

1 **Halo tolerance of Biocontrol Agents against Root Rot of Mung bean**  
2 **(*Vigna radiata* (L.) Wilczek var. *radiata*) Caused by *Macrophomina***  
3 ***phaseolina* (Tassi) Goid in Salt Affected Soils**

4 **P.T. Sharavanan <sup>1\*</sup>, V. K.Satya <sup>2</sup> and M. Rajesh <sup>2</sup>**

5  
6 <sup>1</sup>*Centre of Excellence in Millets*

7 *TNAU, Thiruvannamalai- 606 603, India*

8  
9 <sup>2</sup>*Dept of Plant Protection, Anbil Dharmalingam Agricultural College and Research Institute*

10 *TNAU, Tiruchirapallai -620 027, India*

11  
12  
13  
14 **ABSTRACT**

Root rot of mung bean [*Vigna radiata* (L.) Wilczek var. *radiata*] is major disease and claims huge yield loss if they occur in the field. The pathogen is basically soil borne and survivability may vary depends on soil condition. The fungicide chemicals are available to manage the disease; however, the biocontrol agents are nowadays available for the disease management and the microbial activity of the biocontrol agents is influenced by existing soil condition including soil pH. Hence, a study was conducted to find out the halo tolerance capacity of the biocontrol agents against root rot disease in salt affected soils under *in vitro*, *in vivo* and field condition. The root rot pathogen *Macrophomina phaseolina* was isolated from infected root. Efficacy of biocontrol agents against

<sup>1,2</sup> Assistant Professors (Plant Pathology)

growth of *M. phaseolina* was assessed *in vitro*. The results revealed that TNAU strain of *Bacillus subtilis* reduced the mycelial growth of the *M. phaseolina* significantly when media supplemented with NaCl at 5% (1.4 cm), 7.5% (1.5 cm), 10% (1.6cm) and 12.5% (1.6 cm) and without NaCl (1.2 cm) and similar trend of reduction also expressed by BCA1 strain of *B. subtilis*, *Pseudomonas fluorescens* and *Trichoderma viride* under *in vitro*. The performance of the biocontrol agents against the pathogen is slightly reduced when media supplemented with NaCl. The reduction of mycelia weight of *M.phaeolina* was more in media added with TNAU strain of *B.subtilis* and the performance of TNAU strain of *B.subtilis* on reduction of mycelial weight of *M.phaseolina* is reduced when the broth added with NaCl at 5% (3.15g), 7.5% (3.25g), 10% (3.32g) and 12.5%(3.65g) level and which is followed by *P. fluorescens*, BCA 1 strain of *B. subtilis* and *Trichoderma viride*. Under pot culture conditions, the effect of talc formulated biocontrol agents and challenge inoculation with pathogen was assessed against root rot incidence. It was found that the soil application of TNAU strain of *B.subtilis* performed better in reducing the root rot incidence at pH of 7.0 (2.37%), 7.5 (4.50%), 8.0 (5.53%) and 8.7 (6.57%) and followed by BCA 1 of *B.subtilis* in all pH level. Among the biocontrol agents, TNAU strain of *B.subtilis* applied as seed as well as soil application expressed more population in the rhizosphere in all pH level. The biocontrol agents applied as soil application had more populations of the agents in the soil when compared to seed treatment. The halo tolerance performance of the biocontrol agents was also assessed under field condition in pH of 7.5 and 8.7 during 2019-20 and 2020-21. It was found that the minimum root rot incidence and maximum yield was observed from soil application of TNAU strain of *B subtilis* at 2.5 kg/ha but the effect is on par with soil application of BCA1 strain of *B.subtilis* at 2.5 kg/ha.

15

16 **Key words:** *Vigna radiata*, *Macrophomina phaseolina*, *Biocontrol agents*, *Halo tolerance*, *Salt*  
17 *affected soils*

## 18 **1. INTRODUCTION**

19

20 Mung bean (*Vigna radiate* L) is one of the important pulse crop grown in India and the growth  
21 and yield are being affected by various diseases. Among the diseases in Mung bean, dry root rot

22 caused by *Macrophomina phaseolina* claims yield loss of 10–44% in India [1]. The pathogen is a soil  
23 borne and survives in soil for long period and survivability varied due to salinity of soil. Although  
24 chemicals are available to manage the disease, the biocontrol agents are nowadays available to  
25 contain the pathogenic growth in soil effectively. Beneficial bacteria used as biocontrol agents in  
26 disease management can prevent damage caused by plant pathogens by means of antagonism,  
27 induction of systemic resistance, competition for nutrients and ecological niches, nutrient mobilisation,  
28 phytohormone production and plant growth acceleration [2]. In general, a variety of biotic and abiotic  
29 stresses affect crop productivity, including extreme weather factors, the presence of toxic metals and  
30 organic contaminants in the environment, saline condition and various plant pathogens [3]. Drought  
31 and soil salinity served as limiting factors for crop development and production, especially in arid and  
32 semi-arid environments [4], and had a negative impact on soil microbial complexity, variety,  
33 composition, and functions [5]. In soil, a range of interactions among physical, chemical, and  
34 biological variables play a vital influence in microorganism metabolic activities and are a driving factor  
35 in fundamental metabolic cycles where many enzyme activities occur [6]. The microbial activity of  
36 biocontrol agents and pathogens is frequently influenced by soil salinity and the soil salt level  
37 exceeded, the overall population of bacteria is reduced [7]. The introduced biocontrol agents in soil  
38 ecosystem against plant disease should have capacity to withstand even adverse soil condition. Most  
39 of the *in vivo* as well as field experiments for the development of biocontrol agents against plant  
40 disease were carried out in soil with neutral pH or slightly acidic or basic pH level. The salt stress  
41 affects both the metabolic activity of plant cells and increases the vulnerability of the host plant to  
42 phytopathogen [8]. So, the efficiency of the agents was influenced by salt condition of soil. *P.*  
43 *fluorescens*, *P. trivialis*, *P. putida*, *P. chlororaphis* and *P. extremorientalis* had an antagonistic effect  
44 on *F.solani* in tomato, and the strains produced more indole acetic acid even under saline conditions,  
45 stimulating root growth of the crop against saline conditions [9]. Hence, an elaborate study was  
46 conducted in order to find out the halo tolerance of the biocontrol agents on root rot incidence of mung  
47 bean in salt affected soils.

48

## 49 **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

50

### 51 **2.1 Isolation of *M.phaseolina***

52

53           Root rot infected mung bean plants were collected from the Farm of Anbil Dharmalingam  
54 Agricultural College and Research Institute, Tiruchirapalli, India. The roots showing root rot infection  
55 were initially washed with sterile water and roots were cut into small pieces using a sterile blade and  
56 the pieces were surface sterilized in 0.1 per cent mercuric chloride solution for 30 sec followed by  
57 washing in several changes of sterile distilled water. The surface sterilized pieces were inoculated in  
58 the sterile Petri plates added with sterilized potato dextrose agar (PDA) (20% potato extract, 2%  
59 dextrose, and 1.5% agar) medium under aseptic condition. The inoculated Petri plates were incubated  
60 at room temperature ( $28 \pm 2^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) temperature for five days. After that, the plates observed for the  
61 presence of *M .phaseolina*. Then, the fungus was purified by single spore isolation technique by  
62 transferring a single spore to PDA medium. The purified culture was used for further studies.

63

## 64 **2.2 Preparation of sand maize inoculum of *M.phaseolina***

65

66 The pathogen *M.phaseolina* was multiplied in sand maize medium. Well dried maize grain was  
67 grinded to powder level. The sand was mixed with maize powder @19:1 ratio and sterilized. The  
68 sterilized medium was inoculated with a disc of *M.phaseolina* and incubated for 15 days at room  
69 temperature  $28\pm 2^{\circ}\text{C}$ . Then the well grown medium was used in the study.

70

## 71 **2.3 Isolation of *Bacillus* from rhizosphere of mung bean**

72

73 Rhizosphere soil from mung bean grown in soil with pH of 8.7 in the Farm of Anbil Dharmalingam  
74 Agricultural College and Research Institute, Tiruchirapalli was used for isolation of *Bacillus* spp.  
75 Initially healthy mung bean was pulled and shaken vigorously. Then 10 g of root segments were  
76 excised and taken in a flask containing 100 ml of sterile and shaken for 15 min. The bacteria was  
77 isolated by following serial dilution technique. 0.1 ml of solution was taken in a sterilized Petri plate  
78 and poured with Nutrient Agar medium. The plates were kept for incubation under room temperature  
79 for 36 hours. The growth of the bacteria was observed and colonies of *B. subtilis* was identified.

80

## 81 **2.4 Screening of halophytic capacity of biocontrol agents**

82

83 Screening of salt tolerant capacity of biocontrol agents was carried out under laboratory condition.  
84 TNAU strain of *B. subtilis* and *P. fluorescens* was collected from Department of Plant Protection, Anbil  
85 Dharmalingam Agricultural College and Research Institute, Tiruchirapalli and used in the study. BCA  
86 1 strain of *B.subtilis* was isolated from rhizosphere of mung bean grown in soil with pH of 8.7. Potato  
87 dextrose broth mixed with different concentration of NaCl used for this study. The sterilized Potato  
88 dextrose broth with various concentration of NaCl added with five ml of 48 hours old liquid culture of  
89 *B.subtilis* or *P.fluorescens* or five days old *T.viride* liquid culture. Then 8 mm disc of *M.phaseolina* was  
90 added in the broth and incubated under room temperature ( $28 \pm 2^\circ \text{C}$ ) for seven days. After that the  
91 mycelial growth of *M.phaseolina* was taken from the broth and air dried under shade condition. Then  
92 the weight of the mycelial growth was calculated and expressed as gram of mycelial weight.

93

#### 94 **2.5 Dual culture plate assay**

95

96 The well grown pure culture of the root rot pathogen *M. phaseolina* cultivated on Petri dishes using  
97 standard PDA medium was used in the study. An 8 mm culture disc of the *M.phaseolina* was  
98 inoculated on one side of sterile Petri plate poured with sterilised PDA medium and another side of  
99 plate inoculated with either streaked with bacterial biocontrol agents or 8 mm disc of fungal biocontrol  
100 agents. Then the plates were kept under room temperature ( $28 \pm 2^\circ \text{C}$ ) for 5-7 days. The growth of *M.*  
101 *phaseolina* was measured after incubation and expressed as cm.

102

#### 103 **2.6 Collection of soil samples**

104

105 Soil samples at different pH level collected from farm of Anbil Dharmalingam Agricultural College and  
106 Research Institute, Tiruchirapalli using standard procedure. Initially soil from surface layer removed by  
107 a spade. A "V" shape cut was made to a depth of 15 cm in the sampling area using spade to remove  
108 1 to 2 cm slice of soil. Then the soil was collected and taken in a clean bucket. Likewise, soil samples  
109 were collected from four spotted area in a field. Then soil collected at bucket taken on a clean paper  
110 of cloth and mixed thoroughly. The soil was spread evenly and divided it into four quarters. Two  
111 opposite quarters were discarded and the soil from remaining two sides again mixed thoroughly

112 likewise till soil sample comes to level of 0.5 kg. The soil samples were packed and taken to  
113 laboratory for further studies.

114

## 115 **2.7 Preparation of talc formulation of the biocontrol agents**

116

117 For assessment of efficacy of the biocontrol agents, talc-based formulation of the biocontrol agents  
118 was prepared as per method [10]. Initially sterilized Kings' B medium broth (proteose peptone 20 g, K<sub>2</sub>  
119 HPO<sub>4</sub> 1.5 g, Mg SO<sub>4</sub>.7H<sub>2</sub>O 1.5 g, glycerol 20 ml, water 1000 ml, pH 7.2) inoculated with loopful of the  
120 bacterial biocontrol agents and incubated for 48 hours at room temperature (26±2°C) in a rotary  
121 shaker at 150 rpm/min. Then the well grown bacterial culture was mixed with talc powder @ 2.5 kg/  
122 litre of culture. In order to keep the pH at 7.0, CaCO<sub>3</sub> was added @ 15g /kg of talc powder and talc  
123 formulation containing 10<sup>8</sup> cfu /ml. At time of preparation, the population of bacteria in the formulations  
124 was 10<sup>8</sup> cfu /g of talc powder and fungal biocontrol agents was 10<sup>6</sup>cfu/g of talc powder.

125

## 126 **2.8 *In vivo* assessment of efficacy of the biocontrol agents against root rot pathogen** 127 **in salt affected soils**

128

129 The soil with different pH level was utilized for pot culture experiments under *in vivo*. The collected  
130 soils were sterilized in autoclave at 137.9 kPa for 20 min. The soil was taken in pot @ 12.5 kg/pot and  
131 the seeds of mung bean were sown in the pot soil as per the treatment.

132

### 133 **2.8.1 Seed treatment of the biocontrol agents**

134

135 The seeds of mung bean were treated with the biocontrol agents @ 10 g/kg of seed in case of  
136 *B.subtilis* and *P.fluorescens* and 4g/kg of seed in case of *T.viride* before sowing. The talc formulation  
137 of the biocontrol agents applied @ 5 g/ 12.5 kg of pot soil as soil application of biocontrol agents.  
138 Twelve numbers of treated seeds were sown in Pot.

139

### 140 **2.8.2 Soil application of the biocontrol agents**

141

142 The sand maize inoculum of *M.phaeolina* was also inoculated in the pot @ 5 g/12.5 kg of pot soil. The  
143 talc formulation of the biocontrol agents applied @ 5 g/ 12.5 kg of pot soil as soil application of  
144 biocontrol agents. Twelve numbers of untreated seeds were sown in Pot and they kept in shade net  
145 house and regular watering was done. Each replication contain three pots and four replications were  
146 maintained. The disease development and growth of the crop were recorded at 10 days interval. The  
147 root rot incidence was recorded as per cent disease incidence.

148

### 149 **2.8.3 Population of the biocontrol agents**

150

151 The population of biocontrol agents in the rhizosphere region of the crop was assessed at 15 days  
152 intervals upto 45 days after sowing using serial dilution technique. The population of the biocontrol  
153 agents was expressed as  $\times 10^6$  cfu/g of rhizosphere soil in case of *T.viride* and  $\times 10^8$  cfu/g of  
154 rhizosphere soil in case of *B.subtilis* and *P. fluorescens*.

155

### 156 **2.9 Efficacy of the biocontrol agents against root rot of mung bean in salt affected soil**

157

158 In order to assess the efficacy of the biocontrol agents, two field trials were conducted in soil with pH  
159 7.5 and 8.7 level at the Farm, Anbil Dharmalingam Agricultural College and Research Institute,  
160 Tiruchirapalli during 2019-20 and 2020-21. Following treatments were applied in the trial and the  
161 mung bean variety VBN 5 used in the study.

162

#### **Treatment details**

---

T1: Control

T2: Seed treatment with carbendazim at 2g/kg of seed

T3: Soil drench with copper oxy chloride at 0.3% when infection noticed

T4: Seed treatment with BCA1 strain of *B.subtilis* at 10g/kg of seed

T5: Seed treatment with TNAU strain of *B. subtilis* at 10g/kg of seed

T6: Seed treatment with *T.viride* at 10g/kg of seed

T7: Soil application of BCA1 strain of *B.subtilis* at 2.5 kg/ha

---

---

T8: Soil application of TNAU strain of *B subtilis* at 2.5 kg/ha

T9: Soil application of *T.viride* at 2.5 kg/ha

---

163

164 The crop management practices for mung bean regularly applied in the trial. The crop was monitored  
165 for root rot infection regularly and recorded.

166

## 167 **2.10 Statistical analysis**

168

169 The data collected from the experiments were subjected to statistical analysis. The per cent data are  
170 arcsine transformed before statistical analysis. The significance difference between the treatments  
171 ( $P \geq 0.05\%$ ) was examined using analysis of variance (ANOVA).

172

## 173 **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

174

### 175 **3.1 Efficacy of the biocontrol agents on *M.phaseolina* in vitro**

176

177 An elaborate study was undertaken on the efficiency of biocontrol agents on management of  
178 root rot of mung bean under salt affected soils. Initially root rot pathogen *M. phaseolina* was isolated  
179 from root infected with pathogens collected from field having pH of 8.7. The biocontrol agent's viz., *T.*  
180 *viride*, The performance of the biocontrol agents were assessed against the growth of *M.phaseolina*  
181 under *in vitro* and the results presented in Table.1 and 2. The results revealed that the TNAU strain of  
182 *B. subtilis* reduced the mycelial growth of *M.phaseolina* when media supplemented with NaCl at 5%  
183 (1.4 cm), 7.5% (1.5 cm), 10% (1.6cm) and 12.5% (1.6 cm) and without concentration of NaCl (1.2cm)  
184 which is followed by BCA1 of *B.subtilis*, *P. fluorescens* and *T. viride*. The performance of the  
185 biocontrol agents against the pathogen is slightly reduced when media supplemented with NaCl. The  
186 growth of the *M. phaseolina* also reduced when the pathogen grown as control in media  
187 supplemented with NaCl.

188 Similarly, reduction of mycelial weight of *M.phaeolina* was more in media added with TNAU  
189 strain of *B.subtilis* and the performance of TNAU strain of *B.subtilis* on reduction of mycelial weight of

190 *M.phaseolina* is reduced when the broth added with NaCl at 5% (3.15 g), 7.5% (3.25 g), 10% (3.32 g)  
191 and 12.5% (3.65 g) level and which is followed by *P. fluorescens*, BCA 1 of *B. subtilis* and *T.viride*.  
192 The salinity and drought tolerance was well observed in *Bacillus* strains compared  
193 to *Pseudomonas* due to spore forming capacity of *Bacillus* spp [11]. The endospores produced by  
194 *Bacillus* are extremely resistant dormant structures can withstand unfavorable environmental  
195 conditions [12]. The spore forming *Bacillus* expressed antagonistic effect on *M.phaseolina* [13]  
196 However, the growth promoting effect of *P. fluorescens* and *P. aeruginosa* on tomato observed even  
197 at 6% NaCl [14]. *T. virens* and *T. atroviride* created IAA compound when cultivated in medium  
198 containing 100 mM NaCl and enhanced the growth of Arabidopsis seedlings [15]. *Trichoderma* spp.  
199 enhanced expression of genes linked to salt tolerance, osmoprotection, and ascorbic acid (AA)  
200 synthesis when Arabidopsis and cucumber roots were subjected to salt stress and inoculated with  
201 *Trichoderma* spp. [16].

202

### 203 **3.2. Efficacy of the biocontrol agents on root rot incidence in different soil pH under** 204 **pot culture condition**

205

206 Effect of talc formulation of the biocontrol agents on root rot incidence was assessed under  
207 pot culture condition using soil having different pH. The biocontrol agents applied as seed treatment  
208 @ 4g/kg of seed in case of fungal biocontrol agent and 10g/kg of seed in case of bacterial biocontrol  
209 agents and soil application @ 5 g/12.5 kg of pot soil. The results were given in the Table 3 indicated  
210 that soil application of TNAU strain of *B.subtilis* performed better in reducing the root rot incidence at  
211 pH of 7.0 (2.37%), 7.5 (4.50%), 8.0 (5.53%) and 8.7 (6.57%) which was followed by BCA 1 of  
212 *B.subtilis* in all pH except neutral pH. Among the seed treatment of biocontrol agents, *P. fluorescens*  
213 had lower incidence of root rot in soil pH 7 (5.08%), 7.5 (5.10%) and TNAU of *B.subtilis* in soil pH 8  
214 (6.68%) and 8.7 (8.83%). The efficiency of the biocontrol agents was reduced against root rot of mung  
215 bean when soil pH increased. However when the pathogen alone inoculated, the incidence of root rot  
216 was increased when pH of pot soil increased. Halo tolerant *B.subtilis* suppressed the root rot as well  
217 as wilt incidence in Mung bean [17]. In Mung bean, application of *B. subtilis* showed a marked  
218 reduction of disease incidence caused by *M. phaseolina* and the survival rate of healthy plants was  
219 also increased to 82.14% [18].

220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249

### **3.3 Population dynamic of the biocontrol agents in the rhizosphere of mung bean**

The population of the biocontrol agents was assessed from the experiments. The results given in Table 3. indicated that the populations of the biocontrol agents in rhizosphere of mung bean are varied significantly when applied as seed as well as soil treatment. In case of seed treatment, the population of biocontrol agents was shown as increasing trend over period of time in soil with pH 7.0 and 7.5. Whereas, the population of the agents in the rhizosphere with pH 8.0 and 8.7 was shown as decreasing trend from 15 DAS over period of time. Among the four biocontrol agents, TNAU strain of *B.subtilis* applied as seed as well as soil application expressed more population in the rhizosphere in all pH level. The biocontrol agents applied as soil application had more populations of the agents in the soil when compared to seed treatment. In our experiments, the population of the biocontrol agents is reduced when soil pH was increased. Microbial toxicity is a direct effect of sodium chloride in the soil on the microbial community in the rhizosphere structure [19]. Several workers reported the deleterious effect of salinity on the soil microbial communities and its activities [20,21]. But, the ability of the salt tolerant *Pseudomonas* strain on root colonisation was not affected by higher salinity in soil [22].

### **3.4. Halo tolerance of biocontrol agents on root rot of mung bean under field condition**

Field efficacy of the biocontrol agents was also studied in two field trials during 2019-20 and 2020-21. The root rot incidence as well as yield parameters were recorded from the trials and the results were presented in Table 4. The results revealed that all the treatments were significantly reduced the level of root rot incidence and increased the yield of the crop. Among the treatments, soil application of TNAU strain of *B.subtilis* at 2.5 kg/ha was found to be superior in reducing the root rot incidence in pH of 7.5 (6.63% in 2019-20 and 8.22 % in 2020-21) and 8.7 (8.60% in 2019-20 and 8.02 % in 2020-21) but the effect is on par with soil application of BCA1 strain of *B.subtilis* at 2.5 kg/ha. The efficiency of soil application of biocontrol agents was more than that of seed treatment of the same in the trials. The data also revealed that the maximum yield of crop was obtained from soil

250 application of TNAU strain of *B. subtilis* at 2.5 kg/ha (928.48 kg/ha and 872.13 in soil pH 7.5 and 8.7  
251 respectively during 2019-20 and 950.88 kg/ha and 910.56 kg/ha in soil pH 7.5 and 8.7 respectively  
252 during 2020-21) and which was followed by soil application of BCA1 strain of *B.subtilis* at 2.5 kg/ha.  
253 *B. subtilis* enhanced the plant growth and disease resistance under normal and *M.phaseolina* infected  
254 conditions [18]. Plant growth promoting rhizobacteria Genera including *Pseudomonas* and *Bacillus*  
255 are performed well in improving crop productivity even under saline conditions [23,24,25]. The  
256 characteristics of PGPR include the production of phytohormones [26], produce secondary  
257 compounds [27], synthesize ACC deaminase [28] and osmolytes [29] and activation of plant's  
258 antioxidative enzymes under salt stress [30] are involved in plant disease defense mechanisms.  
259 Among this, activity of ACC deaminase enzyme is a common phenomenon especially when plants  
260 exposed to high salt stress. Besides, ACC deaminase activity of rhizobacteria, they also increased  
261 the survivability survival in saline soils but also increased the productivity of the crop. Under drought  
262 and salt stress, PGPR had an effect on the host cell's membrane stability, the creation of  
263 biocompatible solutes, and the production of photosynthetic pigments [31]. Plant health was improved  
264 by *P. fluorescens* and *P. migulae* strains generating the ACC deaminase enzyme, which impacted the  
265 physiological parameters of the plants under salt stress [32]. The PGPR like *Bacillus*  
266 and *Pseudomonas* stimulated growth of maize under saline conditions [33]. In our studies,  
267 *Trichoderma* also found to be best performing agent against root rot of mung bean in salt affected  
268 soils. *Trichoderma* spp. also having traits of salt tolerance and expressed suitable mechanisms in salt  
269 stress condition [16].

270

#### 271 **4. CONCLUSION**

272

273 The biocontrol agents used in the study viz., BCA 1 strain of *B.subtilis*, TNAU strain of *B.subtilis*, *P.*  
274 *fluorescens*, *T. viride* possessed the halo tolerance capacity in high soil pH and TNAU strain of  
275 *B.subtilis* suppressed the root rot incidence of mung bean even in high soil pH very effectively and soil  
276 application of TNAU strain of *B.subtilis* at 2.5 kg/ha was found to be superior in reducing the root rot  
277 incidence.

278

#### 279 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308

The authors are thankful to the Department of Plant Protection and Department of Agronomy, Anbil Dharmalingam Agricultural College and Research Institute, TNAU, Tiruchirapallai for providing the Lab and Field facility.

### COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

### REFERENCES

1. Kaushik CD, Chand JN. Seedborne nature of *Rhizoctonia bataticola* causing leaf blight of mung bean. *J. Mycol. Plant Pathol.* 1987; 17: 154–157.
2. Sharf W, Javaid A, Shoaib A, Khan IH. Induction of resistance in chili against *Sclerotium rolfsii* by plant growth promoting rhizobacteria and *Anagallis arvensis*. *Egyptian Journal of Biological Pest Control.* 2021; 31: 16.
3. Ahmad P, Hashem A, Abd Allah EF, Alqarawi AA, John R, Egamberdieva D, Gucel S. Role of *Trichoderma harzianum* in mitigating NaCl stress in Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L) through antioxidative defense system. *Front. Plant Sci.* 2015; 6: 868. [10.3389/fpls.2015.00868](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2015.00868)
4. Ahmad P, Hakeem KR, Kumar A, Ashraf M, Akram NA. Salt-induced changes in photosynthetic activity and oxidative defense system of three cultivars of mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.). *Afr. J. Biotech.* 2012; 11: 2694-2703.
5. Zhang Wen Wen, Wang Chong, Xue Rui, Wang Li Jie. Effects of salinity on the soil microbial community and soil fertility. *Journal of Integrative Agriculture*, 2019; 18 (6): 1360-1368

- 309 6. Nannipieri P, Ascher J, Ceccherini MT, Landi L, Pietramellarar G, Renella G. Microbial  
310 diversity and soil functions. *European Journal of Soil Science*. 2003; 54, 655-659  
311
- 312 7. Egamberdieva D, Kucharova Z, Davranov K, Berg G, Makarova N, Azarova T. Bacteria able  
313 to control foot and root rot and to promote growth of cucumber in salinated soils. *Biol. Fertil.*  
314 *Soil*. 2011; 47: 197-205.  
315
- 316 8. Dileo MV, Pye MF, Roubtsova TV, Duniway JM, Macdonald JD, Rizzo DM. Abscisic acid in  
317 salt stress predispositions to Phytophthora root and crown rot in tomato and chrysanthemum.  
318 *Phytopathology*. 2010; 100: 871-879  
319
- 320 9. Dilfuza Egamberdieva, Gabriele Berg, Vladimir Chebotar, Igor Tikhonovich, Faina Kamilova,  
321 Shamil Z Validov, Ben Lugtenberg. Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria for sustainable  
322 agriculture, In Proceedings of the 2nd Asian PGPR Conference, August 21-24, 2011, Beijing,  
323 P.R. China page 75-79  
324
- 325 10. Vidhyasekaran P, Muthamilan M. Development of formulations of *Pseudomonas fluorescens*  
326 for control of chickpea wilt. *Plant Dis*. 1995; 79: 782-786  
327
- 328 11. Praveen Kumar G, Mir Hassan Ahmed SK, Suseelendra Desai, Leo Daniel, Amalraj E, Abdul  
329 Rasul. *In Vitro* Screening for Abiotic Stress Tolerance in Potent Biocontrol and Plant Growth  
330 Promoting Strains of *Pseudomonas* and *Bacillus* spp. 2014; Accessed 21 November 2021.  
331 Available: <https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/195946>  
332
- 333 12. Piggot PJ, Hilbert DW. Sporulation of *Bacillus subtilis*, *Current Opinion in Microbiology*, 2004;  
334 7 (6): 579–586.  
335
- 336 13. Stefany Castaldi, Claudia Petrillo, Giuliana Donadio, Fabrizio Dal Piaz, Alessio Cimmino,  
337 Marco Masi, Antonio Evidente and Rachele Isticato. Plant Growth Promotion Function of  
338 *Bacillus* sp. Strains Isolated from Salt-Pan Rhizosphere and Their Biocontrol Potential against

339 *Macrophomina phaseolina*. Int. J. Mol.Sci. 2021; Accessed 21 November 2021. Available:  
340 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms22073324>

341

342 14. Tank N, Saraf M. Salinity-resistant plant growth promoting rhizobacteria ameliorates sodium  
343 chloride stress on tomato plants. Journal of Plant Interactions, 2010; 5(1): 51–58

344

345 15. Hexon Angel Contreras-Cornejo, Lourdes Macías-Rodríguez, Ruth Alfaro-Cuevas and José  
346 López-Bucio. *Trichoderma* spp. improve Growth of *Arabidopsis* Seedlings Under Salt Stress  
347 Through Enhanced Root Development, Osmolite Production, and Na<sup>+</sup> Elimination Through  
348 Root Exudates, MPMI. 2014; 27(6): 503–514.

349

350 16. Brotman Y, Landau U, Cuadros-Inostroza Á, Tohge T, Fernie AR, Chet I, Viterbo A, Willmitzer  
351 L. *Trichoderma*-plant root colonization: Escaping early plant defense responses and activation  
352 of the antioxidant machinery for saline stress tolerance. PLoS Pathog. 2013; 9:e1003221.  
353 Published online.

354

355 17. Patel RR, Disha D, Patel, Parth Thakor, Bhavika Patel, Vasudev R, Thakkar. Alleviation of  
356 salt stress in germination of *Vigna radiata* L. by two halotolerant *Bacilli* sp. isolated from saline  
357 habitats of Gujarat. Plant Growth Regul. 2014; Accessed 21 November 2021. Available: DOI  
358 10.1007/s10725-014-0008-8

359

360 18. Hashem A, Elsayed Fathi Abd\_Allah, Abdulaziz A, Alqarawi, Ramalingam Radhakrishnan,  
361 Ashwani Kumar. Plant defense approach of *Bacillus subtilis* (BERA 71) against  
362 *Macrophomina phaseolina* (Tassi) Goid in mung bean. Journal of Plant Interactions.  
363 2017;12(1):390-401.

364

365 19. Nelson DR, Mele PM. Subtle changes in rhizosphere microbial community structure in  
366 response to increased boron and sodium chloride concentrations. Soil Biol. Biochem. 2007;  
367 39(1):340–351.

368

- 369 20. Rietz DN, Haynes RJ. Effects of irrigation-induced salinity and sodicity on soil microbial  
370 activity. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 2003; 35(6):845–854.  
371
- 372 21. Sardinha M, Muller T, Schmeisky H, Joergensen RG. Microbial performance in soils along a  
373 salinity gradient under acidic conditions. *Appl. Soil Ecol.* 2003; 23(3):237–244.  
374
- 375 22. Paul D, Nair S. Stress adaptations in a plant growth promoting rhizobacterium (PGPR) with  
376 increasing salinity in the coastal agricultural soils. *J. Basic. Microbiol.* 2008; 48(5):378–384.  
377
- 378 23. Sharma S, Kulkarni J, Jha B. Halotolerant rhizobacteria promote growth and enhance salinity  
379 tolerance in peanut. *Front. Microbiol.* 2016; 7:1600.  
380
- 381 24. Singh RP, Jha PN. The multifarious PGPR *Serratia marcescens* CDP-13 augments induced  
382 systemic resistance and enhanced salinity tolerance of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *PLoS*  
383 *One.* 2016; 11:e0155026. Accessed 22 November 2021. Available: doi:  
384 10.1371/journal.pone.0155026  
385
- 386 25. Sarkar A, Ghosh PK, Pramanik K, Mitra S, Soren T, Pandey S. A  
387 halotolerant *Enterobacter* sp. displaying ACC deaminase activity promotes rice seedling  
388 growth under salt stress. *Microbiological Research.* 2018; 169: 20–32.  
389
- 390 26. Dodd IC, Zinovkina NY, Safronova VI, Belimov AA. Rhizobacterial mediation of plant hormone  
391 status. *Annals of Applied Biology.* 2010; 157: 361–379.  
392
- 393 27. Timmusk S, El-Daim IAA, Copolovici L, Tanilas T, Kännaste A, Behers L. Drought-tolerance  
394 of wheat improved by rhizosphere bacteria from harsh environments: enhanced biomass  
395 production and reduced emissions of stress volatiles. *PLoS One* 2014; 9:e96086. Accessed  
396 22 November 2021. Available: doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0096086  
397

- 398 28. Glick BR, Todorovic B, Czarny J, Cheng Z, Duan J, McConkey B. Promotion of plant growth  
399 by bacterial ACC deaminase. *Cri. Rev. Pla. Sci.* 2007; 26: 227–242.  
400
- 401 29. Bano A, Fatima M. Salt tolerance in *Zea mays* (L). following inoculation  
402 with *Rhizobium* and *Pseudomonas*. *Biol. Fertil. Soils.* 2009; 45: 405–413.  
403
- 404 30. Hashem A, Abd\_Allah EF, Alqarawi AA, Al-Huqail AA, Wirth S, Egamberdieva D. The  
405 interaction between arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and endophytic bacteria enhances plant  
406 growth of *Acacia gerrardii* under salt stress. *Front. Microbiol.* 2016; 7:1089.  
407
- 408 31. Tiwari G, Duraivadivel P, Sharma S, Hariprasad P. 1-Aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylic acid  
409 deaminase producing beneficial rhizobacteria ameliorate the biomass characters of *Panicum*  
410 *maximum* Jacq. by mitigating drought and salt stress. *Sci. Rep.* 2018; 8:17513.  
411
- 412 32. Ali S, Charles TC, Glick BR. Amelioration of high salinity stress damage by plant growth-  
413 promoting bacterial endophytes that contain ACC deaminase. *Plant Physiol. Biochem.* 2014;  
414 80:160–167.  
415
- 416 33. Aslam F, Ali B. Halotolerant bacterial diversity associated with *Suaeda fruticosa* (L.) forssk.  
417 improved growth of maize under salinity stress. *Agronomy.* 2018. 8:131-135.  
418  
419

**Table 1. Efficacy of the biocontrol agents on the growth of *M.phaseolina in vitro***

SI.No	Name of the biocontrol agents	*Mycelial growth of <i>M.phaseolina</i> (cm) in media with NaCl					*Mycelial weight of <i>M.phaseolina</i> (g) in broth with NaCl				
		0 %	5%	7.5%	10%	12.5%	0 %	5%	7.5%	10%	12.5%
1	Control (Only <i>M.phaseolina</i> )	7.6	7.2	6.8	6.7	6.2	12.35	11.75	10.23	9.75	9.50
2	BCA1 strain of <i>B. subtilis</i>	1.3	1.4	1.6	1.6	1.8	3.12	3.29	3.40	3.55	4.15
3	TNAU strain of <i>B. subtilis</i>	1.2	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.6	2.76	3.15	3.25	3.32	3.65
4	<i>P. fluorescens</i>	1.7	1.8	2.0	2.2	2.4	2.83	3.21	3.37	3.52	3.74
5	<i>T. viride</i>	1.6	1.6	2.3	2.5	2.5	4.32	4.62	4.86	4.91	5.03
	SEd	0.078	0.081	0.076	0.169	0.056	0.090	0.221	0.194	0.095	0.099
	CD (P ≥ 0.01)	0.18**	0.18**	0.17**	0.37**	0.19**	0.20**	0.49**	0.43**	0.21**	0.22**

\* Mean of four replications, each replication contain three petri plates

\*\* Mean of four replications, each replication contains three number of 250 ml conical flask containing 200 ml broth medium.

**Table 2. Efficacy of the biocontrol agents on root rot of mung bean under *in vivo* condition**

Treat ment No	Name of the treatments	*Per cent root rot disease incidence			
		At 7.0 pH level	At 7.5 pH level	At 8.0 pH level	At 8.7 pH level
T1	Control	0.00 (0.91)	0.00 (0.91)	0.0 (0.91)	0.00 (0.91)
T2	Sand maize inoculum of <i>M.phaseolina</i> @ 5 g/pot	28.67 (32.36)	32.50 (34.74)	34.73 (36.09)	38.89 (38.52)
T3	Seed treatment with BCA1 strain of <i>B.subtilis</i> @ 10 g/kg of seed	4.73 (12.51)	5.90 (13.99)	11.77 (20.04)	13.43 (21.47)
T4	Seed treatment with TNAU strain of <i>B. subtilis</i> @ 10 g/kg of seed	5.23 (13.22)	5.13 (13.09)	6.63 (14.86)	8.83 (17.26)
T5	Seed treatment with <i>P. fluorescens</i> @ 10 g/kg of seed	5.08 (13.02)	5.10 (13.05)	6.71 (14.96)	11.76 (20.03)
T6	Seed treatment with <i>T. viride</i> @ 4g/kg of seed	6.73 (14.99)	10.93 (19.28)	13.47 (21.51)	19.00 (21.36)
T7	Soil application of BCA1 strain of <i>B.subtilis</i> @ 5 g/ 12.5 kg of pot soil	2.90 (9.78)	4.71 (12.53)	5.93 (14.03)	6.84 (15.10)
T8	Soil application of TNAU strain of <i>B.subtilis</i> @ 5 g/ 12.5 kg of pot soil	2.37 (8.84)	4.50 (12.21)	5.53 (13.58)	6.57 (14.79)
T9	Soil application of <i>P. fluorescens</i> @ 5 g/ 12.5 kg of pot soil	2.47 (9.03)	5.40 (13.43)	7.03 (15.29)	6.60 (14.85)
T10	Soil application of <i>T.viride</i> @ 5 g/ 12.5 kg of pot soil	4.50 (12.21)	5.03 (12.95)	6.77 (15.02)	7.42 (15.81)
	SEd	0.53	0.49	0.48	0.51
	CD (P ≥ 0.05)	0.86**	0.97**	0.81**	0.87**

\*Mean of four replications. Values in parenthesis are arcsine transformed values.

**Table 3. Population dynamic of the biocontrol agents in rhizosphere of mung bean under *in vivo* condition**

Treatment No	Name of the treatments	*Population of biocontrol agents											
		At 7.0 pH level			At 7.5 pH level			At 8.0 pH level			At 8.7 pH level		
		15 DAS	30 DAS	45 DAS	15 DAS	30 DAS	45 DAS	15 DAS	30 DAS	45 DAS	15 DAS	30 DAS	45 DAS
T1	Control (x 10 <sup>8</sup> cfu/g of rhizosphere soil) <sup>#</sup>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
T2	Sand maize inoculum of <i>M.phaseolina</i> @ 5 g/pot (x 10 <sup>8</sup> cfu/g of rhizosphere soil)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
T3	Seed treatment with BCA1 strain of <i>B.subtilis</i> @ 10 g/kg of seed (x 10 <sup>8</sup> cfu/g of rhizosphere soil)	6.06	6.51	6.50	5.82	6.08	6.05	4.69	3.92	3.35	4.32	3.88	2.61
T4	Seed treatment with TNAU strain of <i>B. subtilis</i> @ 10 g/kg of seed (x 10 <sup>8</sup> cfu/g of rhizosphere soil)	7.57	8.35	8.37	6.77	7.40	8.17	6.21	5.91	5.44	5.41	5.28	5.11
T5	Seed treatment with <i>P. fluorescens</i> @ 10 g/kg of seed (x 10 <sup>8</sup> cfu/g of rhizosphere soil)	7.04	7.73	8.24	6.74	7.59	7.96	5.81	5.46	4.20	5.25	4.87	4.18
T6	Seed treatment with <i>T. viride</i> @ 4g/kg of seed (x 10 <sup>6</sup> cfu/g of rhizosphere soil)	4.15	4.82	4.32	4.84	4.40	3.97	3.12	3.06	2.93	2.94	2.07	1.99
T7	Soil application of BCA1 strain of <i>B.subtilis</i> @ 5 g/ 12.5 kg of pot soil (x 10 <sup>8</sup> cfu/g of rhizosphere soil)	8.30	8.77	8.95	7.27	7.89	7.07	7.01	6.75	6.56	6.34	6.11	5.79
T8	Soil application of TNAU strain of <i>B. subtilis</i> @ 5 g/ 12.5 kg of pot soil (x 10 <sup>8</sup> cfu/g of rhizosphere soil)	9.56	9.75	10.27	9.53	10.09	10.48	9.46	9.75	9.85	8.32	8.63	7.61
T9	Soil application of <i>P. fluorescens</i> @ 5 g/ 12.5 kg of pot soil (x 10 <sup>8</sup> cfu/g of rhizosphere soil)	8.79	9.25	9.62	9.38	9.88	10.35	9.20	9.37	9.01	8.26	8.30	6.94
T10	Soil application of <i>T.viride</i> @ 5 g/ 12.5 kg of pot soil	5.20	5.67	6.22	5.60	6.36	6.91	5.27	4.75	4.67	5.22	4.87	4.18
	SEd	0.014	0.112	0.017	0.134	0.021	0.162	0.024	0.113	0.156	0.029	0.123	0.139
	CD (P ≥ 0.05)	0.21 <sup>**</sup>	0.26 <sup>**</sup>	0.25 <sup>**</sup>	0.31 <sup>**</sup>	0.36 <sup>**</sup>	0.39 <sup>**</sup>	0.42 <sup>**</sup>	0.39 <sup>**</sup>	0.37 <sup>**</sup>	0.52 <sup>**</sup>	0.56 <sup>**</sup>	0.44 <sup>**</sup>

DAS- Days after sowing

\*Mean of four replications.

<sup>#</sup>Control: there is no application of biocontrol agents and pathogen.

In every pot, sand maize inoculum of pathogen were inoculated in the pot @ 5 g/12.5 kg of pot soil.

**Table 4. Halo tolerance effect of biocontrol agents on root rot and yield of mung bean under field condition during 2019-20 and 2020-**

Treatment No	Name of the treatments	Per cent root rot disease incidence				Yield (kg/ha)			
		2019-20		2020-21		2019-20		2020-21	
		At 7.5 pH level	At 8.7 pH level	At 7.5 pH level	At 8.7 pH level	At 7.5 pH level	At 8.7 pH level	At 7.5 pH level	At 8.7 pH level
T1	Control	20.16 (26.68)	23.48 (28.99)	17.93(24.95)	19.98(26.55)	769.25	724.08	794.85	718.11
T2	Seed treatment with carbendazim at 2g/kg of seed	8.11 (16.53)	12.31 (20.53)	11.62(19.23)	13.09 (21.33)	817.76	784.21	838.80	782.32
T3	Soil drench with copper oxy chloride at 0.3% when infection noticed	12.88 (21.03)	13.83 (21.83)	12.85 (21.00)	13.20 (21.30)	800.93	744.11	817.79	756.82
T4	Seed treatment with BCA1 strain of <i>B.subtilis</i> at 10g/kg of seed	10.43 (18.81)	12.55 (20.74)	9.70 (18.14)	11.61 (19.92)	828.51	803.17	833.83	803.20
T5	Seed treatment with TNAU strain of <i>B. subtilis</i> at 10g/kg of seed	8.70 (17.12)	10.29 (18.73)	8.97 (17.42)	9.91 (18.34)	894.96	826.37	890.40	871.36
T6	Seed treatment with <i>T.viride</i> at 10g/kg of seed	12.97 (21.08)	13.75 (21.76)	10.18 (18.60)	12.87 (21.22)	829.20	792.57	835.55	771.12
T7	Soil application of BCA1 strain of <i>B.subtilis</i> at 2.5 kg/ha	7.45 (15.67)	8.72 (17.17)	8.52(16.94)	8.61 (17.06)	931.04	845.04	952.43	878.02
T8	Soil application of TNAU strain of <i>B subtilis</i> at 2.5 kg/ha	6.61 (14.88)	8.60 (17.04)	8.22(16.58)	8.02 (16.44)	928.48	872.13	950.88	910.56
T9	Soil application of <i>T.viride</i> at 2.5 kg/ha	8.24 (16.66)	9.83 (18.26)	9.83(18.27)	10.07 (18.49)	913.39	833.87	911.92	869.49
	SEd	0.75	0.44	0.39	0.89	12.06	11.15	11.69	10.88
	CD (P ≥ 0.05)	1.61**	0.93**	1.16**	1.22**	25.46**	23.64**	24.80**	23.06**