IDENTIFICATION OF FUNGAL SEED BORNE PATHOGENS IN FARM SAVED AND CERTIFIED SEED OF SORGHUM (SORGHUM BICOLOR (L.) MOENCH) AND EVALUATION OF THE INCIDENCE AND SEVERITY OF SEED BORNE AND NON-SEED BORNE DISEASES IN THE FIELD

By

JOSEPHINE JERE

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Crop Protection

Department of Crop Science
Faculty of Agriculture
University of Zimbabwe

December 2004

UNIVERSITY OF ZIMBABWE

FACULTY OF AGRICULTURE

The undersigned certify that they have read and recommend to the Department of Crop Science, the thesis entitled:

Identification of fungal seed borne pathogens in farm saved and certified seed of sorghum (Sorghum bicolor (L.) Moench) and evaluation of the incidence and severity of seed borne and non-seed borne diseases in the field.

Submitted by **JOSEPHINE JERE** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **MASTER OF SCIENCE IN CROP PROTECTION**.

Approved:
•••••
Dr A. B. Mashingaidze, Chairperson
Supervisors
Mrs J. Sibiya and Mr W. Manyangarirwa

ABSTRACT

A study to identify fungal seed borne pathogens on sorghum seed samples and to assess seed to field transmission of these pathogens was carried out at the Crop Science Department in the 2003/04 season. Seed samples collected from Mbare Musika traders and Seed Companies were tested for germination, fungal infection and for *Phoma sorghina* transmission in the laboratory. The samples were then planted in the field in a randomized complete block design (RCBD), replicated three times. Disease severity on sorghum plants was assessed at 2-week intervals from the time disease symptoms appeared in the field for a period of 10 weeks. Mean normal germination was higher for the farm saved samples (13.15% and 11% for white and red farm saved seed respectively) as compared to the certified samples with 11.5% and 9.25% for white and red certified sample groups respectively. Six pathogenic fungal genera isolated from certified and farm saved samples were Fusarium, Cercospora, Phoma, Bipolaris, Curvularia and Exserohilum. Seed infection with these pathogens ranged from 0 – 38.1%, with Fusarium, Cercospora and Phoma having the highest infection percentages of 38.1%, 33.5% and 34% respectively. The farm saved samples had generally higher infection levels for most pathogens whilst the certified samples had higher infection levels of Cercospora as compared to the other pathogens. Diseases observed in the field were anthracnose (Colletotrichum graminicola), grey leaf spot (Cercospora sorghi), leaf blight (Phoma sorghina) and covered kernel smut (Sphacelotheca sorghi). There were significant differences in the area under disease progress curves (AUDPC) calculated for the different diseases among the samples (P < 0.05). Anthracnose and leaf blight were prominent in red accessions of both certified and farm saved samples. Grey leaf spot was prevalent in the white samples, with the white certified samples having the highest AUDPC of 6.31. Covered kernel smut was noted on white farm saved samples only with mean infection of 8.1%. The diseases had no significant effect on the final yield (P > 0.05). C. sorghi and P. sorghina that were detected in the seed were also observed in the field, showing high seed to field transmission of the pathogens. C. graminicola was not identified in the laboratory but in the field implying that the disease could be from sources other than seed. The presence of seed borne pathogens on certified seed samples indicates a need for improvement in the seed certification procedures for sorghum.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge and thank the wonderful people with whom I worked with for this study to be a success. Firstly, I thank my supervisors Mrs J. Sibiya and Mr W. Manyangarirwa; I appreciate your advice and guidance from the beginning to the end of this thesis. Mrs M. Cavill, Mrs E. Ngadze and Mr D. Icishahayo should be commended for their assistance in the laboratory work and statistical analysis. I thank also Mr Tumbare and Mr Kambidzi for helping me in laying out the field trial and spraying. I am also indebted to the Belgian Technical Cooperation (BTC) whose financial support made the whole study possible.

May God bless all who have contributed to the success of this research study.

Dedicated to my husband Dzingai.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
DEDICATION	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	X
LIST OF FIGURES	хi
LIST OF APPENDICES	xii
CHAPTER 1	1
1NTRODUCTION.	1
1.1 Objectives	3
CHAPTER 2	5
LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Sorghum production.	5
2.2 Uses	6
2.3 Growing conditions.	6
2.4 Seed borne diseases of sorghum.	7
2.4.1 Sorghum wilt (Acremonium strictum W. Grams)	7
2.4.2 Grey leaf spot (Cercospora sorghi Ellis &Everhart)	8
2.4.3 <i>Phoma sorghina</i> (Sacc.) Boerema, Dorenbosch &van Kesteren	.9

2.4.4 Target leaf spot (<i>Bipolaris sorgnicola</i> (Lefebvre & Snerwin) Alcorn)	
	10
2.4.5 Anthracnose (Colletotrichum graminicola (Cesati) G. W. Wilson)	10
2.4.6 Head blight and stalk rot (Fusarium moniliforme J. Sheldon)	12
2.4.7 Sorghum smuts.	13
2.4.7.1 Covered Kernel Smut (Sphacelotheca sorghi (Link)	
G. P. Clinton)	13
2.4.7.2 Loose Kernel Smut (S. cruenta)	14
2.4.7.3 Head smut (S. reiliana (Kohn) G.P. Clinton)	15
2.5 Economic significance of sorghum seed borne diseases	16
2.6 Seed retention by smallholder farmers.	16
2.7 Seed health testing.	17
2.7.1 Seed visual examination.	17
2.7.2 Incubation tests	18
2.7.2.1 Temperature	18
2.7.2.2 Humidity	18
2.7.2.3 Light	19
CHAPTER 3.	20
MATERIALS AND METHODS	
3.1 Collection of seed samples.	20
3.2 Laboratory seed quality tests on sampled seed	20
3.2.1 Visual inspection of dry seed	20

3.2.2 Seed germination tests.	21
3.2.3 Detection of seed borne fungal pathogens using the blotter test	22
2.3.4 Seedling symptom tests	22
3.3 Field trials	23
3.4 Seed quality test on harvested seed samples	24
3.5 Data analysis.	24
CHAPTER 4	25
RESULTS	
4.1 Inspection of dry seed samples.	25
4.2 Seed germination tests	26
4.3 Identification of seed borne fungal pathogens – blotter test	28
4.4 The effect of seed selection on percentage normal germination and inciden	ce of
seed borne pathogens	29
4.5 <i>P. sorghina</i> transmission efficiency – seedling symptom test	31
4.6 Comparison of pathogen incidence in the original and harvested seed	
samples –blotter test	32
4.7 Field trial results	33
CHAPTER 5	40
DISCUSSION	
CHAPTER 6	47
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
6.1 Conclusions.	47
6.2 Recommendations	47

REFERENCES	48
APPENDICES.	53

TABLES

Table 4.1: Mean germination for the original samples before selection	.27
Table 4.2: Mean seed infection for the pathogens detected on the seeds of the original	
samples	28
Table 4.3: The effect of visual seed selection on percentage normal germination and	
incidence of seed borne pathogens	28
Table 4.4: P. sorghina transmission efficiency and comparison of P. sorghina incidence	
in original and harvested samples.	30
Table 4.5: Mean pathogen incidence for the pathogen on original and harvested samples	
	32
Table 4.6: Mean area under disease progress curve and yield for the samples	
	38

FIGURES

Fig 4.1:	Mean percentage seed weight appearance for the sample categories	25
Fig 4.2:	Mean percentage seed weight appearance for the sample categories	
		26
Fig 4.3:	Sorghum leaves showing symptoms of anthracnose (Colletotrichum graminicola)
		34
Fig 4.4:	Sorghum leaves with grey leaf spot (Cercospora sorghi)	35
Fig 4.5:	Sorghum leaves infected by leaf blight (<i>Phoma sorghina</i>)	36
Fig 4.6:	Sorghum head with covered kernel smut (Sphacelotheca sorghi)	37

APPENDICES

Appendix 1A: Analysis of Variance for normal seedlings
Appendix 1B: Analysis of Variance for abnormal seedlings
Appendix 1C: Analysis of Variance for ungerminated diseased seeds
Appendix 1D: Analysis of Variance for ungerminated uninfected seeds
Appendix 1E: Analysis of Variance for <i>Fusarium</i> spp. (Blotter test) – original samples 53
Appendix 1F: Analysis of Variance for <i>Cercopora</i> spp. (Blotter test) – original samples 53
Appendix 1G: Analysis of Variance for <i>P. sorghina</i> (Blotter test) – original samples54
Appendix 1X: Analysis of Variance for <i>Bipolaris</i> spp. (Blotter test) – original samples 54
Appendix 1I: Analysis of Variance for <i>Curvularia</i> spp. (Blotter test) – original samples 54
Appendix 1J: Analysis of Variance for <i>Exserohilum</i> spp. (Blotter test) – original samples. 54
Appendix 1K: Analysis of Variance for <i>Fusarium</i> spp. (Blotter test) – harvested samples54
Appendix 1L: Analysis of Variance for <i>Cercospora</i> spp. (Blotter test) – harvested samples
54
Appendix 1M: Analysis of Variance for <i>P. sorghina</i> (Blotter test) – harvested samples
55
Appendix 1N: Analysis of Variance for <i>Bipolaris</i> spp. (Blotter test) – harvested samples 55
Appendix 10: Analysis of Variance for <i>Curvularia</i> spp. (Blotter test) – harvested samples
55
Appendix 1P: Analysis of Variance for AUDPC for Anthracnose (Colletotrichum
graminicola)55
Appendix 1Q: Analysis of Variance for AUDPC for grey leaf spot (Cercospora sorghi)55

Appendix 14: Mean infection for the harvested samples (Blotter test) – <i>P. sorghina</i> 61
Appendix 15: Mean infection for the harvested samples (Blotter test) – <i>Bipolaris spp</i> 62
Appendix 16: Mean infection for the harvested samples (Blotter test) – <i>Curvularia spp</i> 62
Appendix 17: Raw data to show the effect of seed selection on percentage normal
germination
Appendix 18: Effect of seed selection on <i>Fusarium</i> spp. incidence on seeds – Blotter test. 63
Appendix 19: Effect of seed selection on <i>Cercospora</i> spp. incidence on seeds – Blotter test
63
Appendix 20: Effect of seed selection on <i>P. sorghina</i> incidence on seeds – Blotter
test
Appendix 21: Effect of seed selection on <i>Curvularia</i> spp. incidence on seeds – Blotter test
63
Appendix 22: Effect of seed selection on <i>Bipolaris</i> spp. incidence on seeds – Blotter test
64
Appendix 23: Area under disease progress curves for anthracnose (Colletotrichum
graminicola)64
Appendix 24: Area under disease progress curves for grey leaf spot (Cercospora sorghi) 64
Appendix 25: Area under disease progress curves for leaf blight (<i>P. sorghina</i>)
Appendix 26: Percentage incidence for covered kernel smut – field trial
Appendix 27: Yield for the field trial 65
Appendix 28: Disease scoring system (Ngwira and Pixley, 1998)
Appendix 29: Average monthly temperature and rainfall data for the year 2004