

Original Research Article

<https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2021.1001.065>

## Degree of Sporulation (SP) and Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) as Important Parameter for Characterizing Field Resistance against Cercospora Leaf Spot (CLS) in Mungbean

Priyanka Choudhary\*

Department of Mycology and Plant Pathology, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, BHU,  
Varanasi, India

\*Corresponding author

### ABSTRACT

#### Keywords

Cercospora Leaf Spot, Kopargaon, ML1720, Recombinant inbred lines, AUDPC

#### Article Info

Accepted:  
08 December 2020  
Available Online:  
10 January 2021

A total of 190 recombinant inbred lines (RILs) of mung bean along with parents Kopargaon (susceptible) and ML1720 (resistant) were screened for resistance to *Cercospora canescens* during three consecutive years (2016, 2017, and 2018) at farm as well as polyhouse. Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variance revealed heterogeneity in data (at  $p < 0.05$ ). ANOVA revealed significant variation (at  $p < 0.001$ ) among the genotypes for various resistance components. Estimates of Correlation coefficient (at  $p < 0.001$ ) and multiple regression analysis both concluded that Degree of sporulation (SP) and Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) are the important parameter for characterizing field resistance against Cercospora Leaf Spot (CLS) of mungbean. Disease severity calculated as AUDPC varied significantly across the year and location. The genotype  $\times$  environment interactions exerted significant influence (at  $\alpha = 0.001$ ) which could be reduced by increasing the number of test locations.

### Introduction

Around 28.8% (around 0.3 billion) of Indian are vegetarian which equivocally advocates the importance of pulse protein in Indian diet, in particular and Indian economy, in general (Akibode and Maredia, 2012; Singh *et al.*, 2016). The pace of its exploration in terms of research has always been slow. Among the thirteen pulses grown in India, mung bean or green gram [*Vigna radiata* (L.) Wilczek] belonging to subgenus *Ceratotropis* is a self-pollinated, diploid ( $2n=2x=22$ ), short duration

pulse/grain legume having 579 Mbp genome size (Nair *et al.*, 2019). It is a widely cultivated crop in Southern and Southeast Asia particularly the humid tropics where Cercospora leaf spot disease (CLS) is a key constraint of socioeconomic importance to its production (Mew *et al.*, 1975). Occurrence of disease coincides with reproductive phase of crop (Vakili, 1977) leading to considerable yield loss (Iqbal *et al.*, 1995) which in turn have been compounded by the evolving pathogenic variants of *C. canescens* (Shanmugasundaram, 1987; Chand *et al.*, 2012).

Hence, exploiting the host plant resistance or tolerance to CLS coupled with higher yields are attributes to be explored. In this context, the present study investigates the important components of CLS resistance for its inclusion in resistance breeding programs. Different components of quantitative resistance or partial resistance in different crops to CLS have already been identified (Aquino *et al.*, 1995, Foster *et al.*, 1980, Ricker *et al.*, 1985). Longer latent periods, lower lesion number and reduced capacity for sporulation (Parlevliet, 1979; Nevill, 1981; Ricker *et al.*, 1985; Rossi *et al.*, 1999) as well as NDVI readings (Alisaac *et al.*, 2018; Robinson *et al.*, 2019) have been identified as components of rate reducing resistance against diseases in various crops.

Characterization of the components CLS disease resistance in mung bean was done, where parents with maximum divergence to CLS reaction along with their 190 RILs (non segregating population) were taken into account. This study would led to better understanding of quantitative resistance in mungbean/*Cercospora* interaction and pave way for future studies in molecular mapping in mung bean CLS resistance breeding program.

## **Materials and Methods**

### **Planting materials**

Experimental germplasm consisted of two mung bean parents Kopargaon (susceptible) a widely adopted cultivar, susceptible to CLS whereas, ML1720 a mungbean line along with their 190 recombinant inbred lines (RILs)

### **Experimental design**

Experiment was conducted in alpha lattice design with two replications. Field sowing of

mungbean line was done in first week of August, while polyhouse sowing was done a week after field sowing. Seeds were sown on mounds with spacing of 20 x 30 cm. The experiment was carried out in field and polyhouse in two replication over three consecutive years to analyze whether significant variation existed for environment, treatment and genotype × environment.

### **Inoculum preparation and artificial inoculation of CLS**

A pathogenic strain of *C. canescens* 'MTCC-10835' has been used in the present study. Mass culturing and artificial inoculation was done as per Chand *et al.* (2013). The inoculum (spore suspension) for artificial inoculation was prepared from 25 days old colonized sorghum grains (200 g) by soaking in 1 liter of sterilized water for 5 minutes. These grains were agitated thoroughly in water to dislodge the spores and filtered through two fold muslin cloths.

The inoculum ( $10^4$  spore  $ml^{-1}$ ) was delivered on mungbean leaves at flowering stage by spraying with a knapsack sprayer between 16.00 and 18.00 hours (Chand *et al.*, 2013). The following morning at 07.00 hours field was irrigated to maintain high humidity. The field was irrigated after every two days in case of no rain, to maintain the humidity.

### **Screening for Disease severity**

Disease was scored first when most of the lines showed the disease symptoms, second, third and fourth disease scoring was performed at 5, 4 and 3 days interval respectively by adopting the 1-9 scale (where, 1 = no infection, 2 = upto 10%, 3 = 10.1 to 20%, 4 = 20.1 to 30%, 5 = 30.1 to 40%, 6 = 40.1 to 50%, 7 = 50.1 to 65%, 8 = 65.1 to 80% and 9 = above 80% disease severity) and the Area Under Disease Progress Curve

(AUDPC) was calculated using formula given by Shaner and Finney (1977):

$$\sum_{i=1}^n [(Y_i + (Y_{i+1} + 1))/2] \times (t_{i+1} - t_i)$$

Where,  $Y_i$  = disease level at time  $t_i$ ,  $(t_{i+1}) - t_i$  = Time (days) between two lesion scores,  $n$  = number of observations (score).

### Data Collection for resistance components

Incubation period (IP) by subtracting the inoculation day from day to appearance of the first lesion (Aquino *et al.*, 1995); Latent period (LP) by subtracting inoculation day from day to appearance of first Degree of sporulation (Aquino *et al.*, 1995); Degree of Sporulation (SP) by manual counting of sporulated lesion was done 35 days after inoculation on tagged leaves of each plant (Smith, 1980). MPLS (maximum percentage lesion sporulating) = number of lesions sporulated by 35 day after inoculation /total number of lesions counted by 25<sup>th</sup> day after inoculation (LN) was adopted from Johnston *et al.* (1986). Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) value would be taken at three different time point before, during and after biotic stress.

$$NDVI = (R_{NIR} - R_{RED}) / (R_{NIR} + R_{RED})$$

Where,  $R_{NIR}$  and  $R_{RED}$  is light reflection at near infra-red and red region of spectrum respectively. Measurements would be taken using hand held NDVI meter (Verhulst *et al.*, 2010a, 2010b)

### Data analysis

All the data were tested for the normality using Sapiro –Wilkin test. Non normal data was normalized by square root transformation then Homogeneity of error variances of non-segregating generations was tested by using

Bartlett's test (Bartlett, 1937), and when the variances were heterogeneous at 1 % and 5% level of significance the data was transformed by dividing observations of each environment/year by the square root of MSE of that environment/year which makes the error variances homogeneous and pooled analysis was performed on transformed data. SAS 9.3 version was utilized for ANOVA, correlation and regression calculations.

## Results and Discussion

### Research findings

All the data obtained for different variables showed normal distribution except for Degree of sporulation (SP), hence square root transformation was carried for SL to get normalized data. Bartlett's test for Homogeneity of variance (table 1) revealed that data for all traits were heterogeneous at 5% level of significance when pooled for field and polyhouse trails over three consecutive years. Hence data was transformed and this transformed pooled data was used for further analysis. Mean values along with standard deviation, standard error and normality test are presented in table 1.

### Significant treatment x environment interaction

Existence of highly significant variation for year (f (df 5,1146;  $\alpha=0.001$ )), treatment(f (df191,1146;  $\alpha=0.001$ )), and the treatment x environment (f (df 955,1146;  $\alpha=0.001$ )) interactions (table 2) indicated that the treatment interacted considerably with the environmental changes.

### Correlation and Regression analysis

The estimates of Correlation coefficient (table 3) among resistance components showed that all the components were moderately to highly correlation ( $p < 0.001$ ) with each other. A

significantly high and positive correlation between AUDPC and SL ( $r=0.837$ ;  $p<0.001$ ) while high and negative correlation between AUDPC and NDVI ( $r=-0.934$ ;  $p<0.001$ ) was noticed underlining the importance of these traits as components of quantitative resistance in mungbean against CLS. Multiple

regression analysis (table 4) clearly enumerated that of AUDPC depended significantly on SP ( $p< 0.078$ ) and NDVI ( $p< 0.000$ ) strengthening the fact that traits SP and NDVI are important components of quantitative resistance in mungbean against CLS.

**Table.1** Estimates of Mean, SE, Bartlett’s test Chi-Square values and Normality test values for resistance components

Traits	Field			Polyhouse			Bartlett’s test @ DF(5), $p<0.05$	Transformed pooled data		
	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018		Chi-Square values	Mean±S. E	Shapiro wilk-w
	Mean±S. E	Mean±S. E	Mean±S. E	Mean±S. E	Mean± S. E	Mean±S. E				
<b>AUDPC</b>	346.88±7.78	341.75±8.84	323.69±8.66	327.69±8.94	324.55±9.07	288.59±9.10	849.33**	20.71±0.55	0.979	0.005
<b>IP</b>	12.52±0.18	12.28±0.18	12.30±0.18	12.16±0.18	12.50±0.18	12.75±0.18	778.71**	95.39±1.41	0.984	0.027
<b>LP</b>	23.45±0.19	23.51±0.19	23.37±0.19	23.36±0.19	23.33±0.19	23.69±0.19	221.01**	115.19±0.92	0.987	0.073
<b>LN</b>	77.49±1.88	74.68±2.15	78.39±1.82	76.23±1.79	78.34±2.39	75.91±1.80	1932.44**	24.61±0.62	0.981	0.012
<b>MPLS</b>	43.43±1.35	46.64±1.37	40.37±1.23	43.68±1.27	46.69±1.67	43.62±1.32	1719.95**	12.35±0.37	0.992	0.339
<b>SP(sqrt)</b>	5.67±0.15	5.61±0.15	5.50±0.15	5.71±0.14	5.72±0.14	5.68±0.14	2342.13**	34.14±0.85	0.994	0.615
<b>NDVI</b>	8.28±0.02	8.39±0.03	8.23±0.03	7.37±0.06	7.19±0.06	7.75±0.06	1571.51**	99.05±0.48	0.973	0.001

AUDPC = Area Under Disease Progress Curve; IP = Incubation Period (Days); LP = Latent Period (Days); LN=Lesion number; MPLS = Maximum percentage sporulating lesion and SP = Degree of Sporulation

**Table.2** Estimates of ANOVA and CD for resistance components (transformed pooled data)

Source of Variation	DF	AUDPC	IP	LP	LN	MPLS	SP (sqrt)	NDVI
		M S	M S	M S	M S	M S	M S	M S
<b>Year</b>	5	224756.2**	4785490**	636668.8**	239566.1**	44164.69**	473116.3**	1775328**
<b>Rep within Year</b>	6	34.358	471.513	134.383	3.453	10.615	11.65	126.3741
<b>Treatment</b>	191	702.314**	4564.736**	1953.048**	895.352**	307.615**	1678.733**	530.229**
<b>Year × Treat</b>	955	164.147**	1063.634**	41.08**	210.186**	48.365**	297.963**	89.091**
<b>Pooled Error</b>	1146	1	1.007	0.995	1.002	1	0.997	0.989
<b>CD (Years)</b>		1.092	4.044	2.159	0.346	0.607	0.636	6.62
<b>CD (Treatments)</b>		13.496	34.355	6.752	15.272	7.326	18.183	9.943
<b>CD (Year × Treatment)</b>		2.58	2.589	2.574	2.583	2.58	2.577	2.567

\*\*significant at  $p < 0.001$

Trait abbreviations as mentioned in Table 1

**Table.3** Estimates of Correlation coefficient among the resistance components (transformed pooled data)

Traits	AUDPC	IP	LP	LN	MPLS	SP (sqrt)
IP	-0.722**					
LP	-0.740**	0.991**				
LN	0.689**	-0.715**	-0.723**			
MPLS	0.763**	-0.651**	-0.675**	0.535**		
SP (sqrt)	0.837**	-0.766**	-0.788**	0.846**	0.898**	
NDVI	-0.934**	0.689**	0.710**	-0.690**	-0.742**	-0.823**

\*\*significant at  $p < 0.001$ 

Trait abbreviations as mentioned in Table 1

**Table.4** Estimates of Multiple regression analysis among the resistance components with AUDPC as dependent variable (transformed pooled data)

Traits	Regression Coefficients	Standard Error	t-value	Significance
IP	-0.071	0.075	-0.939	0.349
LP	0.045	0.119	0.376	0.707
LN	-0.197	0.133	-1.485	0.139
MPLS	-0.281	0.27	-1.04	0.299
SP (sqrt)	0.327	0.184	1.772	<b>0.078</b>
NDVI	-0.85	0.05	-17.025	<b>0</b>
Constant	103.633			

Trait abbreviations as mentioned in Table 1

### Genotype × Environment interaction

Genotype × Environment interaction accounts for selection of suitable test environments to maximize gain from selection (Yan *et al.*, 2011). For each trait under study there was differential response of the genotype to environmental changes. Presence of significant environment × genotype interaction in response to disease resistance in our study was in accordance with the previously reported works on barley/net blotch interaction studied by Cherif *et al.* (2010) as well as recent works on pea/leaf rust interaction studied by Das *et al.*, (2019) as well as mung bean/ CLS interaction studied by Das *et al.*, (2020).

### Trait characterizing resistance to CLS in mung bean

The correlation results among the components of resistance (table 3) were in agreement with that obtained by Aquino *et al.*, (1995) in groundnut for late leaf spot where, AUDPC values were highly correlated with LP, IP, SP and MPLS. Similar results were presented by Johnston *et al.*, (1986), Dwivedi *et al.*, (2002) showing high correlation of AUDPC with LP and MPLS. In accordance with our results, higher negative associations between NDVI and AUDPC have been advocated by Robinson *et al.* (2019) and Alisaac *et al.*, (2018). Hence, selection for longer IP and LP; lower LN, SP and MPLS as well as higher NDVI would effectively delay the CLS

development in the field (Waliyar *et al.*, 1993; Aquino *et al.*, 1995; Dwivedi *et al.*, 2002; Robinson *et al.*, 2019).

In conclusion the evaluating and identifying components of rate reducing resistance *in vivo* is tedious and lengthy process. Existence of variability among the genotypes and significant correlation among all the components of quantitative resistance under study showed that they might be exploited in contributing towards the slowing of epidemics. Resistance resulting in lower AUDPC, higher IP and LP, lower LN, SL and MPLS would contribute to slow disease progression. In our study, SL and NDVI have emerged as main component characterizing the resistance in mung bean/ *Cercospora canescens* interaction. Furthermore, significant genotype  $\times$  environment interactions, reveals increment in number of location for effective screening for quantitative disease resistance of large population not only mung bean but other crops also against leaf spot diseases.

### Acknowledgment

Author is thankful to ICAR, New Delhi for SRF fellowship and her Ph.D. mentor Prof. R. Chand, Department of Mycology and Plant pathology for providing the mungbean parental lines and the pathogenic strain of *Cercospora canescens* for the present research work. Author is highly obliged to Dr. A. K. Singh, Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding for advice during manuscript revision.

### References

Alisaac, E., Behmann, J., Kuska, M. T., Dehne, H. W., and Mahlein, A. K. 2018. Hyperspectral quantification of wheat resistance to Fusarium head blight: comparison of two Fusarium

species. *European Journal of Plant Pathology*, 152(4), 869-884.

Aquino, V. M., Shokes, F. M., Gorbet, D. W., and Nutter, F. W. 1995. Late leaf spot progression on peanut as affected by components of partial resistance. *Plant disease*, 79(1), 74-78.

Bartlett, M. S. 1937. Some examples of statistical methods of research in agriculture and applied biology. *Supplement to the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 4(2), 137-183.

Chand, R. A. M. E. S. H., Kumar, P. R. A. B. H. A. T., Singh, V. I. N. E. E. T. A., and Pal, C. H. H. A. T. T. A. R. 2013. Technique for spore production in *Cercospora canescens*. *Indian Phytophthol*, 66, 159-163.

Chand, R., Singh, V., Pal, C., Kumar, P., and Kumar, M. 2012. First report of a new pathogenic variant of *Cercospora canescens* on mungbean (*Vignaradiata*) from India. *New Dis. Rep*, 26(6), 2044-0588.

Cherif, M., Rezgui, S., Devaux, P., and Harrabi, M. 2010. Genotype  $\times$  environment interactions and heritability of quantitative resistance to net blotch in Tunisian barley. *Journal of Plant Breeding and Crop Science*, 2(5), 110-116.

Das, A., Gupta, S., Parihar, A. K., Saxena, D., Singh, D., Singha, K. D., ..and Chandra, S. 2019. Deciphering genotype-by-environment interaction for targeting test environments and rust resistant genotypes in field pea (*Pisumsativum* L.). *Frontiers in plant science*, 10, 825.

Das, A., Gupta, S., Parihar, A. K., Singh, D., Chand, R., Pratap, A., and Kushwaha, K. P. S. 2020. Delineating Genotype $\times$  Environment interactions towards durable resistance in mungbean against *Cercospora* leaf spot (*Cercospora*

- canescens) using GGE biplot. *Plant Breeding*, 139(3), 639-650.
- Dwivedi, S. L., Pande, S., Rao, J. N., and Nigam, S. N. 2002. Components of resistance to late leaf spot and rust among interspecific derivatives and their significance in a foliar disease resistance breeding in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Euphytica*, 125(1), 81-88.
- Fery, R. L., and Dukes, P. D. 1977. An assessment of two genes for *Cercospora* leaf spot resistance in the Southern pea (*Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp.). *HortScience*, 12(5), 454-456.
- Govaerts, B., and Verhulst, N. 2010. The normalized difference vegetation index (NDVI) GreenSeeker (TM) handheld sensor: toward the integrated evaluation of crop management part A: concepts and case studies.
- Govaerts, B., and Verhulst, N. 2010. The normalized difference vegetation index (NDVI) GreenSeeker (TM) handheld sensor: toward the integrated evaluation of crop management part A: concepts and case studies.
- Iqbal, S. M., Ghafoor, A., Bashir, M., and Malik, B. A. 1995. Estimation of losses in yield components of mungbean due to *Cercospora* leaf spot. *Pakistan J Phytopathol*, 7, 80-81.
- Johnston, C. S., Beute, M. K., and Ricker, M. D. 1986. Relationship between components of resistance and disease progress of early leaf spot on virginia-type peanut. *Phytopathology*, 76(5), 495-499.
- Kumar, S., Röder, M. S., Singh, R. P., Kumar, S., Chand, R., Joshi, A. K., and Kumar, U. 2016. Mapping of spot blotch disease resistance using NDVI as a substitute to visual observation in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *Molecular breeding*, 36(7), 95.
- Madhavan Nair, R., Pandey, A. K., WAR, A. R., Hanumantharao, B., Shwe, T., Alam, A. K. M. M., ..and Douglas, C. A. 2019. Biotic and abiotic constraints in mungbean production-progress in genetic improvement. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 10, 1340.S. Akibode, M. K. Maredia, "Global and regional trends in production, trade and consumption of food legume crops," Department of Agricultural, Food, and Resource Economics, Michigan State University, 2012.
- Mew, I. P., Wang, T. C., and Mew, T. W. 1975. Inoculum production and evaluation of mung bean varieties for resistance to *Cercospora canescens*. *Plant Disease Reporter*, 59(5), 397-401.
- Nevill, D. J. 1981. Components of resistance to *Cercospora arachidicola* and *Cercosporidium personatum* in groundnuts. *Annals of Applied Biology*, 99(1), 77-86.
- Parlevliet, J. E. 1979. Components of resistance that reduce the rate of epidemic development. *Annual review of phytopathology*, 17(1), 203-222.
- Ricker, M. D., Beute, M. K., and Campbell, C. L. 1985. Components of resistance in peanut to *Cercospora arachidicola*. *Plant Disease*, 69(12), 1059-1064.
- Robinson, N. A. 2019. *Use of Normalised Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) to assess tolerance of wheat cultivars to root-lesion nematodes (Pratylenchus thornei)* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Queensland).
- Rossi, V., Battilani, P., Chiusa, G., Giosue, S., Languasco, L., and Racca, P. 1999. Components of rate-reducing resistance to *Cercospora* leaf spot in sugar beet: incubation length, infection efficiency, lesion size. *Journal of Plant Pathology*,

- 25-35..
- Shaner, G., and Finney, R. E. 1977. The effect of nitrogen fertilization on the expression of slow-mildewing resistance in Knox wheat. *Phytopathology*, 67(8), 1051-1056.
- Shanmugasundaram, S. 1987. Mungbean varietal improvement. *AVRDC, Taiwan*, 1-49.
- Singh, D., Shahi, B., and Singh, K. M. 2016. Trends of pulses production, consumption and import in India: current scenario and strategies. Brajesh and Singh, Krishna M., Trends of Pulses Production, Consumption and Import in India: Current Scenario and Strategies (May 15, 2016).
- Smith, D. H. 1980. Management of Peanut Foliar Dis. *Plant Dis*, 64, 357.
- Vakili, N. G. 1977. Field screening of cowpeas for *Cercospora* leaf spot resistance. *Tropical Agriculture*, 54(1), 69-76.
- Waliyar, F., McDonald, D., SubbaRao, P. V., and Reddy, P. M. 1993. Components of resistance to an Indian source of *Cercospora arachidicola* in selected peanut lines. *Peanut Science*, 20(2), 93-96.
- Yan, W., Pageau, D., Frégeau-Reid, J., and Durand, J. 2011. Assessing the representativeness and repeatability of test locations for genotype evaluation. *Crop Science*, 51(4), 1603-1610.

**How to cite this article:**

Priyanka Choudhary. 2021. Degree of Sporulation (SP) and Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) as Important Parameter for Characterizing Field Resistance against *Cercospora* Leaf Spot (CLS) in Mungbean. *Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci*. 10(01): 537-544.  
doi: <https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2021.1001.065>