



Field Evaluation of Indofil M-45 against Fruit Rot (*Colletotrichum* sp.) Leaf Spot (*Alternaria* and *Cercospora*) Disease of Pomegranate

Suresh D. Ekabote^{a*}, Pruthviraj^b, U. Divyajyothi^c and S. O. Nalina^d

^a Department of Horticulture Crop Protection, College of Horticulture, Hiriyyur, UAHS, Shivamogga, India.

^b Department of Plant Pathology, College of Agriculture, Shivamogga, UAHS, Shivamogga, India.

^c ZBNF, ZAHRS, Babbur Farm, Hiriyyur, India.

^d Department of Horticulture Crop Protection, College of Horticulture, Hiriyyur, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. Author SDE designed the study, performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Authors Pruthviraj and UD managed the analyses of the study. Author SON managed the literature searches. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IRJPAC/2021/v22i1230454

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/65689>

Original Research Article

Received 27 December 2020

Accepted 01 March 2021

Published 30 December 2021

ABSTRACT

The pomegranate (*Punica granatum* L.), is one of the ancient and highly praised favorite fruit belongs family Lythraceae of Myrtales order which is mainly grown in tropical and subtropical regions of the world. In recent years for the successful cultivation of pomegranate, faced by many constraints, among them, pest and diseases are the major ones. Common pathogens of pomegranate leaf and fruits include Anthracnose and Cercospora and Alternaria leaf spot and these pathogens cause severe loss to pomegranate crop. Therefore, a field experiment was carried out on the effect of Indofil M- 45 against leaf spots and fruit rot of pomegranate during 2018-19 and 2019-2020 at College of Horticulture, Hiriyyur. Experimental results revealed that all the treatments significantly reduced the leaf spots and fruit rot disease severity over untreated control. Amongst all the treatments in both seasons. Indofil M-45 at 4 gm/liter was most effective in management leaf spots (15.50 and 16.17 PDI), anthracnose (10.55 and 8.33 PDI) with a yield of 4.18 tons/ha and 3.59 tons/ ha respectively followed by the same fungicides at 3.00gm/liter.

*Corresponding author: E-mail: sureshaekabote@gmail.com;

Keywords: Pomegranate; anthracnose; Cercospora and Alternaria leaf spot and Indofil M-45.

1. INTRODUCTION

Pomegranate (*Punica granatum* L.) is one of the oldest known edible fruits and is capable of growing in different agro-climatic conditions ranging from tropical to sub-tropical [1,2]. Though, it is native of Iran but cultivated extensively in Mediterranean and central Asian countries. It is highly suitable for growing under arid and semiarid regions due to its versatile adaptability, hardy nature, low-cost maintenance and high returns. In the recent past its wide significance in health, nutrition and livelihood security has been recognized which resulted in heavy demand for fruit consumption not only in India but throughout the globe. In India, pomegranate is commercially cultivated in Maharashtra, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh and the most important cultivar in this pomegranate belt is 'Bhagwa' which covers around 80% area under pomegranate in Maharashtra [3-5]. In last two decades, its cultivation has popularized in arid and semi-arid regions of India, not only because of its sweet acidic taste, precocious bearing, and better shelf-life but as a remunerative crop as well [6]. Among these leaf/fruit spot caused by various organisms such as, *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides*, *Cercospora punicae*, *Alternaria alternata*, *Sphaceloma punicae*, *Drechslera* sp., and *Phomopsis* sp., take a heavy toll on the crop [7]. This results in drastic reduction in the yield as well as ultimate marketability by way of severe spotting of the produce. Several conventional fungicides are being used by the farmers with no avail. Hence there is a need to explore chemical formulations with higher doses, which are highly

efficient in managing these diseases effectively. Hence an attempt was made to identify the performance of the higher dose molecules against the leaf spots and fruit rot of pomegranate.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Field experiment was conducted in two *Kharif* cropping seasons of 2018-19 and 2019-20 on the management of anthracnose (*Colletotrichum gloeosporioides*), *Cercospora* and *Alternaria* leaf spot (*Cercospora punicae* and (*Alternaria* spp.) on pomegranate crop at College of Horticulture, Hiriyr, UAHS, Shivamogga, Karnataka. The soil of the experimental field was red sandy loam which was acidic to neutral in reaction. The experiment was laid out with Randomized Block Design (RBD). The experiment consists of 5 treatments including control and were laid out in plots with size 8m X 6 m (48 m²) with spacing 12 ft X 10 ft and the variety used was Super Bhagwa. The treatment fungicides were applied to the Pomegranate field at beginning of the disease's appearance. The spray schedule was repeated at 15 days intervals. The observation of incidence of Leaf spots, Fruit spots and Anthracnose diseases was assessed by using the 1-9 score chart and the percent disease index (PDI) was calculated for each spray as under.

The percent disease index (PDI) was calculated by the following formula which was given by Wheeler [8] and Fruit yield per plant wise were recorded.

$$\text{Per cent disease index (PDI)} = \frac{\text{Sum of the individual disease ratings}}{\text{Number of leaves/fruits observed}} \times \frac{100}{\text{Maximum disease grade}}$$

Chart 1. Treatment details along with checks

Treatments	Formulation (ml or g/litre)
1 Indofil M-45	2.0
2 Indofil M-45	3.0
3 Indofil M-45	4.0
4 Propineb 70% WP	3.0
5 Untreated check	NA

Chart 2. Phytotoxicity

Sl. No	Treatments	Formulation (ml/g/Litre)
1	Indofil M-45	2.0g
2	Indofil M-45	3.0g
3	Indofil M-45	4.0 g
4	Untreated check	NA
5	Indofil M-45	8.0 g
6	Indofil M-45	16.0 g

Chart 3. Scores for phytotoxicity

Sr.	Phytotoxicity (%)	Score
1	No phytotoxicity	0
2	0-10	1
3	11-20	2
4	21-30	3
5	31-40	4
6	41-50	5
7	51-60	6
8	61-70	7
9	71-80	8
10	81-90	9
11	91-100	10

2.1 Phytotoxicity on Pomegranate crop

Phytotoxicity observations were recorded at 0, 1, 3, 5, 7 & 10 days after each spray of different treatments as per phytotoxicity parameters.

2.2 Statistical Analysis

The experimental data collected were analyzed statistically for its significance of difference by the normal statistical procedure adopted for randomized block design. Data from the percent disease index and yield were analyzed by ANOVA. Percent data were transformed arcsine where necessary. Differences within the means were compared by using Fisher's LSD (Least Significant Difference) test [9]. The level of significance used in 'F' and 'T' test was P = 0.05 and P = 0.01. Critical differences were calculated wherever 'F' test was significant. The values percent disease index was subjected to angular transformation according to the table given by Sundarraaj et al. [10].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Efficacy of Indofil M-45 against Fruit rot (*Colletotrichum* sp.) Disease of Pomegranate during 2018-19 and 2019-2020

The efficacy of the different treatments during three sprays against fruit rot (*Colletotrichum* Sp.)

in Pomegranate during 2018-19 is presented in Table 1.

Before the spray, the infestation of Fruit rot (*Colletotrichum* Sp.) was uniform in all the treatments and ranged PDI between 0.82 and 1.0. At 10 days after first application, Indofil M-45, the at 4.0 gm/liter was found superior in reducing the fruit rot incidence (3.58 PDI) of Pomegranate followed by Propineb 70% WP at 3.0 gm/lit (5.50 PDI). These were superior over rest of the treatments and these were followed by Indofil M-45 at 3.0 gm/liter recorded 6.28 PDI and IFC017 Indofil M-45 at 2.0 gm/liter recorded PDI 7.10 PDI. However, the untreated check recorded the highest fruit rot incidence by showing 15.13 PDI.

After second spray the treatment with Indofil M-45 at 4gm/liter was recorded 7.13 and Propineb at 3.0 gm/lit recorded 8.45 PDI respectively and were superior over the rest of the treatments. However, the untreated check recorded the highest fruit rot incidence by showing 25.63 PDI.

After the third spray schedule similar trend in the efficacy of treatments was recorded, wherein, Indofil M-45 at 4 gm/liter was recorded lowest fruit rot disease incidence caused by *Colletotrichum* sp. with 10.55 PDI and this plot recorded 76.22 percent reduction of disease over control plot which was followed by Propineb 70%

WP which recorded PDI of 14.45 and Indofil M-45 at 3 gm/liter and 2 gm/liter recorded PDI of 15.75 and 16.23 respectively. However, the highest disease incidence was recorded in the untreated check (45.50 PDI).

The efficacy of the different treatments during three sprays against fruit rot (*Colletotrichum* Sp.) in Pomegranate during 2019-20 is presented in Table 2.

Before the spray, the infestation of Fruit rot (*Colletotrichum* Sp.) was uniform in all the treatments and ranged PDI between 0.57 and 0.82. At 10 days after first application of Indofil M-45, the at 4.0 gm/liter was found superior in reducing the fruit rot incidence of Pomegranate followed by Propineb 70% WP at 3.0 gm/lit (5.20 PDI). Then Indofil M-45 at 3.0 gm/liter recorded 6.83 PDI. These were superior over rest of the treatments and these were followed by Indofil M-45 at 2.0 gm/liter (7.10 PDI). However, the untreated check recorded highest fruit rot incidence by showing 15.13 PDI.

After second spray the treatment with Indofil M-45 at 4gm/liter was recorded PDI 5.78 and it was superior over rest of the treatments and Propineb at 3.0 gm/lit recorded 10.13 PDI. However, the untreated check recorded the highest fruit rot incidence by showing 27.50 PDI.

After the third spray schedule similar trend in the efficacy of treatments was recorded wherein, Indofil M-45 at 4 gm/liter was recorded lowest fruit rot disease incidence caused by *Colletotrichum* sp. with 8.33 PDI which was followed by Propineb 70% WP which recorded PDI of 15.85 and Indofil M-45 at 3 gm/liter and 2 gm/liter recorded PDI of 16.52 and 17.48 respectively. However, highest disease incidence was recorded in the untreated check (45.50 PDI).

3.2 Efficacy of Indofil M-45 against Leaf spot (*Alternaria* and *Cercospora*) Disease of Pomegranate during 2018-19 and 2019-2020

The efficacy of the different treatments during three sprays against Leaf spot (*Alternaria* and *Cercospora*) in Pomegranate during 2018-19 is presented in Table 3.

Before the spray, the infestation of Leaf spot (*Alternaria* and *Cercospora*) was uniform in all the treatments and ranged PDI between 0.82 and 1.00. At 10 days after first application, Indofil

M-45 at 4.0 gm/liter and 3.0 gm/liter were found superior in reducing the leaf spot incidence (3.63 PDI and 3.88) of Pomegranate respectively which were superior over other treatments which were followed by Propineb 70% WP at 3.0 g/lit (5.25 PDI). Then Indofil M-45 at 2.0 gm/liter recorded 7.28 PDI. However, the untreated check recorded the highest fruit rot incidence by showing 14.75 PDI.

After second spray the treatment with Indofil M-45 at 4 gm/liter and 3 gm/liter recorded PDI of 8.41 and 9.08 respectively which was followed by Propineb at 3.0 gm/lit recorded 10.35 PDI and were superior over rest of the treatments. However, the untreated check recorded highest fruit rot incidence by showing 25.25 PDI.

After third spray schedule similar trend in the efficacy of treatments was recorded wherein, Indofil M-45 at 4gm/liter and 3gm/liter was recorded lowest leaf spot disease incidence caused by *Alternaria* and *Cercospora* with 15.50 and 16.27 PDI respectively which was followed by Propineb 70% WP which recorded PDI of 17.40 and Indofil M-45 2 gm/liter recorded PDI of 19.15. However, the highest disease incidence was recorded in the untreated check (44.13 PDI) and in the plot treated with IFC017 (Indofil M-45) at 4gm/liter recorded 64.87 percent disease reduction over control.

The efficacy of the different treatment during three sprays against Leaf spot (*Alternaria* and *Cercospora*) in Pomegranate during 2019-20 is presented in Table 4.

Before the spray, the infestation of Leaf spot (*Alternaria* and *Cercospora*) was uniform in all the treatments and ranged PDI between 0.57 and 0.82. At 10 days after first application of Indofil M-45, at 4.0 gm/liter and 3.0 gm/liter were found superior in reducing the leaf spot incidence (3.55 PDI and 3.73 PDI) of Pomegranate followed by Propineb 70% WP at 3.0 g/lit (5.30 PDI). Then Indofil M-45 at 2.0 gm/liter recorded 6.78 PDI. The untreated check recorded the highest fruit rot incidence by showing 14.88 PDI.

Similar trend in the efficacy of different treatment was recorded after second spray, wherein after second spray the treatment with Indofil M-45 at 4gm/liter and 3 gm/liter recorded PDI of 9.45 and 9.89 respectively and were superior over rest of the treatments which was then followed by Propineb at 3.0 gm/lit which recorded PDI 11.63. However, the untreated check recorded the highest fruit rot incidence by showing 27.38 PDI.

After the third spray schedule similar trend in the efficacy of treatments was recorded wherein, Indofil M-45 at 4gm/liter and 3gm/liter recorded lowest leaf spot disease incidence caused by *Alternaria* and *Cercospora* with 16.13 and 16.82 PDI respectively which was followed by Propineb 70% WP which recorded PDI of 20.23 and Indofil M-45 at 2 gm/liter recorded PDI of 23.50. However, the highest disease incidence was recorded in the untreated check (45.25 PDI).

3.2.1 Fruit yield

The efficacy of the different treatments during three applications was found a difference in Pomegranate yield per plant during 2018-19 is presented in Table 1.

Application of Indofil M-45, the at 4.0 ml/liter recorded higher pomegranate fruit yield of 4.18 tons/ha and this treatment remained statistically superior over all the treatment. Propineb 70% WP at 3g/liter which has given yield of 3.58 tons/ha and Indofil M-45 at 3 ml/liter recorded fruit yield of 3.38 tons/ha where these two treatments were on par with each other. These were followed by the application of Indofil M-45 2ml/liter (3.19 tons/ha). However, lowest yield was recorded in the untreated check (2.32 tons/ha).

The efficacy of the different treatments during three applications were found a difference in Pomegranate yield per plant during 2019-20 is presented in Table 2.

Application of Indofil M-45, at 4.0 gm/liter recorded higher pomegranate fruit yield of 3.59 tons/ha and was on par with Propineb 70% WP at 3gm/liter which has given yield of 3.08 tons/ha. Both the treatments remained statistically superior over all the treatments. These were followed by the application of Indofil M-45 at 3 gm/liter and 2 gm/liter (2.97 tons/ha and 2.52 tons/ha). However, lowest yield was recorded in the untreated check (2.13 tons/ha).

3.3 Phytotoxic Effect of Indofil M-45 for Phytotoxicity on Pomegranate Crop during 2018-19 and 2019-2020

Application of Indofil M-45 at 16.0 gm/liter, 8.0 gm/ liter, 4 gm/liter, 3 gm/liter and 2gm/liter dose rates and other tested chemicals for its phytotoxicity studies did not shown any phytotoxic symptoms like leaf injury, wilting, vein clearing, necrosis, epinasty and hyponasty at any days after treatments on pomegranate crop (Table 5).

Navale et al. [11] found that Mancozeb, Copper oxy chloride, Ziram and Captan as the best fungicides for controlling leaf spot and fruit spots of pomegranate in mrigbahar caused by *Alternaria alternata*, *Cercospora* sp., *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides*. The present findings were also in agreement with the work of Gowder et al. (2017), Sachin and Sandeep [12], Yadav et al. [13] and Jayalakshmi et al. [14]. Mancozeb due to the reason of that being contact fungicide Mancozeb persist long on the stem [15-17] and plots that applied with longer intervals were protected. Mancozeb itself is not fungicidal and can effectively be considered a pro-fungicide which, when exposed to water, breaks down to release ethylene bis isothiocyanate sulfide (EBIS), which is then converted viz., the action of UV light into ethylene bisisothiocyanate (EBI). Both EBIS and EBI are believed to be active toxicants and are thought to interfere with enzymes containing sulphhydryl groups.

This fatal disruption of core enzymatic processes is postulated to inhibit or interfere with at least six different biochemical processes within the fungal cell cytoplasm and mitochondria [18].

The direct effect of mancozeb upon core biochemical processes within the fungus results in inhibition of spore germination [19-21]. Mancozeb displays the characteristics of a typical multi-site protectant-only fungicide, in that following application onto the target plant, the compound remains on the leaf surface and does not penetrate through the cuticle to where systemic redistribution can occur [18]. Fortunately, mancozeb has an excellent record of crop safety over a wide range of crops and environmental conditions. Mancozeb does not show curative properties when sprayed onto plants where the disease has already been established. It is assumed this is because disease is already established inside the plant tissue where mancozeb cannot penetrate.

The rate of breakdown of mancozeb into EBIS and EBI can directly affect the residual activity of the compound on plant foliage. Each mancozeb particle consists of a zinc-rich shell surrounding a central nucleus of polymer-structured EBDC. This structure is extremely stable, and the low solubility of the zinc shell means EBDC can pass through this layer and be deposited on the leaf surface at a controlled rate [18]. Thus, the results of earlier workers are also in line with the results obtained in the present investigations.

Table 1. Bio-efficacy of Indofil M-45 against Fruit Rot (*Colletotrichum* sp.) disease of pomegranate during 2018-19

Tr. No.	Treatments	Dose Formulation (g or ml/liter)	Before spray	PDI 10 days after			% Reduction over control after 3 rd spray	Yield tons/ha
				First spray	Second spray	Third spray		
T1	Indofil M-45	2.0	0.82 (4.93)	6.53* (14.79)	10.50 (18.89)	16.23 (23.76)	63.43	3.19 (10.12)
T2	Indofil M-45	3.0	0.82 (4.93)	6.28 (14.49)	10.25 (18.68)	15.75 (23.38)	64.50	3.38 (10.52)
T3	Indofil M-45	4.0	1.00 (5.97)	3.58 (10.89)	7.13 (15.47)	10.55 (18.96)	76.22	4.18 (11.74)
T4	Propineb 70% WP	3.0	0.98 (5.61)	5.50 (13.56)	8.45 (16.85)	14.45 (22.34)	67.43	3.58 (11.09)
T5	Untreated check	NA	0.94 (5.74)	15.00 (22.79)	25.63 (30.41)	44.38 (41.77)	0.00	2.32 (8.77)
	CDat5%		NS	1.20	1.50	1.13	-	0.99
	SEM		NS	0.38	0.48	0.36	-	0.32

* Mean of three replication PDI- Per cent Disease Index; The values in the parenthesis are arc sine transformed

Table 2. Bio-efficacy of Indofil M-45 against Fruit Rot (*Colletotrichum* sp.) disease of pomegranate during 2019-20

Tr. No.	Treatments	Dose Formulation (gm or ml/liter)	Before spray	PDI 10 days after			% Reduction over control after 3 rd spray	Yield tons/ha
				First spray	Second spray	Third spray		
T1	Indofil M-45	2.0	0.82* (4.93)	6.78 (15.06)	13.93 (21.89)	23.50 (29.00)	48.06	2.52 (9.12)
T2	Indofil M-45	3.0	0.57 (4.62)	3.73 (11.12)	9.89 (18.33)	16.82 (24.21)	62.84	2.97 (9.91)
T3	Indofil M-45	4.0	0.63 (4.22)	3.55 (10.85)	9.45 (17.91)	16.17 (23.71)	64.28	3.59 (10.92)
T4	Propineb 70% WP	3.0	0.63 (4.62)	5.30 (13.3)	11.63 (19.82)	20.23 (26.72)	55.30	3.08 (10.10)
T5	Untreated check	NA	0.75 (4.62)	14.88 (22.69)	27.38 (31.55)	45.25 (42.28)	0.000	2.13 (8.35)
	CDat5%		NS	1.29	2.08	1.11	-	0.81
	SEM		NS	0.42	0.67	0.36	-	0.26

* Mean of three replication PDI- Per cent Disease Index; The values in the parenthesis are arc sine transformed

Table 3. Bio-efficacy of Indofil M-45 against Leaf spot (*Alternaria* and *Cercospora*) disease of Pomegranate during 2018-19

Tr. No.	Treatments	Dose Formulation (gm or ml/liter)	Before spray	PDI 10 days after			% Reduction over control after 3 rd spray	Yield tons/ha
				First spray	Second spray	Third spray		
T1	Indofil M-45	2.0	0.82* (4.93)	7.10 (15.46)	11.43 (19.76)	17.48 (24.71)	61.59	2.52 (9.12)
T2	Indofil M-45	3.0	0.57 (4.62)	6.83 (15.14)	11.04 (19.38)	16.52 (23.98)	63.70	2.97 (9.91)
T3	Indofil M-45	4.0	0.63 (4.22)	3.58 (10.89)	5.78 (13.90)	8.33 (16.77)	81.70	3.59 (10.92)
T4	Propineb 70% WP	3.0	0.63 (4.62)	5.20 (13.17)	10.13 (18.54)	15.85 (23.47)	65.16	3.08 (10.10)
T5	Untreated check	NA	0.75 (4.62)	15.13 (22.89)	27.50 (31.63)	45.50 (42.42)	0.00	2.13 (8.35)
	CDat5%		NS	0.97	1.45	1.03	-	0.81
	SEM		NS	0.31	0.47	0.33	-	0.26

* Mean of three replication PDI- Per cent Disease Index; The values in the parenthesis are arc sine transformed

Table 4. Bio-efficacy of Indofil M-45 against Leaf spot (*Alternaria* and *Cercospora*) disease of Pomegranate during 2019-2020

Tr. No.	Treatments	Dose Formulation (gm or ml/liter)	Before spray	PDI 10 days after			% Reduction over control after 3 rd spray	Yield tons/ha
				First spray	Second spray	Third spray		
T1	Indofil M-45	2.0	0.82* (4.93)	7.28 (15.65)	14.13 (22.07)	19.15 (25.92)	56.60	3.19 (10.12)
T2	Indofil M-45	3.0	0.82 (4.93)	3.88 (11.34)	9.08 (17.53)	16.27 (23.79)	63.12	3.38 (10.52)
T3	Indofil M-45	4.0	1.00 (5.97)	3.63 (10.96)	8.41 (16.85)	15.50 (23.19)	64.87	4.18 (11.74)
T4	Propineb 70% WP	3.0	0.98 (5.61)	5.25 (13.23)	10.35 (18.77)	17.40 (24.66)	60.56	3.58 (11.09)
T5	Untreated check	NA	0.94 (5.74)	14.75 (22.59)	25.25 (30.17)	44.13 (41.63)	0.00	2.32 (8.77)
	CDat5%		NS	0.98	0.96	1.66	-	0.99
	SEM		NS	0.28	0.31	0.53	-	0.32

* Mean of three replication PDI- Per cent Disease Index; The values in the parenthesis are arc sine transformed

Table 5. Evaluation of IFC017 (Indofil M-45) for Phytotoxicity of Pomegranate during 2018-19 and 2019-2020

SI.No.	Treatments	Dosage (gm /lt)	Phytotoxicity observations at 0, 1, 3, 5, 7 & 10 days after application (Scale: 0-9)																				
			Leaf tip injury			Wilting			Vein clearing			Necrosis			Epinasty			Yellowing			Hyponasty		
			R ₁	R ₂	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R ₂	R ₃	R ₁	R ₂
T1	Indofil M-45	2.0g	00	00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	00	00	00	00	00	
T2	Indofil M-45	3.0g	00	00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	00	00	00	00	00	
T3	Indofil M-45	4.0 g	00	00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	00	00	00	00	00	
T5	Untreated check	NA	00	00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	00	00	00	00	00	
T6	Indofil M-45	8.0 g	00	00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	00	00	00	00	00	
T7	Indofil M-45	16.0 g	00	00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	00	00	00	00	00	

4. CONCLUSION

This study shows that the all treatments significantly reduced the leaf spots and fruit rot disease severity over untreated control. Amongst all the treatments in both seasons. Indofil M-45 at 3.00 gm/liter was most effective in management of leaf spots (15.50 and 16.17 PDI), anthracnose (10.55 and 8.33 PDI) with a yield of 4.18 tons/ha and 3.59 tons/ha respectively followed by the same fungicides at 3.00gm/liter.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

- Levin GM. Pomegranate (1st Edn.), Third Millennium Publishing, East Libra Drive Tempe, AZ. 2006;13-120.
- Jalil SH. Linked dominant alleles of inter-locus interaction results in a major shift in pomegranate fruit acidity of Ganesh and Kabul Yellow. *Euphytica*. 2007;158: 201-207.
- Bassiri-Jahromi S. Punica granatum (Pomegranate) activity in health promotion and cancer prevention. *Oncol Rev*. 2018; 12(1):345.
- Castagna F, Britti D, Oliverio M, Bosco A, Bonacci S, Iriti G, et al. In Vitro Anthelmintic Efficacy of Aqueous Pomegranate (*Punica granatum* L.) Extracts against Gastrointestinal Nematodes of Sheep. *Pathogens*. 2020; 9(12):1063.
- Wang D, Ozen C, Abu-Reidah IM, Chigurupati S, Petra JK, Horbanczuk JO, et al. Vasculoprotective Effects of Pomegranate (*Punica granatum* L.). *Front Pharmacol*. 2018;9:544.
- Anonymous. Improved Cultivation Practices for Horticulture Crops. University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad, India. 2004;470.
- Jamadar MM, Patil DR. Bio-efficacy of New formulations against leaf/fruit spot on pomegranate. *Karnataka J Agric Sci*. 2007; 20(4):865-866.
- Wheeler BEJ. An Introduction to Plant Diseases, John Wiley and Sons Ltd. London. 1969;301.
- Walter PF. Experimental design theory and application. 3rd Edition, New York; 1997.
- Sundarraj N, Nagaraja S, Venkataramu MS, Jaganath MK. Design and analysis of field experiments. Mysore; 1974.
- Navale AM, Padule DN, Kaulgud SN. Efficacy of different fungicides against leaf and spots of pomegranate in MrigBahar. *J. Maharashtra Agric. Univ*. 1998;23(3): 251-253.
- Sachin U, Sandeep M. Evaluation of new fungicides for the management of neck blast in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Himachal J Agric Res*. 2016;42(1):114-116.
- Yadav RK, Singh A, Jain S, Dhath AH. Management of purple blotch of onion in Punjab. *Int J Appl Sci Biotechnol*. 2017; 5(4):454-465.
- Jayalakshmi K, Raju J, Ravindra H. Evaluation of Fungicides against *Phytophthora nicotianae* causing black shank disease in FCV tobacco both under *In vitro* and *In vivo*. *Int J Curr Microbiol Appl Sci*. 2017;6(7):2440-2446.
- Suryanarayana V, Rajarao D. Indian tobacco literature. Central Tobacco Research Institute. 1988;1:26-30.
- Amrinder Kaur KS, Vermaand SK. Thind. Evaluation of fungicides against citrus foot rot (*Phytophthora nicotianae* var. *parasitica*). *PI dis Res*. 2009;24(1):19-22.
- Ghazanfar MU, Sahi ST, Wakil W, Iqbal Z. Evaluation of various fungicides for the management of late blight of potato (*Phytophthora infestans*). *Pakistan J Phytopathol*. 2010;22(2):83-88.
- Kaars Sijpesteijn A. Mechanism of action of fungicides: Fungicide Resistance in Crop Plants. J Dekker and SG. Georgopoulos, eds. Center for Agricultural Publishing and Documentation, Wageningen, the Netherlands. 1982;32-45.
- Tate KG, Wood PN, Field evaluation of fungicides for control of peach leaf curl (*Taphrina deformans*). *Proc. 47th N. Z. Plant Prot Conf*. 1994;289-293.
- Wicks T, Lee TC. Evaluation of fungicides applied after infection for control of *Plasmopara viticola* on grapevine. *PI Dis*. 1982;66:839-841.

21. Wong FP, Wilcox WF. Comparative physical modes of action of azoxystrobin, mancozeb, and metalaxyl against *Plasmopara viticola* (grapevine downy mildew). PI Dis. 2001;85:649-656.

© 2022 Ekabote et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/65689>