Mycol. Pl. Pathol. 1977;7(1):27-31.

14. Chirme BB, Wuike RV, Patil VS, Thakare CS. Efficacy of inoculation methods of *Phakopsora pachyrhizi* Syd. on soybean. J. Maharashtra Agric. Univ. 1997;22:262-263.
15. Anonymous. Annual Report. Taiwan Agriculture Research Institue. 1971; 39-41.
16. Dadke MS. Studies on rust of soybean (*Glycine max* (L) Merrill) caused by *Phakopsora pachyrhizi* Syd. M.Sc (Agri.) Thesis. University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad; 1996.
17. Anonymous. Chemical control of fig rust. Joint Agresco Report. 2004. RFRS, Ganeshkhind, Pune; 2022.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:

<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/117482>