



Response of chickpea genotypes against *Ascochyta* blight disease

Abdul Ghaffar*, Niaz Hussain, Muhammad Aslam, Muhammad Irshad, Muneer Abbas, Mudassar Kahliq, Zubeda Parveen, Khalid Hussain

Arid Zone Research Institute, Bhakkar, Punjab, Pakistan

Key words: Chickpea, Genotypes, Susceptibility, Resistance, *Ascochyta rabiei*.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.12692/ijb/16.1.14-19>

Article published on January 15, 2020

Abstract

Blight is the becoming the serious threat in changing climate. To improve the per capita income and to overcome the production losses the evaluation of the blight resistant genotypes is the major herder for the breeders. To overcome this problem study was conducted to develop the *Ascochyta* blight resistant genotype. Evaluation of chickpea genotypes against blight (*Ascochyta rabiei* (Pass) Lab) is an effective method to check the level of resistance and susceptibility. In this study, 40 chickpea genotypes/varieties were screened out by the artificial inoculation at the research area of Arid Zone Research Institute, Bhakkar. Out of 40 genotypes, 8, 20, 2, 6, 4 were classified as highly susceptible, susceptible, moderately susceptible, moderately resistant and resistant respectively. Six entries (TG1401, CM54/05, TG1411, TG1413, CH888/06 and D088-11) exhibited moderately resistant behavior against *Ascochyta* blight. Four entries (09AG006, D08025, CH16/06 and D072-09) classified as resistant genotypes.

* **Corresponding Author:** Abdul Ghaffar ✉ ghafaragri1460@gmail.com

Introduction

Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) is commonly known as Bengal gram, gram and considered to be the third most important grain legume in the world after dry beans and pea, being widely grown in subtropical and warm-temperate regions (Bakhsh *et al.*, 2007; Mansfeld, 2008). Chickpea is not only an important source of human food (Malik *et al.*, 2011) and animal feed, but also fixes nitrogen, which helps in the management of soil fertility, particularly in dry land areas (Sharma and Jodha, 1984; Islam *et al.*, 2011). Chickpea is a rich source of energy, minerals and vitamins. India and Pakistan are major chickpea producing countries based on its area under cultivation and grain production. Pakistan ranks second to India in terms of acreage under chickpea and are cultivated on an area of 985 thousand hectares and contributes the production of 673 thousand tones (Economic Survey of Pakistan 2012-13).

Average yield of chickpea (550 kg/ha) in Pakistan is lower than its actual yield potential (Malik, 1984). *Ascochyta rabiei* (pass.) is one of the major factors limiting grain yield in chickpea. This disease has been reported in Pakistan and also in different chickpea growing countries of the world (Nene *et al.*, 1996).

Blight usually appears in February-March in Pakistan and affects all plant parts. The disease expresses itself as circular spots on leaves and pods and as elongated lesions on petioles and stem. Gram blight (AB), caused by *Ascochyta rabiei* (Pass.) Lab. is an important foliar disease of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) worldwide that causes grain yield and quality losses up to 100% (Pande *et al.*, 2005). Although blight can be effectively controlled by the foliar application and seed dressing of fungicides, the use of disease free seed and destruction of diseased plant debris (Malik *et al.*, 1991; Rauf *et al.*, 1996). Generally these approaches are not feasible and economical. Hence, resistant or tolerant varieties of chickpea may be the most effective tool to control gram blight (Ilyas *et al.*, 2007).

The genetic bases of disease resistance against blight in chickpea could be the best possible solution of the problem. Therefore, there is a dire need for the identification of durable resistant genotypes and incorporation of their resistance genes into commercial cultivars. For the reason, the present study was designed to screen out chickpea cultivars/lines collected from Arid Zone Research Institute (AZRI), Bhakkar.

Materials and methods

The present research work was carried out in the experimental area of the Arid Zone Research Institute, Bhakkar during crop season 2017-18. Forty chickpea genotypes developed at Arid Zone Research Institute, Bhakkar were evaluated for disease resistance against *Ascochyta rabiei*.

Isolation of A. rabiei and Mass culture preparation

Chickpea pods severely infected by *Ascochyta* blight was collected from field of chickpea were refrigerated at 5-8°C. The isolation procedure carried out was adopted by (Ghazanfar *et al.*, 2010). The culture of *A. rabiei* was purified through spore streak method on chickpea seed agar medium and maintained at 5 °C. Mass culture of the fungus was prepared by the method described by (Ghazanfar *et al.*, 2010).

Inoculation of nursery

Forty desi and kabuli chickpea genotypes/varieties were screened out against chickpea blight under randomized complete block design at the research area of Arid Zone Research Institute, Bhakkar. Disease was developed through artificial inoculation by maintaining humidity at 80% by applying fresh water during afternoon and evening. Genotypes were sown in two rows with four meter length keeping row to row and plant to plant spacing 30 cm & 15 cm, respectively.

A susceptible check variety Punjab-1 was planted after every two genotypes as a spreader. At booting stage, the nursery was daily sprayed with spore suspension of *A. rabiei* (1x 10⁵ spores /ml). The spray of spore suspension was continued till the susceptible check

Punjab-1 become fully susceptible. Fresh water was daily sprayed on daily basis to develop *Ascochyta* disease.

Disease rating

Data were taken by applying two scales; 9 point scale used was modified (Pande *et al.*, 2011) and 1 -10 rating scale (Gowen *et al.*, 1989). According to Pande *et al.*, 2011 scale comprised of 1 –9 ratings (modified from Jan and Wiese, 1991); 1=no visible symptoms; 2=minute lesions prominent on the apical stem; 3=lesions up to 5 mm in size and slight drooping of apical stem; 4=lesions obvious on all plant parts and clear drooping of apical stem; 5=lesions on all plants parts, 6=lesions as in 5, dry branches common, some plants killed; 7=lesions as in 5, defoliation, broken, dry branches very common, up to 25% of plants

killed; 8= symptoms as in 7 but up to 50% of the plants killed and 9= symptoms as in 7 but up to 100% of the plants killed.

The genotypes were further categorized for their reaction to *Ascochyta* blight infection on the basis of Gowen *et al.*, (1989) scale, according to this scale; 1 - <2= Highly resistant(HR); 2- <4= resistant (R); 4 <6=moderately resistant (MR); 6- <7= moderately susceptible (MS); 7-<9= susceptible (S); and 9- 10=highly susceptible (HS).

Results and discussion

Forty chickpea genotypes comprising (Desi and Kabuli) were studied and results revealed that tested material showed variable response against the *Ascochyta* blight (Table 1).

Table 1. Disease reaction of different genotypes as a result of screening against *Ascochyta* blight.

| S.No. | Genotypes | Disease Rating | % Av. Severity | Reaction |
|-------|-----------|----------------|----------------|----------|
| 1 | TG1402 | 9 | 63.25 | HS |
| 2 | TG1403 | 9 | 57.55 | HS |
| 3 | TG1401 | 4 | 16.35 | MR |
| 4 | 09AG006 | 3 | 9.75 | R |
| 5 | TG1414 | 7 | 46.5 | S |
| 6 | TG1415 | 7 | 40 | S |
| 7 | Do8025 | 3 | 7 | R |
| 8 | CH16/06 | 3 | 10 | R |
| 9 | CM54/05 | 4 | 13.75 | MR |
| 10 | TG1411 | 4 | 12 | MR |
| 11 | TG1405 | 9 | 66.5 | HS |
| 12 | TG1406 | 9 | 62.75 | HS |
| 13 | TG1416 | 9 | 70 | HS |
| 14 | TG1404 | 7 | 43.5 | S |
| 15 | TG1407 | 7 | 45 | S |
| 16 | TG1408 | 7 | 47.75 | S |
| 17 | CH53/07 | 6 | 40 | S |
| 18 | TG1413 | 4 | 17.5 | MR |
| 19 | CH888/06 | 4 | 11.75 | MR |
| 20 | TG1410 | 7 | 48 | S |
| 21 | TG1423 | 6 | 33.5 | MS |
| 22 | TG1424 | 7 | 42.7 | S |
| 23 | TG1425 | 7 | 40 | S |
| 24 | TG1420 | 9 | 66.5 | HS |
| 25 | TG1417 | 9 | 77.5 | HS |
| 26 | Do88-11 | 4 | 11.5 | MR |
| 27 | CM770/06 | 7 | 46 | S |
| 28 | K7005 | 7 | 40.75 | S |
| 29 | TG1430 | 7 | 45 | S |
| 30 | TG1427 | 7 | 41.25 | S |
| 31 | TG1426 | 7 | 43 | S |
| 32 | CH87/06 | 9 | 68 | HS |
| 33 | TG1409 | 7 | 43.25 | S |
| 34 | TG1412 | 7 | 48 | S |
| 35 | T1418 | 6 | 30.75 | MS |
| 36 | TG1419 | 7 | 50 | S |
| 37 | TG1421 | 7 | 48.9 | S |
| 38 | TG1428 | 7 | 45 | S |
| 39 | TG1429 | 7 | 41.25 | S |
| 40 | Do72-09 | 3 | 8.5 | R |
| 41 | Punjab-1 | 9 | 83.75 | HS |

Eight entries were categorized as highly susceptible where 20 entries were classified as susceptible while six genotypes showed moderately disease reaction. Four entries were kept in resistant classification.

Disease behavior of all the genotypes is represented in Table 1. The average maximum disease severity (up to 83.75%) was recorded in Punjab-1. The genotypes / varieties which showed highly susceptible disease reactions were TG1402, TG1403, TG1405, TG1406, TG1416, TG1417, TG1420, CH87/06 and Punjab-1 (check). On the other hand, the tested lines with susceptible level of reactions were TG1404, TG1407, TG1408, TG1409, TG1410, TG1412, TG1414, TG1415, TG1419, TG1421, TG1424, TG1425, TG1426, TG1427, TG1428, TG1429, TG1430, CH53/07, CM770/06 and K7005. Two inbred strains (TG1418 and TG1423) showed moderately susceptible behavior. Whereas, the entries TG1401, CM54/05, TG1411, TG1413, CH888/06 and Do88-11 expressed moderately resistant behavior against Ascochyta blight. Out of forty genotypes studied, four genotypes (09AG006, Do8025, CH16/06 and Do72-09) showed resistant type of response against blight (Table 1).

While screening, it was observed that most of the entries were susceptible to highly susceptible. This represents that most of the genotypes did not have resistance genes. These results also correlate with the Iqbal *et al.*, (2010) who studied one hundred and forty five genotypes against Ascochyta blight and wilt diseases and most of them expressed susceptible to highly susceptible reaction. Similarly, Bokhari *et al.*, (2011) evaluated the resistance level of ten cultivars of gram and observed that maximum number of varieties were susceptible under field conditions. Although, those genotypes can be released for commercial cultivation which have resistant genes (Nasir *et al.*, 2000). A comprehensive study on the number of genes possessing resistance against chickpea blight, their nature, and diversity is essential for exploiting a particular resistance source in chickpea breeding programme (Ilyas *et al.*, 2007). Resistance against chickpea blight is controlled by single dominant gene or recessive gene (Singh and

Reddy, 1991). Ali *et al.* (2011) conducted molecular marker study and represented that resistance in chickpea is due to presence of three independently segregating dominant genes and a recessive gene. Various Quantitative Trait loci (QTL) also contributed towards inheritance of blight resistance (Collard *et al.*, 2003). Different bio-chemicals and physiological characters of varieties also control the resistance against blight in chickpea cultivars. Randhawa *et al.* (2009) studied the role of glandular hairs density, population and size of stomata aperture in chickpea cultivars against Ascochyta blight. It was observed that these characters played comprehensive role in varieties resistance.

It is now well established that the fungus *A. rabiei* possesses variability and the pathotypes present in Pakistan and India are more aggressive than those prevalent in the Mediterranean region (Singh *et al.*, 1984). Resistant lines to the local pathogen have been reported in India (Singh *et al.*, 1988) and in Pakistan (Iqbal *et al.*, 1989). High level of AB resistance has also been identified among wild *Cicer* species. Resistance against AB has been identified in *C. judiacum*, *C. pinnatifidum*, *C. echinospermum* and *C. reticulatum* (Singh *et al.*, 1981; Singh and Reddy 1991; Collard *et al.*, 2001; Pande *et al.*, 2005, 2006). Ascochyta blight resistance is a complex venture controlled by various different resistant sources comprises of resistance genes. Under such condition, introducing diverse resistance genes into varieties may assist in developing resistance stability in commercially grown varieties.

Conclusion

The study concludes that none of the lines/varieties was observed as highly resistant which indicated that immunity in chickpea against blight is rather scarce. Sources of resistance identified during this study, can further be used in breeding programmes for the development of disease resistant commercial cultivars after determining their genetics. Most of the genotypes were susceptible to highly susceptible against chickpea blight indicating scarcity of resistance. To develop resistance, therefore, an

intensive screening of chickpea germplasm is required to be conducted.

References

- Ali Q, Ahsan M, Tahir MHN, Farooq J, Waseem M, Anwar M, Ahmad W.** (2011). Molecular markers and QTLs for *Ascochyta rabiei* resistance in chickpea. *International Journal for Agro Veterinary and Medical Sciences* **5(2)**, 249-270.
- Bakhsh A, Malik SR, Iqbal U, Arshad W.** 2007. Heterosis and heritability studies for superior segregants selection in chickpea. *Pakistan Journal of Botany* **39(7)**, 2443-2449.
- Bokhari AA, Ashraf M, Rehman A, Ahmad A, Iqbal M.** 2011. Screening of chickpea germplasm against *Ascochyta blight*. *Pakistan Journal of Phytopathology* **23(1)**, 05-08.
- Collard BCY, Ades PK, Pang ECK, Brouwerand JB, Taylor PWJ.** 2001. Prospecting for sources of resistance to *Ascochyta blight* in wild *Cicer* species. *Australian Plant Pathology* **30**, 271-276. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/AP01036>.
- Collard BCY, Pang ECK, Ades PK, Taylor PWJ.** 2003. Preliminary investigations of QTL associated with seedlings resistance to *Ascochyta blight* from *Cicer chino spermum*, a wild relative of chick pea. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* **107**, 719-729.
- Economic Survey of Pakistan.** 2012. Economic Advisor's Wing, Finance Division, Government of Pakistan, Islamabad.
- Ghazanfar MU, Sahi ST, Javed N, Waqil W.** 2010. Response of advanced lines of chickpea against chickpea blight disease. *Pakistan Journal of Botany*. **42(5)**, 3423-3430.
- Gowen SR, Onon M, Tiurley B, White A.** 1989. Variation in pathogenicity of *Ascochyta rabiei* in chickpea. *Tropical Pest Management* **35(2)**, 182-186.
- Ilyas MB, Chaudhry MA, Javed N, Ghazanfar MU, Khan MA.** 2007. Sources of resistance in chickpea germplasm against *Ascochyta blight*. *Pakistan Journal of Botany* **39(5)**, 1843-1847.
- Iqbal SM, Ghafoor A, Bakhsh A, Iftikhar A, Sher A.** 2010. Identification of resistant sources for multiple disease resistance in chickpea. *Pakistan Journal of Phytopathology* **22(2)**, 89-94.
- Iqbal SM, Khan IA, Bashir M.** 1989. Screening of chickpea cultivars against *Ascochyta blight* in Pakistan. *International Chickpea Newsletter*, 20:16.
- Islam M, Mohsan S, Ali S, Khalid R, Hassan F, Mahmood A, Subhani A.** 2011. Growth, nitrogen fixation and nutrient uptake by chickpea pea (*Cicer arietinum*) in response to phosphorus and sulfur application under rain fed conditions in Pakistan. *International journal of Agriculture and Biology* **13**, 725-730.
- Malik BA.** 1984. Pulses in Pakistan with emphasis on chickpea and *Ascochyta blight*. Pp 1-9. In *Proceedings of a Training course on Ascochyta blight of chickpea in Pakistan*. 3-10 March, 1984, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Malik MR, Iqbal SM, Malik BA.** 1991. Economic losses of *Ascochyta blight* in chickpea. *Sarhad Journal of Agriculture* **8**, 765-768.
- Malik SR, Saleem M, Iqbal U, Zahid MA, Bakhsh A, Iqbal SM.** 2011. Genetic analysis of physiochemical traits in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*) seeds. *International journal of Agriculture and Biology* **13**, 1033-1036.
- Mansfeld.** 2008. *Cicer arietinum* subsp. *arietinum* Mansfeld's World Database of Agricultural and Horticultural Crops.
- Nasir A, Bretag TW, Kaiser WJ, Meredith KA, Brouwer JB.** 2000. Screening chickpea germplasm for *Ascochyta blight* resistance. *Australian journal of*

plant pathology **29(2)**, 102-107.

Nene YL, Sheila VK, Sharma SB. 1996. A world list of chickpea and pigeonpea pathogens. Patancheru 502 324, Andhra Pradesh, India: International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics.

Pande S, Ramgopal D, Kishore GK, Mallikarjuna N, Sharma M, Pathak M. Rao Narayana J. 2006. Evaluation of wild Cicer species for resistance to *Ascochyta* blight and *Botrytis* grey mold in controlled environment at ICRISAT, Patancheru, India. International Chickpea and Pigeonpea Newsletter **13**, 25-27.

Pande S, Siddique KHM, Kishore GK, Baya B, Gaur PM, Gowda CLL, Bretagand T, Crouch JH. 2005. *Ascochyta* blight of chickpea: biology, pathogenicity and disease management. Australasian Journal of Agricultural Research **56**, 317-332.

Pande S, Sharma M, Gaur PM, Tripathi S, Kaur L, Basandrai A, Khan T, Gowda CLL, Siddique KHM. 2011. Development of screening techniques and identification of new sources of resistance to *Ascochyta* blight disease of chickpea. Australasian Plant Pathology **40**, 149 –156.

Randhawa MA, Sahi ST, Ilyas MB, Ghazanfar MU, Javed N. 2009. Comparative assessment of density of glandular hairs, population and size of aperture of stomata in resistant and susceptible

cultivars of chickpea to *Ascochyta* blight disease. Pakistan Journal of Botany **41(1)**, 121 -129.

Rauf CA, Malik MR, Iqbal SM, Rahat S, Hussain S. 1996. Fungicides; an economic tool to enhance productivity and net returns in chickpea crop. Sarhad Journal of Agriculture **12**, 445-448.

Sharma D, Jodha NS. 1984. Pulse Production in Semi-arid Region of India, p 241-265. Proceedings of pulses production, constraints and opportunities.

Singh G, Singh G, Kumar L. 1988. Chickpea response to various races of *Ascochyta rabiei*. ICN **19**, 10-13.

Singh KB, Reddy MV. 1991. Advances in disease-resistance breeding in chickpea. Advances in Agronomy **45**, 191-222.

Singh KB, Hawtin GC, Nene YL, Reddy MV. 1981. Resistance in chickpeas to *Ascochyta* blight. Plant Disease **65**, 586-587.

Singh KB, Reddy MV, Nene YL. 1984. International testing of chickpeas for resistance to *Ascochyta* blight. Plant Disease **68(9)**, 782-784.