ISSN: 2348-8808 (Print), 2348-8867 (Online)

Screening of Genotypes against Alternaria Blight of Rapeseed Mustard and its Fungicidal Management

HKSINGH*, SUDHAKAR SHUKLA, JAY KUMAR YADAV, MANISH KUMAR MAURYA AND KN MAURYA¹

Department Plant Pathology, Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Faizabad -224229 (U.P.), India

ABSTRACT



Alternaria blight is a destructive disease of rapeseed-mustardcaused by Alternaria brassicae (Berk) Sacc. and A. brassicicola (Schw). The field experiments were conducted during 2013-14 and 2014-15, with 200 genotypes for evaluation of their resistance to Alternaria blight, as well as to develop effective management strategies for this disease. None of the genotypes were found disease-free or highly resistant, only 7 genotypes namely (DLSC-1, DRMR-261, DRMR-270, GSC-101, GSL-1, NPC-20, and PHR-2) were found resistant, 15 genotypes were rated as moderately resistant. Rest of the genotypes was either recorded susceptible or highly susceptible. For disease management, newly molecules of 6 fungicides were evaluated with 13 treatments combinations for their effectiveness. Propiconazole 25% EC @ 0.10% was found most effective in reducing the disease severity followed by the same fungicide @ 0.05%. It was followed by Hexaconazole 5% SC @ 0.010%. Maximum test weight and yield were also recorded with the sprays of Propiconazole 25% EC @ 0.10% followed by the same fungicide @ 0.05%. In comparison to other fungicides, the maximum B:C ratio was recorded with three sprays of Hexaconazole 5% SC @ 0.05% followed by Propiconazole 25% EC@ 0.05%.

Keywords: S

INTRODUCTION

The oilseed crops, especially *Brassica* spp. play a pivotal role in the agricultural economy of India. Rapeseed-mustard, among these, are most important rabi crops. India is one of the leading countries with respect to production, consumption ,and import of vegetable oils (Singh et al., 2013). Alternaria blight caused by Alternaria brassicae (Berk) Sacc. and A. brassicicola (Schw) Wiltshire is one of the major limiting factor, causing yield losses from 17 to 45% in mustard (Brassica juncea L.) (Singh and Singh, 2005a, Singh and Singh, 2006, Kumar et al., 2009) and upto 70% in rapeseed of yellow sarson and brown sarson (Brassica compestris) (Kolte, 2002). The blight also reduces the seed size; seed colour and oil content. In the absence of resistant cultivars, the disease was managed through cultural practices and by using different fungicides up to certain levels (Singh and Singh, 2005b, Singh et al., 2008 and Singh *et al.*, 2013).

Since the chemical compound is not safe for the human being, animals even also to the microbes (Ko and Farley, 1969). The ideal and most economical means of managing the Alternaria blight disease of rapeseed and mustard would be the use of resistant varieties. In the absence of resistant cultivars, chemical fungicides provide the most reliable means of disease control (Singh et al., 2014). Therefore, in the present study, efforts have been made to find out suitable genotypes, newly molecule of fungicides for the management of Alternaria blight of mustard.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The investigations were carried out at Genetics and Plant Breeding Research Farm and in the laboratory of the Department of Plant Pathology, N.D. University of Agriculture & Technology, Kumargani, Faizabad, Uttar Pradesh, India. This investigation consisted of two separate components i.e. varietal screening for host resistance and use of newly molecule fungicides in Indian mustard [Brassica juncea (L.) Czern & Coss.] for the management of the disease.

Varietal resistance:

Two Hundred (200) promising genotypes/cultivars supplied by Directorate of rapeseed-mustard research, Sewar, Bharatpur, Rajasthan were normals own in the first week of November during 2013-14 and 2014-15rabi season. All the entries were planted in paired rows and replicated twice. Plant to plant and row to row spacing was maintained as 30x10cm. The crop was fertilized with NPK in the ratio of 120:60:60 kg/ha to obtain a good crop. The disease severity was recorded following scale as per the recommendation of All India Coordinated Research Project on Rapeseed-Mustard, 2017 which is as under. [0=No lesion [Immune (I)]; 1= Non sporulating pinpoint size or small brown necrotic spots, less than 5% leaf area covered by the lesions [Highly resistant (HR)]; 3= small roundish slightly sporulating larger brown necrotic spot, about 1-2 mm in diameter with a distinct margin or yellow halo, 5-10% leaf area covered by lesions [Resistant (R)]; 5= moderate sporulation, non-coalescing larger brown spots, about 2-4mm in diameter with a distinct margin or yellow halo, 11-25% leaf area covered by the lesions

¹ Department Genetics and Plant Breeding, Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Faizabad -224229 (U.P.), India *Corresponding Author Email: hksndu@gmail.com

[Moderately resistant (MR)]; 7=moderately sporulating, coalescing, larger brown spots about 4-5 mm in diameter, 26-50% leaf area covered by the lesions [Susceptible (S)]; 9 = profusely sporulating, rapidly coalescing, brown to black spots measuring more than 6mm in diameter without margins covering more than 50% leaf area [Highly susceptible (HS)]. The tested mustard genotypes were classified into different groups according to their response and reaction to the pathogen. The Area under Disease Progress Curve (AUDPC) and infection rate (r) were calculated by the employing formula given below:

$$PDI = \frac{Sum\ of\ total\ numerical\ ratings}{Total\ number\ of\ leaves\ observed}\ x\ \frac{100}{Highest\ grade}$$

The avoidable yield loss (AYL) was also calculated by the following formula:

$$AYL = \frac{Yp - Yup}{Yp} \times 100$$

Where,

Yp = yield under protected conditions Yup = yield under unprotected conditions

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Varietal screening

Appearance of disease

The initial symptoms of the disease could be noted between 40 to 48 days after in different genotypes and earliest appearance of disease (40 DAS) was noted in genotypes CJ-37-61, CS-13000-3-3-2-2-1, CS-1100-1-2-2-3, Divya-33, DRMR-10-40, DRMRIJ-31, Hyb-7-2011, Hyb-9-2011, JC-210-541, JMM-08-1, JMWR-08-3, KMR-12-2, LES-47, MCP-802, NDRE-7, NPJ-172, NPJ-175, PMH-12-1, PPBR-2, PRE-2007-6, PT-2006-4, PT-2010-10, PYS-2007-10, PYS-2008-5, RAUDT-10-18, RAUDYS-10-07, RAUDYS-10-12, RGN-321, RH-0749, RH-0904, RMM-10-1, RMM-10-12, RMT-10-7, RRN-788, RTM-10-10, RTM-1351, TKM-102, TL-21, TM-106, YSKM-12-1, YSKM-12-2, YSWB-2010/8, YSWB-2011-10-1, YSWB-2014/3-12 and YSWB-20229/2-12 and latest (48 DAS) in genotypes DRMR-261, GSC-101, GSL-1, NPC-20 and PHR-2 (Table 1). Similar studies on the response of varieties have been studied by Pandey et al. (2018) with other genotypes as the disease first appeared on the genotype NDRS-2010 (38 DAS) followed by genotypes Ashirwad (42 DAS), Varuna (44 DAS) and NDR- 8501 (45 DAS). The latest appearance of disease was noted on genotype JD-6 (63 DAS).

Severity of disease

An examination of data in Table 1 revealed thatlowest disease severity (5.00%) was recorded in genotype GSC-101 followed by GSL-1 (6.00%), PHR-2 (6.50%), DRMR-261 (7.50%), NPC-20 (9.00%), DRMR-270 and CNH-11-13 (9.50%), HNS-1001 and DLSC-1 (10.00%) (Table1). Similar studies on the response of varieties have been studied by Singh *etal.*, (2008) with other genotypes.

They have reported that Alternaria blight severity ranged from 8.70% to 23.80% is minimum in the ELM-079 (8.7%) followed by LET-18 (9.10%), PQR-2001-3 (9.50%) and CAN-130 (9.50%), respectively. Earlier worker has also reported that

blight severity ranged from 23.11% to 70.21% in different genotypes Singh *et al.* (2014).

Area under disease progress curve (AUDPC)

On average basis Area under the disease progress curve (AUDPC) showed more susceptible genotypes or varieties (Table1). The lowest AUDPC (82.35) was recorded in genotype GSC-101 followed by GSL-1 (105.00), PHR-2 (116.25), DRMR-261 (136.05), NPC-20 (174.00), DRMR-270 (176.25), CNH-11-13 (175.05), HNS-1001 (195.00) and DLSC-1 (198.75). Kumar and Kolte (2001) also reported the genotypes PR-8988 and PR-9024 showed less value of AUDPC (45.35-126.70) on leaves and pods, respectively in comparison to susceptible genotype Varuna in case of Indian mustard. Singh et al. (2014) have made similar studies to find out the resistance source and reported AUDPC ranged from 365.40 to 1414.20 in different genotypes evaluated against Alternaria blight of mustard.

Infection rate (r)

The infection rate (r) was found variable in different genotypes which could be the reason for variations in severity of genotypes. On the mean basis, the infection rate was higher in between 60 to 75 days after sowing situations because high frequency of severity was recorded between 65 DAS to 75 DAS and found to be a critical stage for blight development (Table1). Slow blighting may be defined as a reduction in the infection rate of the pathogen.

Lowest infection rate (0.025) was recorded in genotype GSC-101 followed by GSL-1 and PHR-2 (0.032), DRMR-261 (0.043), NPC-20 (0.045), DRMR-270 (0.046), CNH-11-13 (0.056), HNS-1001 (0.058) and DLSC-1 (0.065) in normal sowing. Kumar and Kolte (2001) also reported from Pantnagar, mustard genotypes PR-8988 and PR-9024 had reduced apparent infection rates as compared to susceptible genotypes Varuna. Similar reports also were given by Pandey et al. (2018).

Host reaction

Out of 200 genotypes screened, none of the genotypes were found disease-free or highly resistant, only 7 genotypes namely (DLSC-1, DRMR-261, DRMR-270, GSC-101, GSL-1, NPC-20 and PHR-2) were found resistant, 15 genotypes namely (CNH-11-13, CNH-11-7, EC-552608, HNS-1001, PAB 04-10, PAB 05-16, PAB 05-19, PAB 09-05, PAB-2004-4, PAB-2005-16, PPBJ-5, PPBJ-2, PPBJ-3, PPBN-3 and PPBN-2) were rated as moderately resistant , 63 as moderately susceptible and 115 as susceptible (Table1).

Similarly, several researchers have also reported other genotypes resistant to this disease time to time (Kumar *et al.*, 2009; Kumar and Singh, 2012; Rai and Mishra, 2014 and Singh *et al.*, 2015).

Effect of different fungicides

On the severity of disease

All the treatments significantly decreased the severity of disease on leaves in comparison to the untreated check.

Table- 1: Per cent disease severity, AUDPC and Infection rate (r) of Alternaria blight in rapeseed and mustard genotypes

		,,			` `	0	1	-	9 71		
S. No.	Name of Genotypes	Appearance of		Disease Severity on Leaves	on Leaves	AUDPC on		ection rate (r) on lea	Infection rate (r) on leaves at 15 days intervals	Maximum Grade	Host
		Disease (DAS)	60 DAS	/5 DAS	90 DAS	Leaves	60 to 75 DAS	75 to 90 DAS	Average	(<i>6</i> -0)	Keacti
1	211 0009	44	15.71	34.00	54.00	1032.83	0.068	0.055	0.062	6	S
. 6	44S31	44	12.00	26.00	47.00	832.50	0.063	0.062	0.063		MS
3	45S42	42	19.00	35.00	52.00	1057.50	0.055	0.047	0.051	6	S
4	AH 53	44	15.50	32.00	53.00	993.75	0.063	0.058	0.061	6	S
5	AHS 55	46	5.50	14.00	24.00	431.25	0.068	0.044	0.056	ιc	MR
9	Albeli-1	43	12.00	28.00	52.00	00.006	0.07	890.0	690.0	6	S
7	ASH 42	44	16.00	34.00	57.00	1057.50	990.0	0.063	0.065	6	S
80	C-3001-1-1-1	45	10.52	28.00	40.00	798.90	80.0	0.036	0.058	7	MS
6	CJ-37-61	40	23.00	39.48	58.00	1199.70	0.052	0.05	0.051	6	S
10	CNH-11-13	46	2.80	5.52	9.50	175.05	0.073	0.039	0.056	3	R
11	CNH-11-7	46	3.50	7.00	11.00	213.75	0.049	0.033	0.041	ъ	MR
12	CS 13000-3-3-2-2-1	40	20.00	45.00	59.50	1271.25	0.079	0.039	0.059	6	S
13	CS-1100-1-2-2-3	40	20.00	44.00	58.00	1245.00	920.0	0.038	0.057	6	S
14	CS-204-2-2-1	42	17.00	38.52	55.00	1117.80	0.074	0.04	0.059	6	S
15	Divya-33	40	22.50	44.00	61.00	1286.25	990:0	0.046	0.056	6	S
16	DLSC-1	46	2.50	7.00	10.00	198.75	0.072	0.058	0.065	3	R
17	DRMR-100	44	13.00	26.00	44.80	823.50	0.057	0.056	0.057	7	MS
18	DRMR-10-40	40	22.00	41.36	58.00	1220.40	0.061	0.045	0.053	6	S
19	DRMR-11-08	45	9.72	23.51	41.50	736.80	0.07	0.056	0.063	7	MS
70	DRMR-11-10	46	8.00	21.68	42.50	703.95	0.077	0.065	0.071	7	MS
21	DRMR-11-11	42	11.00	26.00	47.50	828.75	0.07	0.063	0.067	7	MS
22	DRMR-1187-60	44	13.00	30.00	46.00	892.50	0.07	0.046	0.058	7	MS
23	DRMR-13	44	14.40	25.00	39.00	775.50	0.046	0.043	0.045	7	MS
24	DRMR-15	42	17.00	35.00	57.00	1080.00	0.064	90.0	0.062	6	s o
25	DKMK-16/9-100	4.2	17.00	42.00	58.00	1192.50	0.084	0.043	0.064	ς .	v i
5 2 2 2	DRMR-261	48	1.00	3.50	7.50	136.05	0.052	0.034	0.043	m (~ f
72	DKMR-270	46	1.50	6.IU	9.50	176.25	0.065	0.027	0.046	n 1	¥ ;
8 8	DKMK-302	44	12.64	29.00	45.50	871.05	0.069	0.048	0.059	<u>, 1</u>	MS
3 3	DKMK-312	44	14.55	32.00	49.00	756.62	0.068	0.048	0.038	\ (SIN
S 5	DKMK-316	42	18.00	36.00	57.00	1170.00	0.067	0.057	0.062	ν c	Λ
3.	DPMP 91	7 . CF	18.00	20.00	39.00	11/0:00	0.074	0.046	0.001	n 0	n u
32	DRMR-91	7 7	15.00	39.00	27.00	00.411	0.070	0.045	0.000	n [SVG
3 %	DRMRHI-2409	44	16.00	37.00	46.00	1020 00	0.075	0.075	050.0	. [MS
35	DRMRII-04	46	8.50	20.00	37.00	641.25	0.066	0.057	0.062	. [MS
36	DRMRIJ-11-04	44	13.00	37.00	45.00	00:066	0.091	0.022	0.057	_	MS
37	DRMRIJ-11-286	41	9.50	23.00	45.50	757.50	0.07	0.068	0.069	7	MS
38	DRMRIJ-11-287	44	14.00	36.20	53.00	1045.50	0.083	0.046	0.065	6	S
39	DRMRIJ-1-275	44	13.00	30.00	54.50	956.25	0.07	890.0	0.069	6	S
40	DRMRIJ-21-1	44	16.00	37.00	58.00	1110.00	0.075	0.057	0.066	6	S
41	DRMRIJ-27	44	15.58	28.00	39.00	829.35	0.05	0.033	0.042	7	MS
42	DRMRIJ-31	40	23.50	40.00	58.50	1215.00	0.052	0.05	0.051	6	S
43	DRMRMJA-27	42	18.00	37.00	59.00	1132.50	0.066	90.0	0.063	6	S
44 ;	DRMRMJA-35	45	10.00	25.00	45.00	787.50	0.073	90:0	0.067	r\ 1	WS
c	DKMKMJB-38	4.7	11.00	27.00	48.00	847.50	0.073	0.061	0.067	_ 0	NIS o
1	EC 399301	44	15.00	34.00	56.50 42.00	780.00	0.06	0.062	0.064	1 7	5
/#	EC-399299 EC 414323	41	16.00	25.00	42.00	780.00	0.06	0.032	0.036	\ [MS A
Ç Q	EC-414324	‡ 4	10.50	33.00	30.00	742.30	0.0	#0:0 0 0	0.033	\ r	CIVI SM
£ 6	EC-414324 FC-552608	45	0.501 0.07	12.70	42.46 24.00	/42.20 408.00	0.068	0.00	0.001	ч	MR
3 17	GSC-101	48	080	2 59	5.00	87.35	0.000	0.03	5000) (r	NIVI R
52	GSL-181	48	1.00	3.50	6.00	105.00	0.037	0.026	0.025	o en	4 22
		1							1		i

í	Y YY YO 4 O'VA			1	000	00	0 00 1		0	c	٤
S E	HINS-1001	46	2.00	7.00	10.00	195.00	0.087	0.029	0.038	10	X X
# LC	Hvb-9-2011	40	20.00	38.00	47.00	1072.50	0.048	0.035	0.041		SM
26	IC-255498	3 4	13.00	27.00	45.50	843.75	0.06	0.054	0.057		MS
57	IC-399678	45	11.58	26.00	47.00	829.35	0.066	0.062	0.064		MS
28	IC-399824	44	14.00	35.00	56.50	1053.75	80.0	0.059	0.070	6	s
26	JC-210-541	40	22.00	44.00	61.00	1282.50	0.068	0.046	0.057	6	s
09	JMM-08-1	40	21.30	38.42	57.52	1167.45	0.056	0.052	0.054	6	s
19	JMT-08-13	44	14.10	30.00	42.00	870.75	0.064	0.035	0.050	7	MS
62	JMWR-08-3	40	24.00	42.61	61.00	1276.65	0.057	0.05	0.054	6	s ;
63	KMR(L)-12-1	44	13.00	36.00	44.00	967.50	0.088	0.022	0.055	L 1	MS
40 1	KMR(L)-12-2	44	15.00	33.00	45.00	945.00	0.068	0.034	0.051	L (MS
99	KMK-12-1	44	16.00	37.00	55.00	1087.50	0.075	0.049	0.062	5	νo
90	NMR-12-2 1 ADI 1	40	15.00	39.00	34.00	1140.00	0.063	0.04	0.032	1 1	ر الأد
6 %	LES-45	‡ 1	13.00	31.57	49.5	942.30	0.049	0.042	0.048	. 1	SM
69	LES-46	44	15.55	37.00	55.00	1084.13	0.077	0.049	0.063	, 6	S
20	LES-47	40	21.36	43.00	62.50	1273.95	890.0	0.053	0.061	6	s
7	MCP-802	40	20.00	36.00	52.00	1080.00	0.054	0.044	0.049	6	s
72	MCP-807	42	17.00	30.00	44.50	911.25	0.049	0.042	0.046	7	MS
73	NDRE-7	40	23.70	38.83	55.50	1176.45	0.048	0.045	0.047	6	s
74	NDRS 2017	43	11.00	29.00	54.50	926.25	0.08	0.072	0.076	6	S
72	NPC-20	46	2.50	00.9	9.00	174.00	0.061	0.029	0.045	m ·	~
92	NPJ 153	44 ;	14.00	32.95	57.50	1030.50	0.074	0.067	0.071	6 (S
1 4	NPJ 154	42	12.82	29.90	52.50	938.40	0.071	0.063	0.06/	5 (νo
æ í	NF) 155	42	17.33	32.00	50.62	989.62	0.054	0.052	0.053	6 1	ν ;
6/ 5	NF) 156	43	10.21	23.54	37.50	710.92	0.066	0.044	0.055	· ·	MS (
S 5	NPJ-121	44	13.84	31.00	55.00	1008 75	0.068	0.067	0.068	D 0	Λc
3 S	NFJ-12/	44	15.00	37.00	57.50	1072.05	0.08	0.036	0.08	<i>p</i> . 0	n c
7 8 8 8	NPJ-140 NPF-164	44	16.00 6.38	36.34	54.50 40.00	10/3.85	0.078	0.049	0.061	2 1	s M
8 25	NPI-165	41	11.00	30.00	49.00	900.00	0.078	0.054	0.05		SMS
82	NPI-167	46	7.00	20.00	44.50	686.25	0.08	0.078	0.079		MS
98	NPJ-168	44	14.80	28.00	44.00	861.00	0.054	0.047	0.051	7	MS
87	NPJ-169	46	6.55	18.00	30.00	544.12	0.076	0.045	0.061	7	MS
88	NPJ-170	42	17.10	38.00	54.50	1107.00	0.073	0.045	0.059	6	s
68	NPJ-171	44	14.00	35.00	47.50	986.25	0.08	0.035	0.058	7	MS
96	NPJ-172	40	21.00	39.00	60.00	1192.50	0.058	0.057	0.058	6 (so c
91	NEJ-173	4 C	17.34	33.00	55.00 47.00	1012.30 962 55	0.074	0.061	0.048	y 1	s y
4 8	NPI-175	40	21.00	36.00	50.00	1072 50	0.05	0.038	0.044	. 1	MS
94	NUDH-YI-10	42	17.00	37.00	53.00	1080.00	0.07	0.043	0.057	. 6	s
95	NUDH-YJ-6	44	14.00	36.00	50.00	1020.00	0.083	0.038	0.061	7	MS
96	OMK-4	45	10.00	23.42	44.00	756.30	0.067	0.063	0.065	7	MS
26	PAB 04-10	46	5.32	12.83	24.61	416.92	0.064	0.053	0.059	ı کا	MR.
86 S	PAB 05-16	46	2.76	9.50	19.00	305.70	0.087	0.054	0.071	ر د	MK
£ 5	PAB 05-19	46	6.30	13.00	23.46	418.20	0.053	0.048	0.031	С п	MK
101	FAB 09-03	46	15.00	34.33	21.50	1047.30	0.073	0.019	0.049	no	MIK C
102	PAB-2004-4	46	4.40	34.32 10.70	17.50	324.75	0.064	0.038	0.051	ט זיט	MR.
103	PAB-2005-16	46	3.28	10.00	16.50	298.35	0.079	0.038	0.059	Ŋ	MR
104	PBR-384	42	18.00	32.00	48.00	975.00	0.051	0.045	0.048	7	MS
105	PBR-422	44	15.00	34.00	50.00	997.50	0.071	0.044	0.058	7	MS
106	PHR-2	48	2.64	4.50	6.50	116.25	0.037	0.026	0.032	3	×
107	PMH-12-1	40	20.68	38.00	55.65	1142.48	0.057	0.048	0.053	6	S
108	PMH-12-2	45	10.50	27.00	42.80	804.75	0.076	0.047	0.062	L 1	MS
109	PMH-12-3	44	14.34	27.00	40.00	812.55	0.053	0.039	0.046	7	MS

4	, and a			1							
110	PPBJ 4	46	6.51	15.00	23.00	446.32	0.062	0.035	0.049	δı	X E
111	FFb) 3	46	5.00	11.50	21.50	3/1.23	0.06	0.05	0.033	Сп	MIK
112	FFbJ-2 ppbi 3	40	6.30	13.45	22.76	421.20 367 50	0.054	0.043	0.049	Сп	MIK MD
114	FFBJ-3 PPRN 3	46 46	2.00	15.00	23.00	367.30 453.75	0.037	0.035	0.036	יו ה	MR
115	PPBN-2	46	5.00	13.00	24.00	412.50	0.069	0.05	0.060	טו נט	MR
116	PPBR-2	40	24.24	44.00	64.92	1328.70	90.0	0.057	0.059	6	s
1117	PR-2006-14	41	10.00	24.00	46.50	783.75	0.07	0.067	690.0	7	MS
118	PR-2008-1	43	9.50	21.00	38.00	671.25	0.062	0.056	0.059	7	MS
119	PR-2009-12	44	13.52	28.00	43.00	843.90	0.061	0.044	0.053	7	MS
120	PRB-2004-3-4	42	12.00	29.00	48.50	888.75	0.073	0.056	0.065	7	MS
121	PRB-2008-5	44	14.00	25.83	41.50	803.70	0.051	0.047	0.049	7	MS
122	PRB-2008-5	44	16.50	35.00	49.50	1020.00	0.067	0.04	0.054	~	MS
123	PRE-2007-6	40	22.00	43.00	65.00	1297.50	0.066	0.06	0.063	6 I	v ;
124	PRE-2010-15	44	16.62	31.00	48.00	949.65	0.054	0.048	0.051	1 1	MS.
125	PRE-2010-19	42	11.32	30.00	49.00	902.40	0.081	0.054	0.068	. ~ 1	MS
126	PRL-2009-3	44 43	15.12	38.00	46.50	1035.30	0.097	0.023	0.036		SM SM
128	PRO-5111	54	9.26	21.00	36.50	661.95	0.06	0.051	0.056		MS MS
129	PT-2006-4	40	27.00	48.00	67.86	1431.45	0.061	0.055	0.058	, 6	S
130	PT-2008-2	42	12.70	33.00	55.50	1006.50	0.081	0.062	0.072	6	s
131	PT-2010-10	40	20.58	45.00	64.50	1313.10	0.077	0.053	0.065	6	s
132	PT-303	46	13.00	29.00	51.50	918.75	0.067	0.064	0.066	6	s
133	PTE-2008-02	42	17.85	41.00	58.00	1183.88	0.077	0.046	0.062	6	S
134	PYS-2007-10	40	20.00	43.00	64.00	1275.00	0.074	0.057	0.066	6	S
135	PYS-2008-5	40	25.00	47.00	64.00	1372.50	0.065	0.046	0.056	6	s
136	RAUDT-10-18	40	24.00	47.00	00.89	1395.00	690.0	0.058	0.064	6	S
137	RAUDT-10-33	46	11.00	24.00	36.00	712.50	0.062	0.038	0.050	7	MS
138	RAUDYS-10-07	40	22.86	43.00	64.00	1296.45	0.062	0.057	0.060	6	s
139	RAUDYS-10-12	40	21.00	41.00	00.09	1222.50	0.064	0.051	0.058	6 1	s ;
140	RAURD 09-25	44	16.00	29.00	44.41	888.07	0.051	0.045	0.048	۷ .	MS
141	KAUKU 9-78	44	14.00	35.00	56.50	1053.75	80:08	0.059	0.070	5 (νı
142	KAUKD-09-212 PATIPD 09-32	41	12.38	34.00	56.50	1026.60	0.086	0.062	0.0/4	D 0	Λυ
C#1	RAUND-09-32	44	12.67	34.00	52.00	1012.30	0.082	0.033	0.089	v 0	n u
145	RB-57	£4 44	16.50	40.00	54.00	1128.75	0.07	0.047	0.060	` o	o or
146	RB-59	1 4	13.00	25.63	43.20	805.95	0.056	0.053	0.055	^ _	MS
147	RB-64	45	10.82	23.00	39.00	718.65	90.0	0.051	0.056	7	MS
148	RGN-306	44	15.20	27.00	43.00	841.50	0.0418	0.047	0.048	7	MS
149	RGN-307	44	15.00	35.00	51.00	1020.00	0.074	0.044	0.059	6	s
150	RGN-308	42	17.00	33.10	52.00	1014.00	0.059	0.052	0.056	6	S
151	KGN-315	46	8.00	20.00	33.00	607.50	0.07	0.045	0.058	7	MS o
152	KGN-321 PCN 333	40	18.00	45.00 35.00	64.00	1323.30	0.069	0.052	0.061	7 72	ر الأد
154	RH 0749	40	23.42	48.00	61.00	1353.15	0.074	0.035	0.055	, 6	g s
155	RH-0555A	2 4	13.00	30:00	50.00	922.50	0.07	0.056	0.063	^ _	MS
156	RH-0831	44	12.00	26.00	40.50	783.75	0.063	0.044	0.054	7	MS
157	RH-0834	41	12.84	33.00	50.00	966.30	80.0	0.047	0.064	7	MS
158	RH0901	44	12.00	26.00	43.00	802.50	0.063	0.051	0.057	7	MS
159	KH0902	44	16.00	33.00	55.00	1027.50	0.063	0.061	0.062	6 (so o
160	KH-0904	40 45	21.00	40.00 28.40	62.00	1222.50	0.061	0.06	0.061	1 72	ر د د
161	N110948	54 74	12.00	21.00	32 50	650.62 656.75	0.063	0.037	0.031	۱ ،	NIS NIC
163	RH-903	C + 44	14.00	32.00	49.00	952.50	0.071	0.048	0.060		MS M
164	RHH-1101	44	16.00	35.00	48.50	1008.75	690.0	0.037	0.053	7	MS
165	RMM-10-1	40	21.00	46.00	58.00	1282.50	0.078	0.032	0.055	6	s
166	RMM-10-12	40	20.00	40.00	61.50	1211.25	0.065	0.058	0.062	6	s

167	KMM-9-12	43	9.00	22.00	43.3/	722.77	70:0	0.067	0.069	_	MS
168	RMM-9-4	43	11.00	30.78	50.00	919.20	0.085	0.054	0.070	7	MS
169	RMT-08-2	42	18.00	40.00	00.09	1185.00	0.074	0.054	0.064	6	S
170	RMT-10-10	44	23.00	41.64	58.00	1232.10	0.058	0.044	0.051	6	s
171	RMT-10-7	40	23.31	43.00	62.00	1284.83	0.057	0.051	0.054	6	s
172	RMWR-09-4	44	16.54	34.00	43.00	956.55	0.064	0.025	0.045	^	MS
173	RMWR-09-5	44	13.30	25.20	42.00	792.75	0.052	0.051	0.052	^	MS
174	RMWR-09-6	44	12.50	25.00	43.50	795.00	0.056	0.056	0.056	7	MS
175	Rohini	44	15.40	39.22	58.00	1138.80	0.084	0.051	0.068	6	S
176	RRN-783	42	17.00	32.00	51.00	00.066	0.055	0.053	0.054	6	S
177	RRN-788	40	20.00	45.00	00.09	1275.00	0.079	0.04	090.0	6	S
178	RRN-789	44	15.00	34.30	51.00	1009.50	0.072	0.046	0.059	6	S
179	RRN-813	44	14.00	32.00	46.00	930.00	0.071	0.04	0.056	7	MS
180	RTM-10-10	40	22.42	42.00	61.00	1255.65	0.061	0.051	0.056	6	s
181	RTM-1351	40	27.60	49.00	68.50	1455.75	0.062	0.054	0.058	6	S
182	RTM-1359	44	17.00	36.00	54.00	1072.50	0.067	0.049	0.058	6	S
183	SKM-1013	44	16.24	31.76	45.00	935.70	0.058	0.038	0.048	7	MS
184	SKM-1040	42	19.00	34.00	53.00	1050.00	0.052	0.052	0.052	6	S
185	SKM-815	44	20.00	42.00	58.00	1215.00	0.071	0.043	0.057	6	S
186	SKM-B-817	42	12.00	25.00	42.53	783.97	90.0	0.053	0.057	7	MS
187	TK-17-14	44	16.24	37.00	58.50	1115.55	0.074	0.058	0.066	6	S
188	TKM-102	40	25.17	45.00	00.99	1358.78	0.059	0.058	0.059	6	S
189	TL-21	40	25.00	44.00	63.00	1320.00	0.057	0.052	0.055	6	S
190	TM-106	40	24.00	43.80	29.00	1279.50	90.0	0.041	0.051	6	S
191	TM-117	42	18.00	35.00	55.00	1072.50	90.0	0.055	0.058	6	S
192	Varuna	42	23.00	42.32	00.09	1257.30	90.0	0.048	0.054	6	S
193	YSB-9	42	19.72	40.00	00.09	1197.90	990.0	0.054	090:0	6	S
194	YSKM-12-1	40	27.52	46.74	00.99	1402.50	0.056	0.053	0.055	6	S
195	YSKM-12-2	40	22.00	47.00	00.99	1365.00	0.076	0.052	0.064	6	S
196	YSWB-2010/8	40	25.50	49.28	00.89	1440.45	690.0	0.052	0.061	6	S
197	YSWB-2011-10-1	40	30.00	51.00	70.00	1515.00	0.080	0.078	0.079	6	S
198	YSWB-2012/9	42	19.00	38.32	29.00	1159.80	0.065	0.056	0.061	6	S
199	YSWB-2014/3-12	40	28.00	49.51	00.69	1470.15	0.082	0.070	0.076	6	S
200	YSWB-20229/2-12	40	24.68	44.00	63.50	1321.35	0.058	0.053	0.056	6	S
Average	ď.		15.67	31.24	47.50	936.25	990.0	0.044	0.055		

Among the treatments, minimum PDI (18.97% and 20.70%) was recorded with treatment T₁₂ (Propiconazole 25% EC @ 0.10%) followed by treatment T_{11} (Propiconazole 25% EC @0.05%) 22.00% and 24.73%, T₈ (Hexaconazole 5% SC @ 0.10%) 23.30% and 25.27%, T_7 (Hexaconazole 5% SC @ 0.05%) 25.03% and 28.77% during both the years, respectively. Propiconazole 25% EC was found superior to all other treatments followed by Hexaconazole 5% SC at both concentrations (0.05% and 0.10%) during both the years. Maximum PDC (74.48% and 72.68%) was also recorded with treatment T₁₂ (Propiconazole 25% EC @ 0.10%) followed by T_{11} (Propiconazole 25% EC @ 0.05%) 70.39% and 67.36%, T₈ (Hexaconazole 5% SC @ 0.10%) 68.64% and 66.65%, T₇ (Hexaconazole 5% SC @ 0.05%) 66.31% and 62.03% during both the years, respectively (Table2).

All the treatments reduced Area under the disease progress curve (AUDPC) in comparison to the untreated check. The minimum AUDPC of 510.75 and 562.28 was recorded in plots sprayed with (Propiconazole 25% EC @ 0.10%) followed by AUDPC of 588.98 and 645.90 in plots sprayed with same fungicide @ 0.05%, T_8 (Hexaconazole 5% SC @ 0.10%) 633.23 and 665.48, T_7 (Hexaconazole 5% SC @ 0.05%) 699.23 and 762.00 during both the years, respectively (Table-2).

A lot of findings were done by several scientists to manage Alternaria blight of mustard with the help of different fungicides time to time. (Singh and Singh, 2005°; Singh and Singh, 2005°; Kumar *et al.*, 2009; Singh *et al.*, 2013 and Singh *et al.*, 2015). Singh *et al.* (2013) have also reported the effectiveness of Propiconazole 25% EC @ 0.10% against the Alternaria blight of mustard.

On test weight and yield

DAS = Days after sowing and AUDPC = Area under disease progress curve

0.05%) 1720.22 Kg/ha, T_s (Hexaconazole 5% SC @ 0.10%) 1572.22 Kg/ha, T_7 (Hexaconazole 5% SC @ 0.05%) 1486.94 Kg/ha.Propiconazole 25% EC was found increased the test weight as well as yield over all other treatments followed by Hexaconazole 5% SC at both concentrations (0.05% and 0.1%). The highest per cent increase in yield (94.80%) was recorded in treatment T_{12} (Propiconazole 25% EC @ 0.10%) followed

Table 2: Effect of different Fungicidal treatments on the severity of Alternaria blight

Treatments		Y	ear (2013-14))			Y	ear (2014 <i>-</i> 15))	
ireatments	After I	PDI After II	After III	PDC	AUDPC on	After I	PDI After II	After III	PDC	AUDPC on
	Spray	Spray	Spray		Leaves	Spray	Spray	Spray		Leaves
T_1	24.13	31.83	36.63	50.70	933.15	25.80	30.33	37.50	50.51	929.70
	(29.41)	(34.34)	(37.24)			(30.50)	(33.42)	(37.74)		
T_2	22.20	28.60	33.00	55.59	843.00	25.53	29.70	35.73	52.84	904.95
	(28.09)	(32.33)	(35.05)			(29.01)	(33.01)	(36.47)		
Тз	26.00	33.90	39.20	47.25	997.50	27.30	34.27	40.17	46.99	1020.08
	(30.62)	(35.59)	(38.76)			(31.25)	(35.82)	(39.33)		
T_4	25.50	32.63	37.27	49.85	960.23	24.77	31.23	37.90	49.98	938.48
	(30.21)	(34.79)	(37.59)			(29.71)	(33.97)	(37.97)		
T5	34.20	43.83	48.47	34.78	1277.48	35.87	41.03	46.33	38.85	1231.95
	(35.76)	(41.45)	(44.12)			(36.76)	(39.83)	(42.90)		
T_6	31.40	37.97	43.97	40.83	1134.83	30.73	39.80	43.23	42.94	1151.70
	(34.09)	(38.09)	(41.53)			(33.66)	(39.12)	(41.10)		
T 7	21.40	23.40	25.03	66.31	699.23	22.17	25.33	28.77	62.03	762.00
	(27.52)	(28.88)	(29.94)			(28.07)	(30.13)	(32.41)		
T_8	19.13	21.00	23.30	68.64	633.23	19.80	21.83	25.27	66.65	665.48
	(25.90)	(27.22)	(28.82)			(26.41)	(27.82)	(30.17)		
Т9	35.40	45.60	49.87	32.89	1323.53	36.40	41.13	47.50	37.31	1261.20
	(36.50)	(42.47)	(44.93)			(37.08)	(40.48)	(43.57)		
T10	33.00	39.77	44.40	40.25	1177.05	34.67	40.83	43.57	42.50	1199.25
	(35.04)	(39.07)	(41.78)			(36.04)	(39.71)	(41.30)		
T ₁₁	17.67	19.43	22.00	70.39	588.98	18.33	21.53	24.73	67.36	645.90
	(24.81)	(26.13)	(27.94)			(25.28)	(27.64)	(29.82)		
T ₁₂	15.27	16.93	18.97	74.48	510.75	15.93	19.17	20.70	72.68	562.28
	(22.94)	(24.21)	(25.76)			(23.50)	(25.91)	(27.06)		
T ₁₃	58.63	66.20	74.27	-	1989.75	57.43	68.30	75.77	-	2023.50
	(49.98)	(54.48)	(59.50)			(49.28)	(55.74)	(60.52)		
SEm±	1.22	1.25	1.32			1.22	1.13	1.13		
CD at 5%	3.57	3.64	3.85			3.55	3.31	3.30		
CV%	6.7	6.1	6.0			6.6	5.5	5.1		

Note: Figure in parenthesis are angular transformed value, PDI = Percent Disease Intensity, PDC = Percent Disease Control and AUDPC = Area Under Disease Progress Curve.

 $T_1 = Sure \; (Carbendazim \; 12\% + Mancozeb \; 63\% \; WP \;) \; @ \; 0.20\%, \; T_2 = Sure \; (Carbendazim \; 12\% + Mancozeb \; 63\% \; WP \;) \; @ \; 0.30\%, \; T_3 = Sectin \; (Fenamidon \; 10\% + Mancozeb \; 50\% \; WG) \; @ \; 0.10\%, \; T_4 = Sectin \; (Fenamidon \; 10\% + Mancozeb \; 50\% \; WG) \; @ \; 0.20\%, \; T_5 = Melody \; (Iprovelicarb \; 5.5\% + Propineb \; 61.25\% \; WP) \; @ \; 0.20\%, \; T_6 = Melody \; (Iprovelicarb \; 5.5\% + Propineb \; 61.25\% \; WP) \; @ \; 0.30\%, \; T_7 = Krizole \; (Hexaconazole \; 5\% \; SC) \; @ \; 0.05\%, \; T_8 = Krizole \; (Hexaconazole \; 5\% \; SC) \; @ \; 0.10\%, \; T_9 = Moncerin \; (Pencycuron \; 22.9\% \; SC) \; @ \; 0.10\%, \; T_{11} = Result \; (Propiconazole \; 25\% \; EC) \; @ \; 0.05\%, \; T_{12} = Result \; (Propiconazole \; 25\% \; EC) \; @ \; 0.10\%, \; T_{13} = Control \; (Untreated)$

by treatment T_{11} (Propiconazole 25% EC @ 0.05%) 82.14%, T_8 (Hexaconazole 5% SC @ 0.10%) 66.47%, T_7 (Hexaconazole 5% SC @ 0.05%) 57.44%. All the treatments could avoid both test weight loss as well as yield loss. Highest test weight loss (34.92%) was avoided with treatment T_{12} (Propiconazole 25% EC @ 0.10%) followed by treatment T_{11} of same fungicide @ 0.05% (30.51%), T_8 (Hexaconazole 5% SC @ 0.10%) 28.07%, T_7 (Hexaconazole 5% SC @ 0.05%) 25.93%. The highest yield loss (48.67%) was avoided with treatment T_{12} (Propiconazole 25% EC @ 0.10%) followed by treatment T_{11} of same fungicide @ 0.05% (45.10%), T_8 (Hexaconazole 5% SC @ 0.10%) 39.93%, T_7 (Hexaconazole 5% SC @ 0.10%) 36.48% (Table 3). Singh *et al.*,

(2013) reported maximum test weight and yield was recorded with Propiconazole 25 EC @ 0.1% (1366.66 Kg/ha and 6.057g). He also reported maximum test weight as well as yield loss was avoided with Propiconazole 25 EC @ 0.1%.

Economics of fungicidal treatment

The maximum B:C ratio of 7.35:1 was recorded in treatment T_7 (Hexaconazole 5% SC @ 0.05%) followed by treatment T_{11} (Propiconazole 25% EC @ 0.05%) of 6.76:1, T_8 (Hexaconazole 5% SC @ 0.10%) 6.30:1, T_{12} (Propiconazole 25% EC @ 0.10%) 4.74:1. Singh *et al.*, (2013^b) reported maximum benefit-cost ratio of 6.79:1 was obtained with Propiconazole 25% EC @

Table 3: Effect of different Fungicidal treatments on test weight and yield

		-	Test Weight	(g)			Yield (Kg/h	a)	
Treatments	Ye	ear		Avoidable	Ye	ar		Per cent Yield	Avoidable
Treatments	2013-14	2014-15	Average	Test Weight Loss (%)	2013-14	2014-15	Average	Increase	Yield Loss
T_1	E 10	F 21	E 16	20.47	1444 40	12/1 10	1402.70	40 E2	(%)
	5.10	5.21	5.16		1444.40	1361.10	1402.78	48.53	32.67
T_2	5.30	5.17	5.24	21.68	1472.20	1413.00	1442.61	52.75	34.53
Т3	5.00	5.10	5.05	18.81	1183.30	1155.20	1169.28	23.81	19.23
T_4	5.17	5.07	5.12	19.92	1190.80	1173.00	1181.88	25.14	20.09
T 5	4.83	4.50	4.67	12.11	1083.30	1052.70	1068.00	13.08	11.57
T_6	4.87	4.60	4.74	13.41	1163.90	1129.60	1146.72	21.42	17.64
T_7	5.47	5.60	5.54	25.93	1527.80	1446.10	1486.94	57.44	36.48
T_8	5.60	5.80	5.70	28.07	1583.30	1561.10	1572.22	66.47	39.93
T9	4.67	4.40	4.54	9.59	1027.80	989.78	1008.78	6.81	6.38
T ₁₀	4.77	4.67	4.72	13.14	1111.10	1041.30	1076.22	13.95	12.24
T ₁₁	5.77	6.03	5.90	30.51	1750.00	1690.40	1720.22	82.14	45.10
T ₁₂	6.23	6.37	6.30	34.92	1847.20	1832.30	1839.78	94.80	48.67
T ₁₃	4.20	4.00	4.10	-	972.22	916.66	944.44	-	0.00
SEm±	0.27	0.26			106.72	105.71			32.67
CD at 5%	0.78	0.75			311.45	308.49			
CV%	9.00	8.50			13.80	14.00			

0.1% (Table 4). Singh *et al.* (2013) reported Tilt (Propiconazole 25 EC) @ 0.1% and 0.075% was next effective fungicide for reduction of Alternaria blight intensity as well as AUDPC and increasing test weight and yield after Quintal (Iprodione 25% + Carbendazim 25%) @ 0.2% but, in our studies Propiconazole

25% EC @ 0.10% was found most effective followed by Hexaconazole @ 0.10%. Singh and Maheshwari (2003) have also reported two spraying of Contaf 5E (Hexaconazole) @ 0.05% at 15 days intervals as most effective for the control of disease and increasing yield.

Table 4: Economics of different treatments for the management of Alternaria blight

Treatments	Additional yield over control (Kg/ha)	Additional income (Rs/ha)	Cost of protection (Rs/ha)	Net income (Rs/ha)	Benefit-Cost ratio (Rs/ha)
T ₁	458.34	13750.05	5520.00	8230.05	1.49
T_2	498.17	14945.10	7620.00	7325.10	0.96
Тз	224.84	6745.05	9750.00	-3004.95	-0.31
T_4	237.44	7123.20	18180.00	-11056.80	-0.61
T5	123.56	3706.65	13380.00	-9673.35	-0.72
T_6	202.28	6068.25	19410.00	-13341.75	-0.69
T_7	542.50	16274.85	1950.00	14324.85	7.35
T_8	627.78	18833.25	2580.00	16253.25	6.30
T 9	64.33	1930.05	2955.00	-1024.95	-0.35
T ₁₀	131.78	3953.40	4590.00	-636.60	-0.14
T ₁₁	775.78	23273.25	3000.00	20273.25	6.76
T_{12}	895.34	26860.05	4680.00	22180.05	4.74
T13	-	-	-	-	-

Note: Mustard price – Rs 3000.00/q, Labour charge – 140/day, Sprayer charge – 20/day, Sure – Rs 700.00/Kg, Melody – Rs 2010/Kg, Sectin – Rs 2810/Kg, Krizole – Rs 420/lit, Moncerin – Rs 1090/lit and Propiconazole – Rs 1120/lit.

Conclusion

It is concluded that the low productivity may be due to several biotic and abiotic stresses. Alternaria blight caused by *Alternaria brassicae* and *Alternaria brassicicola* is one of the most severe yield destabilizing factors causing a reduction in yield. The ideal and most economical means of managing the Alternaria blight disease is the use of resistant varieties. Till

date, no resistant variety is available. In present findings, out of 200 genotypes screened none of the genotypes were found disease-free or highly resistant, only 7 genotypes namely (DLSC-1, DRMR-261, DRMR-270, GSC-101, GSL-1, NPC-20, and PHR-2) were found resistant. In the absence of resistant cultivars, chemical fungicides provide the most reliable means of disease control. In management experiment, 3

sprays of newly molecules of 6 fungicides were tested. Out of which Propiconazole 25% EC @ 0.10% was found most effective in reducing the disease severity. The maximum B:C

REFERENCES

- Ko WH and Farley JD.1969. Conversion of Pentachlorobenzene to Pentachloroaniline in soil and the effect of these compounds on soil microorganisms. *Phytopathology* **59**: 64-67.
- Kolte SJ. 2002. Diseases and their management in oilseed crops, new Paradigm in oilseeds and oil: research and development needs (Raimangla, Harvir singh, D.M. Hegdeed.) *Indian Society of Oilseeds Research* Hyderabad, India, 244-252.
- Kumar B and Kolte SJ. 2001. Progression of Alternaria blight of mustard in relation to components of resistance. *Indian Phytopath* 54 (3): 329-331.
- Kumar S and Singh R B. 2012. Integrated management of Alternaria blight of yellow *Sarson (Brassica campestris* L. var. Yellow *Sarson* Prain) caused by *Alternaria* spp. *J. Soi. Cro.* **22**(2): 264-269.
- Kumar S, Singh RB and Singh RN.2009. Fungicides and genotypes for the management of foliar diseases of rapeseed-mustard. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. India, sect. B.* **79** (II): 189-193.
- Pandey MK, Kumar N, Singh HK and Kumar S. 2018. Effect of mancozeb on disease severity, infection rate and seed weight of mustard [Brassica juncea (L.) Czen & Coss.] caused by Alternaria spp. Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci. 7 (2): 3689-3699.
- Rai D and Mishra A K. 2014.Reaction of *Brassica* genotypes against Alternaria blight caused by *Alternaria brassicae* (Berk.) Sacc. *Int. J. Pl. Protect.* 7 (1): 235-237.
- Singh D and Maheshwari V K. 2003.Effect of Alternaria leaf spot disease on seed yield of mustard and its management. *Seed Res.* **31**(1): 80-83.
- Singh HK, Singh RB and Maurya KN. 2015. Management of major

ratio was recorded with three sprays of Hexaconazole 5% SC @ 0.05% followed by Propiconazole 25% EC @ 0.05%.

- fungal foliar diseases of rapeseed-mustard. Res. on Crops.16 (1):182-188.
- Singh HK, Singh RB, Singh M and Maurya K N. 2014.Management of Alternaria blight in Indian mustard through genotypes, date of sowing and micronutrients. *Res. Environ. Life. Sci.* 7 (3): 161-164.
- Singh HK, Singh RB, Singh M and Maurya KN. 2014.Management of Alternaria blight in Indian mustard through genotypes, date of sowing and micro nutrients. *Res. Environ. Life. Sci.* 7 (3): 161-164.
- Singh HK, Srivastava S, and Singh RB and Singh AK. 2013. Management of Alternaria blight of rapeseed-mustard. *J. Pl. Dis. Sci.* 8 (2): 131-136.
- Singh JP, Singh HK and Singh RB. 2008. Integrated management of foliar diseases of mustard. *Indian Phytopath*. **61** (3): 408-409.
- Singh RB and Singh RN.2005^a Status and management of foliar diseases of timely sown mustard in mid-eastern India. *Pl. Dis. Res.* **20** (1): 18-24.
- Singh RB and Singh RN.2005^b. Fungicidal management of foliar diseases of mustard in mid-eastern India. *Indian Phytopath* **58** (1):51-56.
- Singh RB and Singh RN. 2006. Spray schedule for the management of Alternaria blight and white rust of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea*) under different dates of sowing. *Indian J. Agricul. Sci.* **76** (9): 575-579.
- Vanderplank JE 1963. *Plant Diseases: Epidemics and Control*. Academic Press, New York, pp 394.

Citation: