

## USE OF *EUCALYPTUS* SP., IN THE CONTROL OF ROOT INFECTING FUNGI ON MUNG BEAN AND CHICK-PEA

SHAHNAZ DAWAR, SUMAIRA M. YOUNUS, MARIUM TARIQ  
AND M. JAVED ZAKI

Department of Botany,  
University of Karachi, Karachi-75270, Pakistan.

### Abstract

Use of aqueous extract of leaves, stem, bark and fruit *Eucalyptus* sp., in the control of root rot fungi viz., *Fusarium* sp., *Rhizoctonia solani* and *Macrophomina phaseolina* by paper disc and well methods were examined. *R. solani* was less susceptible than *Fusarium* sp., and *M. phaseolina*. Aqueous extract of leaves, stem, bark and fruit of *Eucalyptus* sp., was more effective @ 5% w/v against *M. phaseolina*, *R. solani* and *Fusarium* sp. Soil amendment with leaves, stem, bark and fruit of *Eucalyptus* sp., @ 5% w/w showed significant increase in germination, shoot length, shoot weight, root length and root weight of chick-pea and mung bean plants. Besides this, the infection by *Fusarium* sp., *M. phaseolina*, *R. solani* was also reduced. All parts of *Eucalyptus* sp., were equally effective in the control of root infecting fungi.

### Introduction

Diseases of crop plants adversely affect the agricultural economy of a country (Hafeez, 1986). These plant diseases are due to ubiquitous plant pathogens causing severe damages to root system of plants consequently resulting in the death of plants. *M. phaseolina* a soil-borne root infecting fungus, is known to produce charcoal rot of over 500 species of plants (Sinclair, 1982). Another root infecting fungus *R. solani* exists as active mycelium in the soil and attacks more than 2000 species of plants (Parmeter, 1970) and similarly species of *Fusarium* are known to attack a wide range of plants in different parts of the world (Booth, 1971). The chemical control of plant diseases has proved very effective but majority of these chemicals are highly expensive and exhibit lethal effects. The genus *Eucalyptus* of the family Myrtaceae, is a native to Australia. *Eucalyptus* sp., grow under a wide range of climatic and edaphic conditions in their natural habitat. It is found commonly growing in the Karachi University campus. *Eucalyptus* essential oils have shown to have a marked antiseptic activity against a wide variety of infectious bacteria, viruses and fungi (Inouye *et al.*, 2001). Organic amendment is an important method for the control of plant diseases. Organic amendments are generally used for the improvement of crop plants and increasing agricultural productivity. Various organic amendments have a suppressive effect on plant parasitic fungi and nematodes (Alam, 1990). The method involves the amendment of different plant parts for the control of fungal and nematode diseases (Mital & Gowswami, 2001). Of the organic substrates, neem cakes (Alam, 1990, Abid *et al.*, 1992) have shown promising results in the control of root infecting fungi. The present study was carried out to investigate the antifungal activity of different parts viz., leaves, stem, bark and fruit of *Eucalyptus* sp., in the control of root infecting fungi on mung bean and chick pea.

### Materials and Methods

**In Vitro studies:** Paper disc and well methods were used to study the interaction of root rot fungi with aqueous extract of leaves, stem, bark and fruit of *Eucalyptus* sp. The cultures of *R. solani*, *M. phaseolina* and *Fusarium* sp., were isolated from soil and grown

on potato dextrose agar containing penicillin @ 20,000 unit/litre and streptomycin @ 200 mg/litre. A 5mm disc of the root infecting fungi viz., *M. phaseolina*, *R. solani* and *Fusarium* sp., was placed in the centre and 5 mm paper discs soaked in aqueous extract of leaves, stem, bark and fruit @ 0.1, 1 and 5% w/v were placed on three corners of the Petri dish. The disc soaked in sterilized water placed at other corner served as control. Each treatment was replicated three times for each root infecting fungus. Inoculated Petri dishes were incubated for 5-6 days and zone of inhibition was measured. Similarly in the well method, the four wells on PDA poured plates containing penicillin @ 20,000 unit/litre and streptomycin @ 200 mg/litre were made by cork borer of 5mm. A 5 mm disc of root infecting fungi viz., *M. phaseolina*, *R. solani* and *Fusarium* sp., was inoculated in the centre of Petri dish. Three wells of 5 mm were poured with leaves, stem, bark and fruit aqueous extract @ 0.1, 1 and 5 % w/v .The well inoculated with sterilized water served as control. Each treatment was replicated three times. Inoculated plates were incubated at 30°C for 5-6 days and zone of inhibition was measured.

**In Vivo studies:** Different plant parts viz., leaves, stem, bark and fruit of *Eucalyptus* sp., were collected from Karachi University campus, dried and ground in a grinder. The soil used for the experiment was obtained from the experimental plot of Botany Department, University of Karachi. The soil was sandy loam (sand, silt, clay, 70, 19 and 11%), pH ranged from 7.1- 8.1 with moisture holding capacity (MHC) of 50% (Keen & Raczkowski, 1922), total nitrogen 0.077-0.099% (Mackenzie & Wallace, 1954), sclerotia of *M. phaseolina* 3-5 g<sup>-1</sup> soil as found by wet sieving technique (Sheikh & Ghaffar, 1975), 5-10% of *R. solani* on sorghum seeds used as baits (Wilhem, 1955) and 3000 cfu g<sup>-1</sup> *Fusarium* spp., as assessed by soil dilution technique (Nash & Synder, 1962). Soil was amended with different parts viz., leaves, stem, bark and fruit of *Eucalyptus* sp., used @ 0.1, 1 and 5% w/w and kept in 8cm diam., pot containing 300gm soil and allowed to decompose for 10 days. After 10 days of decomposition of organic matter, 5 seeds of mung bean and chick-pea were sown in each pot. Non-amended soil served as control. Each treatment was replicated three times. After 30 days of germination, mung bean and chick-pea plants were uprooted and growth parameters were recorded. Plant roots were washed in running tap water and surface sterilized with 1% Ca (OCl)<sub>2</sub> for 3 minutes. Five pieces of roots were transferred on PDA plates containing penicillin @ 100,000/litre and streptomycin @ 20mg/l. Petri dishes were incubated for five days at room temperature to confirm infection by root infecting fungi.

Data were analyzed and subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA) using procedure given by Gomez & Gomez (1984).

## Results and Discussion

Aqueous extract of leaves, stem, bark and fruit of *Eucalyptus* sp., by paper disc and well method showed inhibition of growth of *Fusarium* sp., *R. solani* and *M. phaseolina* with increasing percentage but *R. solani* was less inhibited as compared with other two fungi by both paper disc and well method (Table 1). Three percentages 0.1, 1 and 5% w/v were not equally inhibitory to test fungi but more inhibition was recorded @ 5% w/v. Present results showed that extract of different parts viz., leaves, stem, bark and fruit of *Eucalyptus* sp., exhibited potential to suppress the *Fusarium* sp., *R. solani* and *M. phaseolina* which have a wide host range and are distributed worldwide (Ehtheshamul Haque & Ghaffar, 1994). This study revealed that aqueous extract was effective in general to cause growth inhibition in three test fungi. But test fungal species were not equally susceptible to aqueous extract of *Eucalyptus* sp.

**Table 1. Growth Inhibition of root rot fungi with *Eucalyptus* sp., by paper disc and well method.**

| Treatments   |        | <i>Fusarium</i> spp.<br>(mm) | <i>Rhizoctonia</i><br><i>solani</i> (mm) | <i>Macrophomina</i><br><i>phaseolina</i> (mm) |
|--------------|--------|------------------------------|--|---|
|              |        | Paper disc method            |  |   |
| 0% (control) |        | 0                            | 0  | 0   |
| 0.1% extract | Leaves | 17.0                         | 10.0                                     | 12.6  |
|              | Stem   | 19.6                         | 10.0                                     | 11.6  |
|              | Bark   | 19.0                         | 1.0                                      | 7.6   |
|              | Fruit  | 19.3                         | 19.3                                     | 13.0  |
| 1% extract   | Leaves | 21.0                         | 16.6                                     | 18.0  |
|              | Stem   | 21.0                         | 10.0                                     | 16.6  |
|              | Bark   | 19.6                         | 4.6                                      | 8.0   |
|              | Fruit  | 21.0                         | 19.3                                     | 17.3  |
| 5% extract   | Leaves | 21.3                         | 19.3                                     | 18.6  |
|              | Stem   | 22.0                         | 11.0                                     | 21.0  |
|              | Bark   | 20.3                         | 5.0                                      | 11.6  |
|              | Fruit  | 22.0                         | 24.3                                     | 18.0  |
| Well method  |        |                              |  |   |
| 0% (control) |        | 0                            | 0  | 0   |
| 0.1% extract | Leaves | 20.6                         | 11.3                                     | 14.6  |
|              | Stem   | 19.0                         | 11.0                                     | 16.0  |
|              | Bark   | 20.3                         | 11.6                                     | 11.6  |
|              | Fruit  | 21.0                         | 14.0                                     | 17.3  |
| 1% extract   | Leaves | 20.6                         | 12.6                                     | 18.3  |
|              | Stem   | 21.0                         | 13.3                                     | 19.0  |
|              | Bark   | 23.6                         | 12.0                                     | 19.0  |
|              | Fruit  | 21.3                         | 16.0                                     | 19.6  |
| 5% extract   | Leaves | 21.0                         | 14.6                                     | 19.3  |
|              | Stem   | 24.3                         | 13.6                                     | 24.6  |
|              | Bark   | 24.0                         | 12.6                                     | 22.6  |
|              | Fruit  | 24.3                         | 16.6                                     | 20.3  |

Significant increase in growth parameters was observed where soil was amended with different parts viz., leaves, stem, bark and fruit of *Eucalyptus* sp., used @ 0.1, 1 and 5% w/w (Table 2). There was significant increase in shoot length ( $p<0.001$ ), shoot weight ( $p<0.01$ ), root length ( $p<0.001$ ) and root weight ( $p<0.01$ ) of mung bean plants whereas shoot length of chick-pea plants showed a significant ( $p<0.05$ ) increase. Significant reduction in infection of *R. solani* and *M. phaseolina* ( $p<0.05$ ), ( $p<0.01$ ) was observed on mung bean plants whereas there was complete suppression of *M. phaseolina* ( $p<0.01$ ) infection followed by *R. solani* and *Fusarium* on chick-pea plants where soil was amended with different parts of *Eucalyptus* sp., used @ 0.1, 1 and 5% w/w (Table 2). All parts viz., leaves, stem, bark and fruit of *Eucalyptus* sp., were more effective when used @ 5% w/w. Present results showed that leaves, stem, bark and fruit powder of *Eucalyptus* sp., has potential to reduce infection caused by root infecting fungi viz., *Fusarium* sp., *R. solani* and *M. phaseolina*. Neem cake has shown promising results in the control of root infecting fungi (Alam, 1990; Abid *et al.*, 1992). Similarly seaweeds *Stoechospermum marginatum*, neem cake and cotton cake showed promising results in the control of root

infecting fungi on sunflower (Ehtheshamul-Haque *et al.*, (1998). Tariq *et al.*, (2006) used different parts of *Avicennia marina* viz., leaves, stem and pneumatophore for the control of root infecting fungi. *Eucalyptus* essential oil is considered to have marked antiseptic action against infectious bacteria, viruses and fungi (Inouye *et al.*, 2001). There is need to provide information to farmers on the use different parts of *Eucalyptus* sp., in the control of root rot fungi on a large scale.

**Table 2. Effect of different parts of *Eucalyptus* sp., on growth parameters and control of root infecting fungi on mung bean and chick-pea plants.**

| Treatments       | Plant growth parameters |              |              |             |             | Infection %          |                  |                      |
|------------------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------------|
|                  | Germination %           | Shoot length | Shoot weight | Root length | Root weight | <i>Fusarium</i> spp. | <i>R. solani</i> | <i>M. phaseolina</i> |
| <b>Mash bean</b> |                         |              |              |             |             |                      |                  |                      |
| Control          | 100                     | 16.7         | 0.24         | 2.76        | 0.06        | 100                  | 77.77            | 55.55                |
| 0.1% Leaf        | 100                     | 21.4         | 0.49         | 4.51        | 0.09        | 100                  | 33.33            | 0                    |
| 1% leaf          | 100                     | 22.6         | 0.53         | 4.9         | 0.12        | 88.88                | 33.33            | 0                    |
| 5% leaf          | 86.66                   | 25.12        | 0.78         | 6.56        | 0.13        | 77.77                | 0                | 0                    |
| 0.1% stem        | 100                     | 22.2         | 0.69         | 5.7         | 0.07        | 88.88                | 11.11            | 11.11                |
| 1% stem          | 93                      | 22.2         | 0.74         | 7.1         | 0.15        | 88.88                | 0                | 11.11                |
| 5% stem          | 93                      | 24.52        | 0.76         | 7.2         | 0.20        | 77.77                | 0                | 0                    |
| 0.1% bark        | 100                     | 23.5         | 0.63         | 6.05        | 0.08        | 77.77                | 44.44            | 11.11                |
| 1% bark          | 100                     | 24.4         | 0.80         | 8.2         | 0.12        | 77.77                | 11.11            | 11.11                |
| 5% bark          | 100                     | 24.76        | 0.85         | 10.23       | 0.13        | 66.66                | 0                | 0                    |
| 0.1% fruit       | 86.66                   | 20.9         | 0.31         | 4.5         | 0.07        | 88.88                | 44.44            | 22.22                |
| 1% fruit         | 66.66                   | 21.3         | 0.47         | 4.8         | 0.08        | 77.77                | 33.33            | 0                    |
| 5% fruit         | 93                      | 23.3         | 0.66         | 10.6        | 0.08        | 66.66                | 0                | 0                    |
| LSD.05 =         | 19.017                  | 3.007        | 0.269        | 2.618       | 0.0583      | 45.202               | 44.367           | 22.484               |
| <b>Chick pea</b> |                         |              |              |             |             |                      |                  |                      |
| Control          | 100                     | 20.8         | 0.54         | 9.9         | 0.21        | 100                  | 66.66            | 22.22                |
| 0.1%Leaves       | 93                      | 23.4         | 0.69         | 16.7        | 0.29        | 100                  | 55.55            | 0                    |
| 1% leaves        | 93                      | 24.6         | 0.70         | 19.0        | 0.30        | 77.77                | 33.33            | 0                    |
| 5% leaves        | 86.66                   | 28.9         | 0.80         | 19.6        | 0.31        | 66.66                | 33.33            | 0                    |
| 0.1% stem        | 100                     | 25.2         | 0.75         | 18.1        | 0.35        | 88.88                | 66.66            | 0                    |
| 1% stem          | 100                     | 26.6         | 0.79         | 21.1        | 0.36        | 77.77                | 55.55            | 0                    |
| 5% stem          | 100                     | 31.1         | 0.86         | 26.9        | 0.38        | 66.66                | 44.44            | 0                    |
| 0.1% bark        | 93                      | 24.8         | 0.71         | 17.1        | 0.34        | 88.88                | 33.33            | 0                    |
| 1% bark          | 93                      | 28.5         | 0.81         | 17.4        | 0.37        | 66.66                | 22.22            | 0                    |
| 5% bark          | 93                      | 30.1         | 0.82         | 17.6        | 0.39        | 44.44                | 11.11            | 0                    |
| 0.1% fruit       | 100                     | 25.4         | 0.65         | 15.5        | 0.31        | 100                  | 22.22            | 0                    |
| 1% fruit         | 86.66                   | 26.1         | 0.70         | 16.6        | 0.33        | 88.88                | 11.11            | 0                    |
| 5% fruit         | 86.66                   | 27.0         | 0.80         | 20.9        | 0.36        | 66.66                | 0                | 0                    |
| LSD.05 =         | 22.949                  | 4.660        | 0.228        | 10.531      | 0.194       | 48.441               | 49.058           | 8.993                |

### References

Abid, M., S. Ehtheshamul-Haque, M.A. Maqbool and A. Ghaffar. 1992. Effect of oil cakes, *Bradyrhizobium* sp., *Paecilomyces lilacinus* and furdan on root nodulation and root-knot nematodes in mung bean. *Pak. J. Nematol.*, 10: 145-150.

Alam, M. 1990. Neem in nematode control. In: *Nematode biocontrol (Aspects and prospects)*: M.S. Jairajpuri, M.M. Alam and I. Ahmed. BS Publishers and Distributors (Pvt) Ltd. Dehli-110032, India. 51-55pp.

Booth, C. 1971. *The genus Fusarium*. Commonwealth Mycological Institute, Kew, Surrey, England, pp.237.

Ehtheshamul-Haque, S., M. Abid and A. Ghaffar. 1994. Efficacy of *Bradyrhizobium* spp., and *Paecilomyces lilacinus* with oil cakes in the control of root rot of mung bean. *Tropical Science*, 35: 294-299.

Ehtheshamul-Haque, S., M.J. Zaki, A.A. Vahidy and A. Ghaffar. 1998. Effects of organic amendments in the efficacy of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* in the control of root rot disease of sunflower. *Pak. J. Bot.*, 30: 45-50.

Gomez, K.A and A.A. Gomez. 1984. *Statistical procedures for Agriculture Research*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed Wiley, New York, pp. 680.

Hafeez, A. 1986. *Plant diseases*. Pakistan Agricultural Research centre (PARC). Islamabad. pp 552.

Inouye S., T. Takizawa and Yamaguchi. 2001. Antibacterial activity of essential oil and their major constituents against respiratory tract pathogens by gaseous contact. *J. Antimicrobial chemotherapy*, 47: 565-573.

Keen, B.A. and H. Rackzowski. 1922. The relation between clay content and certain physical properties of soil. *J. Agric. Sci.*, 11:441-449.

Mackenzie, H.A. and H.S. Wallace. 1954. The kjeldahl determination of nitrogen: A critical study of digestion conditions, temperature, catalyst and oxidizing agent. *Aust. J. Chem.*, 7: 55-70.

Mital, A and B. K. Gowswami. 2001. Role of undi oil seed cake for the management of disease complex caused by *Fusarium solani* and *Meloidogyne incognita* on brinjal. *Pak. J. Nematol.*, 19(1&2): 87-90.

Nash, S.M. and W.C. Snyder. 1962. Quantitative estimation by plate count of propagules of the bean root rot fungus *Fusarium* in field soils. *Phytopathology*, 52: 567-572.

Parmeter, J.R. 1970. *Rhizoctonia solani, Biology and Pathology*. Univ. of California Press, Berkeley Los Angeles and London, 255 pp.

Sheikh, A.H. and A.Ghaffar. 1975. Population study of sclerotic of *Macrophomina phaseolina* in cotton field. *Pak. J. Bot.*, 7: 13-17.

Sinclair, J.B. 1982. *Compendium of soyabean diseases*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. American Phytopathological Society. pp. 104.

Tariq, M., S. Dawar, F.S. Mehdi and M.J. Zaki. 2006. Use of *Avicennia marina* in the control of root infecting fungi on okra and mash bean. *Pak. J. Bot.*, 38(3): 811-815.

Wilhelm, S. 1955. Longevity of the *Verticillium* wilt fungus in the laboratory and field *Phytopathology*, 45: 180-181.

(Received for publication 2 January 2007)