

## Original Research Article

### Estimation of yield losses for major diseases (late leaf spots) in hot spot

location [SUGGESTION: HIGH INCIDENCE AREAS] on groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.)

#### ABSTRACT

Late leaf spot (LLS, *Phaeoisariopsis personata* L.) is the major biotic constraint of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) productivity in hot spot location in Maharashtra. The aim of this study was to determine the yield losses due to attack of diseases, with and without using tebuconazole. Management of LLS through fungicides was evaluated with eight treatments in randomized block design with three replications during Kharif, 2021, 2022 and 2023 at Oilseed Research Station, Jalgaon, Maharashtra. Applications of fungicide sprays impact on the development of *Cercospora* late leaf spot and reduce its intensity. The significantly lowest pod yield loss 0% and haulm yield loss 0% was shown by the treatment T4 i.e. foliar spray of Tebuconazole 25.9 EC at 50, 65, 80 and 95 Days After Sowing (DAS) as compared to control treatment (T8) i.e. (36.85%) and (15.07%), respectively. It was followed by treatment T3 i.e. Tebuconazole 25.9% EC at 50, 65 and 80 DAS and treatment T5 i.e. Tebuconazole 25.9% EC at 65, 80 and 95 DAS. Influence of fungicide used for disease management was apparent on yield. The pod and haulm yield loss in treatment T5 was (7.75%) and (5.89%), respectively. The highest BCR was recorded by treatment T4 (5.41), it was followed by treatment T5 (5.32) and treatment T3 (5.08), respectively.

**Key words: Management, LLS, disease, groundnut**

#### INTRODUCTION

Groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) also known as peanut or earthnut or money nut is a member belongs to family *Leguminosae* and sub-family *Papilionaceae*. It is one of the important oilseed crops in the world often known for its global economic significance not only for its wide spread distribution, but also for the even wider areas of processing and consumption. Groundnut was introduced in India by around 16<sup>th</sup> century by the Portuguese. It is grown under a wider range of environmental conditions encompassing latitudes between 40° South and 40° North of the equator. There are a few economically important foliar fungal diseases, such as early and late leaf spots, commonly called as 'tikka' diseases. Late leaf spot caused by *Phaeoisariopsis personata* are commonly present wherever groundnut is grown. As the area under groundnut is predominant in kharif (rainy) season the foliar diseases like late leaf spot may cause yield losses up to 50% in the semi-arid tropics. In India, late leaf spot is more severe than early leaf spot (Ghewande, 1990). It causes severe defoliation and reduces pod yields by more than 50% if the crop is not protected with chemicals (Shew *et al.*, 1988). The fungicides are the most common tools for controlling disease losses. It contributes significantly to food

and nutrition security, as a good source of dietary protein, fats, vitamins, minerals and micronutrients. The crop also contributes to improving soil fertility via biological nitrogen fixation and organic matter returns to the soil while its haulms and provide valuable supplementary feed for livestock especially during the long dry season.

India is the second largest producer of groundnuts after China. Groundnut is the largest oilseed in India in terms of production with 86.54 lakh tons production in 2023 (Anon., 2023). Late leaf spot caused by *Cercosporidium personatum* (Berk. and Curt) Arx. [ USE LATEST SCIENTIFIC NAME] are the major diseases of groundnut worldwide. The leaf spot diseases can cause 30 to 70 per cent loss in pod yield and reduction in the kernel quality (Reddy *et al.*, 1997). Besides causing quantitative losses, these diseases are responsible for reduction in protein content and oil recovery (Gupta *et al.*, 1987). Losses yield due to the diseases was recorded about 15 to 59 per cent in groundnut (Kumar and Thirumalaisamy, 2016). In the semi-arid tropics, where chemical control is generally not practiced, losses in excess of 50 per cent were common. This disease of groundnut is very destructive on a world-wide scale as evident from maximum yield losses ranging from 10 to 50 per cent. Without the foliar application of fungicides, the disease could cause up to 100 per cent defoliation prior to harvest and losses in excess of 50 per cent of potential yield. But this loss varies considerably from locality to locality and also between seasons (McDonald *et al.*, 1985).

Leaf spots are the most common and serious diseases of groundnut in northern Ghana. Previous research on identifying yield gaps in northern Ghana showed that ELS and LLS [ELABORATE ONCE ANYWHERE] together cause pod yield losses in the range of 10 to 50 per cent (Tsigbey *et al.*, 2001 ab). These diseases also have an adverse influence on seed quality as well as on quality of haulms (SARI, 2002).

Leaf spot can be managed by applying fungicides during the most vulnerable periods of fungal infection; that is, when excessive moisture and humidity occurs (Smith & Littrell, 1980). A few studies have shown that applying fungicides can reduce the severity of leaf spot and improve yields in West Africa (Waliyar *et al.*, 2000).

Keeping this in view, the present work on 'Estimation of yield losses for major diseases (LSS) [WRITE IN FULL] in hot spot location on groundnut.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

A field experiment was laid out during *kharif*, 2021, 2022 and 2023 using groundnut with susceptible variety SB-XI for late leaf spot. Randomized block design with eight treatments of fungicides applied on different dates after planting distributed in three replications. The fungicides, sprays at 50, 65, 80 & 95 DAS [ELABORATE]. The natural incidence of LLS was recorded at 50, 65, 80 & 95 DAS using 0–9 scale suggested by Mayee and Datar (1986). On the basis of dry pod yield and haulm yield, pod yield and haulm yield losses were calculated and also the Benefit Cost Ratio was calculated.

### Experimental Details

Variety: SB-XI

Plot Size: 4.2 x5m<sup>2</sup>(Gross), 3.5 x5 m<sup>2</sup>(Net)

Design: RBD

No. of Treatments: 8

No. of replications: 03

#### Treatment No. Treatment Detail

MAKE ANOTHER COLUMN

T1	Tebuconazole 25.9 %EC <b>at 50 DAS</b>
T2	Tebuconazole 25.9 %EC <b>at 50 and 65 DAS</b>
T3	Tebuconazole 25.9 %EC <b>at 50, 65 and 80 DAS</b>
T4	Tebuconazole 25.9 %EC <b>at 50, 65, 80 and 95 DAS</b>
T5	Tebuconazole 25.9 %EC <b>at 65, 80 and 95 DAS</b>
T6	Tebuconazole 25.9 %EC <b>at 80 and 95 DAS</b>
T7	Tebuconazole 25.9 %EC <b>at 95 DAS</b>
T8	Water spray

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The statistically significant differences were observed in respect of per cent intensity of LLS as well as dry pod yield and haulm yield of groundnut. The results presented in table no. 1 revealed that, the treatment T<sub>4</sub> i.e foliar spray of Tebuconazole 25.9 EC at 50, 65, 80 and 95 DAS was found statistically significant and showed lowest per cent disease index (19.97 %) which was found at par with T<sub>5</sub> (20.72 %) as compared to control and rest of the treatments. The per cent disease index in control treatment was 55.44 per cent. The significantly highest pod yield (13.94 q/ha) and haulm yield (22.79 q/ha) was shown by the treatment T<sub>4</sub> i.e foliar spray of Tebuconazole 25.9 EC at 50, 65, 80 and 95 DAS as compared to control (8.93 q/ha) and (16.43 q/ha), respectively. It was followed by treatment T<sub>5</sub> i.e. Tebuconazole 25.9 %EC at 65, 80 and 95 DAS.

The significantly lowest pod yield loss 0 % and haulm yield loss 0 % was shown by the treatment T<sub>4</sub> i.e foliar spray of Tebuconazole 25.9 EC at 50, 65, 80 and 95 DAS as compared to control treatment (T<sub>8</sub>) i.e (35.95 %) and (29.46 %), respectively. It was followed by treatment T<sub>5</sub> and treatment T<sub>3</sub>. The pod and haulm yield loss in treatment T<sub>5</sub> was (9.10%) and (9.46 %), respectively. The highest **BCR** was recorded by treatment T<sub>4</sub> i.e 4.67, it was followed by treatment T<sub>5</sub> (4.51) and treatment T<sub>3</sub> (4.47), respectively.

So overall it was concluded that, the fungicidal sprays treatment reduced the late leaf spot severity as compared to control. The pod yield and haulm yield losses due to late leaf spot disease was (35.95 %) and (29.46 %) respectively in unprotected fungicidal sprays treatment when

compared with highly protected sprays treatment. Moreover, the fungicidal sprays treatment was really effective and increased pod and haulm yields significantly as compared to control.

These research findings agree with the earlier workers Alabi *et al.* (1993) evaluated Benlate, Dithane M-45 and Hexaconazole fungicides for their efficiency against foliar diseases of groundnut under field conditions and found Hexaconazole fungicide as most effective in controlling the diseases and increase pod and haulm yields. Jadeja *et al.* (1999) reported sprays of Hexaconazole (0.0025%) and Difenconazole (0.0125%) at three times on 30, 45- and 60-days old plant to manage leaf spots and rust of groundnut and reported that the fungicides reduced leaf spot and increased the yields significantly. Hexaconazole treatments showed 71% increase in pod yield and 87% increase in fodder yield.

Johnson and Subrahmanyam (2003) reported that on groundnut hexaconazole (0.2%) fungicide recorded minimum Percent Disease Index (PDI) of 18.8 (LLS) and increased the pod and haulm yields by 43 and 41 percent, respectively when sprayed two times on 60 and 75-days old plant. Seed treatment with Mancozeb @ 2 g/kg + three sprays of Hexaconazole @ 1 ml/lit. at 45, 60 and 75 DAS i.e., T1 was superior in minimizing the late leaf spot disease. The highest pod yield and maximum CBR (1:30) was recorded when seed treatment with Mancozeb @ 2g/kg + three sprays of Hexaconazole @ 1ml/lit at 45, 60 & 75 DAS.

Patel *et al.*, 2022 reported tebuconazole 50% + trifloxystrobin 25% at 0.05% (26.53%) followed by spraying of carbendazim 12% + mancozeb 63% at 0.15% (31.83%) in checking the leaf spot of groundnut. The economics of spraying of different fungicides revealed that the highest incremental cost: benefit ratio (ICBR) was obtained by three spraying of carbendazim 12% + mancozeb 63% at 0.15%, followed by Hexaconazole 5% at 0.005%. Nath *et al.* 2023 evaluated that impact of fungicides used for disease control was apparent on yield per plot. Tebuconazole @ 0.15% gave best result and increased yield up to 67 %.

Nutsugah *et al.* 2005 reported yield losses varied considerably, depending on entry and its yield potential. Pod yield losses due to early and late leaf spot diseases ranged from 9.7 to 81.2 per cent in 2003, and from 19.5 to 65.9 per cent in 2004 when yield of protected entries was compared with yield of unprotected entries. Paul and Yahaya, 2017 reported from Ghana that late leaf spot, ***Cercosporidium personatum* (Berk. & Curt)** are the most important in Ghana. Apart from damaging the leaves, these fungi also cause lesions on petioles, pegs, and main shoots leading to substantial defoliation and yield losses. The leaf defoliation of greater than 80% and yield losses of up to 78% caused by *Cercospora* leaf spots on-farm in the Guinea savannah of Ghana.

Khan *et al.*, 2014 reported that maximum disease control with high pod yield was observed with Nativo and Triazole treatments. Efficacy of Chlorothalonil was also better than Mancozeb and Propineb. Maximum disease control and pod yield was observed when Nativo was used @ 0.97g/L of water, followed by @ 0.65g/L and 0.32 g/L, respectively.

## CONCLUSION

The significantly lowest pod yield loss 0% and haulm yield loss 0 % was shown by the treatment T4 *i.e* foliar spray of Tebuconazole 25.9 EC at 50, 65, 80 and 95 DAS as compared to control treatment **(T8) *i.e* (36.85 %) and (15.07 %)**, respectively. It was followed by treatment T3 and treatment T5. The pod and haulm yield loss in treatment T5 was (7.75%) and (5.89 %), respectively. The highest BCR was recorded by treatment T4 *i.e* 5.41, it was followed by treatment T5 (5.32) and treatment T3 (5.08), respectively.

## REFERENCES

1. Anonymous, (2023). Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare, Department of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare (DA&FW), Second Advance Estimates of Production of Food Grains for 2023-24.
2. Alabi, O., P.E. Olorunju, S.M. Misari and S.R. Boye-Goni, (1993). Management of groundnut foliar diseases in Samaru, Northern Nigeria. Proceeding of 3rd Regional Groundnut Meeting for West Africa, September 14-17, 1992, ICRISAT, Patancheru, A.P. (India), pp:35-36.
3. Ghewande, M.P., (1990). Diseases of groundnut and their management. *J. Oilseeds Res.*, 7:78-97.
4. Gupta, S.K., Gupta, P.O., Parasar, R.D., Sindhan, G.S., (1987). Fungicidal control of leaf spots and influence on quality of groundnut. *Indian Phytopathology*. 40(3):360- 364.
5. Jadeja, K.B., D.M. Nandolia, I.U. Dhruj and R.R. Khandar, (1999). Efficacy of four triazole fungicides in control of leaf spot and rust of groundnut. *Indian Phytopath.*, 52:421-422
6. Johnson, M. and K. Subrahmanyam, 2003. Management of groundnut late leaf spot and rust through triazole fungicides. *Annal. Plant Protect. Sci.*, 11:395-397.
7. Khan A.R., M. Ijaz, I.U. Haq, A. Farzand, M. Tariq Javed, (2014). Management of *cercospora* leaf spot of groundnut by using systemic fungicides. *Cercetări Agronomice în Moldova Vol. XLVII, No. 2*, 158.
8. Kumar V., Thirumalaisamy P.P., (2016). Diseases of Groundnut. National Research Centre for Litchi, Muzaffarpur, Bihar (Formerly at DGR, Junagadh).
9. Mayee, C. D. and Datar, V. V. (1986). *Phytopathometry: Technical Bulletin, Marathwada Agricultural University, Parbhani, PP95.*
10. McDonald, D., Subrahmanyam, P., Gibbons, R. W. & Smith, D. H. (1985). Early and late leaf spots of groundnut. *Information Bulletin 21, ICRISAT, Patancheru, AP 502324, India.* 24 pp.
11. Nath Bharat Chandra, J.P. Singh, Seweta Srivastava and R.B. Singh. (2013). Management late leaf spot of groundnut by different fungicides and their impact on yield. *Plant Pathology Journal* :12(12 (2) 85-91.
12. Nutsugah, S. K., C Oti-boateng, F. K. Tsigbey & R. L. Brandenbur G, (2005). Assessment of yield losses due to early and late leaf spots of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Ghana Jnl agric. Sci.* 40 :21-26.

13. Shew, B.B., M.K. Beute and J.C. Wynne, (1988). Effect of temperature and relative humidity on expansion of resistance to *Cercosporidium personatum* in peanut. *Phytopathology*, 78:493-498.

14. Patel Jasmee R., Patel, K.K., Jaiman, R.K. and Nakrani B.R., (2022). Evaluation of fungicide against early leaf spot and late leaf spot of groundnut in field condition. *The Pharma Innovation Journal* 11(6): 1378-1382.

15. Paul B. Tanzubil and Baba S. Yahaya, (2017). Assessment of yield losses in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) due to arthropod pests and diseases in the Sudan savanna of Ghana. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies* 2017; 5(2): 1561-1564.

16. Reddy C.D.R., Srinivas T, Reddy P.N., (1997). Evaluation of advanced groundnut lines for resistance to early and late leaf spots. *International Arachis Newsletter*: 17:13-15.

17. SARI (2002) Annual -In-House Review Meeting, March 25-27, (2002). Savanna Agricultural Research Institute.

18. Smith, D. H. & Littrell, R. H. (1980). Management of peanut foliar diseases with fungicides. *Plant Dis.* 64, 356-361.

19. Tsigbey, F. K., Bailey, J. E. & Nutsugah, S. K. (2001 ab). Managing groundnut leaf diseases in northern Ghana with fungicides, neem seed extract and local soap (abstr.). *Proc. Am. Peanut Res. Educ. Soc.* 33,38.

20. Waliyar, F., Adomou, M. & Traore, A. (2000). Rational use of fungicide applications to maximize peanut yield under foliar disease pressure in West Africa. *Plant Dis.* 84, 1203-1211.




Fig .1 Bar graph showing Pod yield ratio

Table 1 : Estimation of yield loss for Late Leaf Spot in Groundnut

**Yield loss for Late Leaf Spot in Groundnut Pooled data:Kharif - 2021 to 2023**

Treatments	LLS	Yield (q / ha)		% Yield Loss		BCR
	PDI (%)	Pod yield	Haulm yield	Pod yield	Haulm yield	
T1	33.76 (35.47)	10.14	17.93	27.24	22.39	4.18
T2	30.84 (33.67)	11.04	18.78	20.85	18.58	4.21
T3	25.35 (30.21)	12.58	20.40	9.83	10.87	4.47
T4	19.97 (26.51)	13.94	22.79	0.00	0.00	4.67
T5	20.72 (27.04)	12.61	20.72	9.10	9.46	4.51
T6	26.06 (30.65)	11.12	18.83	20.21	18.34	4.25
T7	36.53 (37.07)	9.91	17.61	28.98	23.66	4.07
T8	55.44 (43.33)	8.93	16.43	35.95	29.46	0.00
SEm ±	1.39	0.10	0.36	0.73	2.31	0.13
CD at 5%	4.22	0.31	1.11	2.20	7.02	0.40

### Suggestions

**Materials and Methods:**

1. Explain how you have taken yield observation and calculated loss percentage
2. Mention name of the statistical tool used

**Result and Discussion:**

1. Concise the reference portion
2. T4 has 0% yield loss means no pest was there and no environmental factors affected the yield. It sounds weird. Recheck the data.
3. Which date you have taken observation? Mention date.
4. Add picture if possible
5. Graph is incomplete. Where is T7 and T8?
6. Mention Fig 1 in text.
7. Change title of Fig 1
8. All fungicide name should be in Small Letter.

**References:**

1. Add recent References
2. Follow reference arrangement according to the journal.