

Table 3. Identification of combined resistance to Ascochyta blight and Botrytis gray mold diseases in controlled environment.

Accession No ¹	Disease reaction (on 1–9 rating scale)					
	Ascochyta blight			Botrytis gray mold		
	Test 1	Test 2	Mean	Test 1	Test 2	Mean
ICC 17211	2.7	2.0	2.3	4.0	3.0	3.5
IG 69986	2.5	3.5	3.0	4.5	2.5	3.5
IG 70030	3.5	2.5	3.0	4.5	2.5	3.5
IG 70037	2.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	3.0
IG 70038	2.7	3.0	2.8	3.5	2.0	2.8

1. All accessions belong to *Cicer judaicum*.

accessions, found resistant to AB, BGM and or to both the diseases, can be used in the chickpea foliar disease resistance breeding programs as resistant donor parents.

References

- Davidson JA, Pande S, Bretag TW, Lindbeck KD and Kishore GK.** 2004. Biology and management of *Botrytis* spp. in legume crops. Pages 295–318 in *Botrytis: Biology, Pathology and Control* (Elad Y, Williamson B, Tudzynski P and Delen N, eds.). The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Haware MP, Narayana Rao J and Pundir RPS.** 1992. Evaluation of wild Cicer species for resistance to four chickpea diseases. *International Chickpea Newsletter* 27:16–18.
- Pande S, Kishore GK, Ramsay G, Williamson B, Senth G, Shivram LP, Mallikarjuna N, Gaur PM and Rao JN.** 2004. Biology and epidemiology of botrytis grey mould of chickpea. Page 10 in *Proceedings of the XIII International Botrytis Symposium*, 25–31 October 2004, Antalya, Turkey.
- Pande S, Siddique KHM, Kishore GK, Baaya B, Gaur PM, Gowda CLL, Bretag T and Crouch JH.** 2005. Ascochyta blight of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.): A review of Biology, pathogenicity and disease management. *Australian Journal of Agricultural Research* 56(4):317–332.
- Singh G, Kaur L and Sharma YR.** 1992. Exploitation of host-plant resistance to manage biotic stresses in chickpea. Page 76 in *Program and abstracts, Second International Food Legume Research Conference*, 12–16 Apr 1992, Cairo, Egypt.

Comparison of Greenhouse and Field Screening Techniques for Botrytis Gray Mold Resistance

S Pande*, M Sharma, M Pathak and J Narayana Rao
(ICRISAT, Patancheru 502 324, Andhra Pradesh, India)

*Corresponding author: s.pande@cgiar.org

Botrytis gray mold (BGM), caused by *Botrytis cinerea* Pers. ex. Fr., is the most destructive foliar disease of chickpea in eastern India, Bangladesh, Nepal, and western Australia. Cool wet weather favors the development of BGM and can cause upto 100% yield loss. Host plant resistance (HPR) is the most economical and eco-friendly means of management of BGM. For exploitation of HPR, reliable field and controlled environment screening techniques are essential. In general, field screening techniques (FST) are used for large-scale screening of germplasm and breeding material, and controlled environment screening techniques (CESTs) are used to confirm field resistance, screening against different pathotypes/races and to carry out inheritance and race identification studies.

Several CESTs, such as whole plant screening technique (WPST), cut-twig screening technique in water (CTST-W) and cut-twig screening technique in sand (CTST-S) were standardized in a controlled environment facility (CEF) at ICRISAT, Patancheru. Components of CESTs such as optimum temperature, relative humidity, and photoperiod for BGM were identified. This study attempts to compare CESTs with FSTs.

In WPST, seedlings of the test material were grown in rows in plastic trays filled with a mixture of sterilized sand and vermiculite (4:1) in a greenhouse (Fig. 1A). One row of a susceptible cultivar JG 62 was planted as indicator

in each tray along with nine test entries. Trays with 10-day-old seedlings were transferred to CEF adjusted at $15\pm 1^\circ\text{C}$ and ~ 1500 Lux light intensity for 12 h a day, allowed to acclimatize for 24 h and inoculated with conidial suspension (3×10^5 spores ml^{-1}) of *B. cinerea*. After inoculation the plants were allowed to partially dry for 30 min and thereafter 100% RH was maintained till the end of experiment (Pande et al. 2002). The experiment was conducted in two replications with eight plants in each replication and repeated once.

In CTST-W, tender shoots of chickpea plants were cut from the actively growing chickpea plant (30–60 days after sowing) with a sharp edged blade in the evening. The lower portion of the detached twig was wrapped with a cotton plug and transferred to a test tube (15×100 mm) containing fresh water (Sharma et al. 1995), (Fig. 1B). The tubes were kept in CEF, allowed to acclimatize for 12–24 h and inoculated following standardized procedures (Pande et al. 2002).

In CTST-S, the detached twigs were planted into sterilized moist coarse sand-vermiculite medium in trays (Fig. 1C). Trays were kept in the CEF, allowed to acclimatize




Figure 1. Controlled environment screening techniques at ICRISAT, Patancheru 502 324, Andhra Pradesh, India (a) Whole plant (WPST) (b) Cut twig-water (CTST-W) (c) Cut twig-sand (CTST-S).

Table 1. Comparison of controlled environment and field screening techniques for Botrytis gray mold resistance.

Entry	Disease score ¹ (1–9 rating scale) ²					Overall mean
	Controlled environment			Field		
	WPST ³	CTST-W ⁴	CTST-S ⁵	Pantnagar	Ishurdi	
ICC 8509	5.0	4.5	5.0	7.0	4.5	5.2
ICC 12339	4.5	4.0	5.5	5.0	4.5	4.7
ICC 89302	4.0	4.0	5.0	7.0	4.0	4.8
ICC 89303	6.0	6.0	6.5	7.0	6.0	6.3
ICC 89310	7.0	7.0	7.5	8.0	6.0	7.1
ICC 86215	6.0	5.5	4.0	6.0	5.5	5.4
ICC 86242	6.5	5.0	5.5	6.5	4.7	5.6
ICCX860030-BP-BP	6.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	6.0	6.4
ICCX860023-BP-BP-BP-3P-BH-IH-BH	6.0	6.0	7.0	8.0	6.6	6.7
ICCX880355-BH-BP-5H-BH	7.2	7.5	8.0	9.0	6.5	7.6
Susceptible check	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0
Overall mean	6.1	5.9	6.3	7.2	5.8	
CD at 5%						
Techniques = 0.69						
Entry = 0.86						
Technique \times Entry = 1.9						

1. Average of three replications.

2. Disease reaction was based on the disease score: 1 = asymptomatic; 1.1–3 = resistant; 3.1–5 = moderately resistant (MR); 5.1–7 = Susceptible; 7.1–9 = Highly susceptible (HS).

3. WPST = whole plant screening technique.

4. CTST-W = cut-twig screening technique in water.

5. CTST-S = cut-twig screening technique in sand.



Figure 2. Field screening technique, Ishurdi, Bangladesh.

for 12–24 h and inoculated following standardized procedures as explained above. The experiment was conducted in two replications with eight twigs in each replication and repeated once.

To compare the CESTs and FST for BGM resistance, 10 chickpea lines selected from the International Botrytis Gray Mould Nursery (IBGMN) were evaluated under CEF at ICRISAT and in the field at hot spot locations in Pantnagar (India) and Ishurdi (Bangladesh). In FST test lines were sown in 2–3 m long rows spaced at 30 × 10 cm. Indicator-cum-infecter rows of a susceptible cultivar H208/JG 62 were sown after every two-test row. At the onset of flowering, the trial was irrigated and plants were inoculated with a spore suspension (5×10^4 spores ml⁻¹) of 10 day old culture of *B. cinerea*. From the following day, sprinkler irrigation or perfo-irrigation was run every day for about 15 min after every 1 or 2 h from 9.00 to 17.00 h depending upon the environmental conditions (Fig. 2). Inoculation with spore suspension of *B. cinerea* was repeated twice at 10-day intervals after the first inoculation (Pande et al. 2002). The trial was replicated twice at both the locations. Data on disease severity was recorded on a 1–9 rating scale after 20 days of inoculation (DAI) in WPST, 8 DAI in CTST-W and CTST-S and at the time of harvest in FST. Based on the mean disease score, individual chickpea line was categorized as asymptomatic (disease score 1.0), resistant (disease score 1.1–3), moderately resistant (disease score 3.1–5),

susceptible (disease score 5.1–7) and highly susceptible (disease score 7.1–9).

Results obtained with CESTs i.e. WPST, CTST-W, CTST-S, and FST are comparable for BGM (Table 1). Analysis of variance revealed that there was no significant difference between the techniques except in the field screening at Pantnagar where disease pressure was marginally higher on a few test entries than the CESTs. However, the severity of BGM in susceptible check and in majority of test entries was uniform in all the techniques. Therefore, we can conclude that the CEST and FST are equally reliable, repeatable and economical. However, CTST-W and CTST-S are found to be rapid and economical and useful in screening segregating germplasm and breeding lines without destroying the plants and thus can be used to screen for other target traits and seed production.

References

- Pande S, Singh G, Narayana Rao J, Bakr MA, Chaurasia PCP, Joshi S, Johanson C, Singh SD, Kumar J, Rahman MM and Gowda CLL.** 2002. Integrated management of botrytis gray mold of chickpea. *In* Information Bulletin No. 61. Patancheru, Andhra Pradesh, India. International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics. 32 pp.
- Sharma YR, Singh G and Kaur L.** 1995. A rapid technique for *Ascochyta* blight resistance in chickpea. *International Chickpea and Pigeonpea Newsletter* 2:34–35.