



# Effectiveness of Different Fungicides in Combating Tomato Powdery Mildew in Karnataka

C. R. Jahir Basha <sup>a\*</sup>, C. P. Manjula <sup>b</sup>, Akash Bevanur <sup>a</sup>,  
Divyashree <sup>a,b</sup>, J. Harish <sup>a</sup> and Lakshmeesha R <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Plant Pathology, University of Agricultural Sciences, GKVK, Bangalore, Karnataka-560065, India.

<sup>b</sup> All India Coordinated Research Project on Sunflower and Directorate of Research, UAS, GKVK, Bangalore -560065, India.

<sup>c</sup> Department of Biotechnology, University of Agricultural Sciences, GKVK, Bangalore, Karnataka-560065, India.

## Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. Authors CRJB and AB conceptualized the research work. Authors CRJB and Divyashree did data curation. Authors CRJB and did formal analysis. Author CRJB investigated the study. Author CRJB did data visualization. Authors CRJB and Divyashree wrote original draft. Authors CPM and AB supervised the study. Authors CPM and AB did data validation. Author CPM wrote, reviewed and edited the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## Article Information

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56557/pcbmb/2024/v25i9-108825>

### 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://prh.ikpress.org/review-history/12320>

Original Research Article

Received: 11/06/2024  
Accepted: 13/08/2024  
Published: 19/08/2024

## ABSTRACT

Field experiment was carried out to know the effect of different fungicides against powdery mildew of tomato during two Kharif seasons of the year 2022 and 2023. Among the nine treatments, combination fungicides were significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) more effective than solo fungicides.

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: [jahir\\_basha@rediffmail.com](mailto:jahir_basha@rediffmail.com);

**Cite as:** Basha, C. R. Jahir, C. P. Manjula, Akash Bevanur, Divyashree, J. Harish, and Lakshmeesha R. 2024. "Effectiveness of Different Fungicides in Combating Tomato Powdery Mildew in Karnataka". *PLANT CELL BIOTECHNOLOGY AND MOLECULAR BIOLOGY* 25 (9-10):74-81. <https://doi.org/10.56557/pcbmb/2024/v25i9-108825>.

Picoxystrobin 6.78% + Tricyclazole 20.33% SC applied at 2 ml/l achieved the lowest percent disease index (PDI) of 14% in the first season, with a 74.77% reduction over the control (55.50% PDI). This was closely followed by Azoxystrobin 18.2% + Difenoconazole 11.4% SC at 1.2 ml/l, which recorded a PDI of 14.50% and a 73.87% reduction. In the second season, similar trends were observed with Picoxystrobin 6.78% + Tricyclazole 20.33% SC achieving a PDI of 13.50% and a 74.53% reduction, followed by Azoxystrobin 18.2% + Difenoconazole 11.4% SC with a PDI of 14% and a 73.58% reduction. Pooled data from both seasons confirmed these findings, showing Picoxystrobin 6.78% + Tricyclazole 20.33% SC with a PDI of 13.75% and a 74.65% reduction, and Azoxystrobin 18.2% + Difenoconazole 11.4% SC with a PDI of 14.25% and a 73.73% reduction. The highest PDIs were noted in the Carbendazim 50% WP and Hexaconazole 5% SC treatments. The study highlights the inefficacy of relying on a single fungicide due to resistance development, suggesting combination fungicides as a more effective strategy for managing powdery mildew in tomatoes. It is possible advancing with broader integrated disease sustainable management strategies to protection of environment, crop protection and yield.

**Keywords:** Tomato; *oidium neolyopersici*; powdery mildew; tebuconazole; trifloxystrobin.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

One of the most widely grown horticulture crops in the world is the tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum*), which is native to the Andes of South America. It may be grown in a variety of regions, from tropical to temperate, and it can also be grown indoors when the weather outside is unfavourable. After potatoes, tomatoes are the vegetable that people consume the most globally [1]. Tomatoes are used in a wide range of applications and are essential to a nutritious diet, which has led to a surge in the production of both processed and fresh types globally in recent years [2]. There are 161.7 million metric tonnes of tomatoes produced worldwide, with a market value of \$59 billion. The production of tomatoes in the USA adds 13.2 million metric tonnes, worth \$5 billion, to global output. After China and India, the USA comes in third place in terms of tomato output globally [3]. Tomato is most profitable crops in Indian agriculture. Ranking second globally after potatoes, tomatoes have become the “Red gold of India”, making their presence known not just on our plates but also in our fields. The tomato production in India for the 2022-23 agricultural year was approximately 208.19 lakh tonnes, highlighting its crucial role in the nation's horticultural sector and affirming India's status as a top global tomato producer. India has embraced tomato farming, with various states contributing significantly to its production. The major tomato-producing states include Bihar, Karnataka, Uttar Pradesh, Orissa, Maharashtra, and Andhra Pradesh [1].

Powdery mildew of tomato caused by *Oidium neolyopersici* has become an important disease problem worldwide in both field and greenhouse

production since outbreaks of this disease reported in Europe, North and South America and Asia in the early 1990. The disease mainly affects leaves, causing yellowing, drying, necrosis and defoliation. The powdery mildew is a dangerous pathogen, which spread through temperate areas of the world and the disease can cause up to 50 per cent yield losses in tomato [4].and Study found that, losses due to powdery mildew in tomato ranges from 10% to as high as 90% in severely affected areas it a critical issue for growers, particularly those in greenhouse where the conditions favour the spread of powdery mildew [5].

Numerous bacterial, viral, fungal, and nematode illnesses have made it difficult to produce tomatoes for commercial purposes. Among fungal diseases, such as powdery mildew, have hampered tomato production. Due to severe selection and inbreeding during evolution and domestication, the cultivated tomato has a limited genetic diversity [6] making it more susceptible to disease epidemics. In contrast, wild tomato species are more disease resistant than tomato species that are grown in a greenhouse. Many systemic and non-systemic fungicides were reported to manage the powdery mildew of tomato. The information on the efficacy of new combi- fungicides against powdery mildew of tomato is insufficient in India. Hence, there is a need to evaluate new fungicides against powdery mildew of tomato. By considering the seriousness of diseases and the economic damage caused by the diseases, the present investigation was carried out by using new formulation of chemicals for its efficacy against powdery mildew of tomato.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The field trial was conducted during Kharif, 2022 and 2023 at ZARS, GKVK, Bangalore, Karnataka. The experiment was laid out in Randomized Block Design (RBD) with three replications and nine treatments with control. The seedlings of 25 days old were transplanted to the main field by following a spacing of 60x45 cm and with plot size of 2.4x3.15 m. The recommended package of practices was followed for the trial. All the foliar sprays (treatments) were given as per their doses. Observations on disease were recorded 10 days after each spray. The PDI (Per cent Disease Index) was assessed based on visual observation and graded in 0-5 scale (Table 1) [7] obtained results were statistically analysed to observe the significance of the treatment in disease management. Further, PDI was calculated as per the standard formula given by [8]. The treatment details have been provided in Table 2.

Per cent disease index =

$$\frac{\text{Sum of all disease ratings}}{\text{Total No. of leaves observed}} \times \frac{100}{\text{Maximum disease rating}}$$

## 3. RESULTS

A field study was conducted to evaluate different fungicides against powdery mildew of tomato. Combi fungicides were more effective than solo fungicides in controlling the disease.

Picoxystrobin 6.78% + Tricyclazole 20.33% SC @ 2 ml/l recorded least PDI of 14% compared to control 55.50% with 74.77% reduction over control followed by Azoxystrobin 18.2% + Difenoconazole 11.4% SC @ 1.2 ml/l (14.50%) with 73.87% of reduction over control. Highest PDI was recorded in the treatment Carbendazim 50% WP @ 1 gm/l with 30.33% of PDI followed by Hexaconazole 5% SC @ 1 ml/l (24.50 %). Control recorded 55.50% of PDI (Table 3). In 2<sup>nd</sup> season Picoxystrobin 6.78% + Tricyclazole 20.33% SC @ 2 ml/l recorded least PDI of 13.50% compared to control 53.00% with 74.53 % reduction over control followed by Azoxystrobin 18.2% + Difenoconazole 11.4% SC @ 1.2 ml/l (14.00%) with 73.58% of reduction over control. Highest PDI was recorded in the treatment Carbendazim 50% WP @ 1 gm/l with 28.33% of PDI followed by Hexaconazole 5% SC 1 ml/l (23.00%). Control recorded 53.00 % of PDI (Table 4).

In the pooled data of two seasons Picoxystrobin 6.78% + Tricyclazole 20.33% SC @ 2 ml/l recorded least PDI of 13.75% compared to control 54.25% with 74.65% reduction over control of the disease which is followed by Azoxystrobin 18.2% + Difenoconazole 11.4% SC @ 1.2 ml/l (14.25 %) with 73.73% of reduction over control. Highest PDI was recorded in the treatment Carbendazim 50% WP @ 1 gm/l with 29.33% of PDI followed by Hexaconazole 5% SC 1 ml/l (23.75%). Control recorded 54.25% of PDI (Table 5).

**Table 1. Powdery mildew of tomato disease rating scale**

Score	Description
0	No visible symptoms and no apparent defoliation
1	<10% Leaves with lesions and minimal defoliation
2	Approximately 25% of leaves with lesions and 10% defoliation
3	Approximately 50% of leaves with lesions and 25% defoliation
4	Approximately 75% of leaves with lesions and 50% defoliation
5	Most leaves (>90%) with lesions and extensive defoliation (75%)

**Table 2. Treatment details**

Sl. No.	Treatments	Dosage/L (g/ml)
1	Tebuconazole 50% + Trifloxystrobin 25% WG	0.4
2	Azoxystrobin 18.2% + Tebuconazole 18.3% SC	1.0
3	Azoxystrobin 18.2% + Difenoconazole 11.4% SC	1.2
4	Picoxystrobin 6.78% + Tricyclazole 20.33% SC	2.0
5	Hexaconazole 5% SC	1.0
6	Carbendazim 50% WP	1.0
7	Control	-

Table 3. Bio-efficacy of novel fungicides on powdery mildew of tomato (first season)

Sl. No	Chemical treatments	Dosage/L (g/ml)	PDI at different intervals (Days)						Reduction over control (%)	
			Before First spray	10 days after first spray	Before second spray	10 days after second spray	Before third spray	10 days after third spray		A week before harvest
1	Tebuconazole 50% + Trifloxystrobin 25% WG	0.4	11.50 (3.46)	13.20 (3.70)	14.11 (3.82)	16.50 (4.12)	17.50 (4.24)	19.30 (4.45)	21.50 (4.69)	61.26
2	Azoxystrobin 18.2% + Tebuconazole 18.3% SC	1.0	11.00 (3.39)	13.33 (3.72)	14.20 (3.83)	13.50 (3.74)	16.20 (4.09)	14.75 (3.91)	16.00 (4.06)	71.17
3	Azoxystrobin 18.2% + Difenoconazole 11.4% SC	1.2	13.50 (3.74)	15.00 (3.94)	15.50 (4.00)	12.00 (3.54)	13.50 (3.74)	11.50 (3.46)	14.50 (3.87)	73.87
4	Picoxystrobin 6.78% + Tricyclazole 20.33% SC	2.0	13.00 (3.67)	12.50 (3.61)	13.00 (3.67)	11.50 (3.46)	12.50 (3.61)	13.00 (3.67)	14.00 (3.81)	74.77
5	Hexaconazole 5% SC	1.0	13.00 (3.67)	14.00 (3.81)	16.00 (4.06)	21.50 (4.69)	22.00 (4.74)	23.00 (4.85)	24.50 (5.00)	55.85
6	Carbendazim 50% WP	1.0	12.75 (3.64)	13.50 (3.74)	16.20 (4.09)	21.50 (4.69)	24.50 (5.00)	26.00 (5.15)	30.33 (5.55)	49.84
7	Control	-	21.00 (4.64)	33.00 (5.79)	35.00 (5.96)	41.00 (6.44)	50.05 (7.11)	53.00 (7.31)	55.50 (7.48)	-
	Sem ±		0.03	0.04	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.02	0.02	
	CD (5%)		0.09	0.11	0.14	0.09	0.17	0.07	0.06	

Note: PDI - Per cent Disease Index

Table 4. Bio-efficacy of novel fungicides on powdery mildew of tomato (second season)

Sl. No	Chemical treatments	Dosage/L (g/ml)	PDI at different intervals (Days)						Reduction over control (%)	
			Before First spray	10days after first spray	Before second spray	10days after second spray	Before third spray	10days after third spray		A week before harvest
1	Tebuconazole 50% + Trifloxystrobin 25% WG	0.4	11.00 (3.39)	12.20 (3.56)	13.11 (3.69)	15.50 (4.00)	16.50 (4.12)	18.30 (4.33)	20.50 (4.58)	61.32
2	Azoxystrobin 18.2% + Tebuconazole 18.3% SC	1.0	10.50 (3.32)	12.33 (3.58)	13.20 (3.70)	12.50 (3.61)	15.20 (3.96)	13.75 (3.77)	15.50 (4.00)	70.75
3	Azoxystrobin 18.2% + Difenoconazole 11.4% SC	1.2	13.00 (3.67)	14.00 (3.80)	14.50 (3.87)	11.00 (3.39)	12.50 (3.61)	10.50 (3.32)	14.00 (3.81)	73.58
4	Picoxystrobin 6.78% + Tricyclazole 20.33% SC	2.0	12.50 (3.61)	11.50 (3.46)	12.00 (3.53)	10.50 (3.32)	11.50 (3.46)	12.00 (3.53)	13.50 (3.74)	74.53
5	Hexaconazole 5% SC	1.0	12.50 (3.61)	13.00 (3.67)	15.00 (3.93)	20.50 (4.58)	21.00 (4.63)	22.00 (4.74)	23.00 (4.85)	56.60
6	Carbendazim 50% WP	1.0	12.00 (3.53)	12.50 (3.61)	15.20 (3.96)	20.50 (4.58)	23.50 (4.90)	25.00 (5.05)	28.33 (5.37)	46.55
7	Control	-	20.00 (4.52)	32.00 (5.70)	33.00 (5.79)	39.00 (6.28)	48.05 (6.97)	51.00 (7.18)	53.00 (7.31)	-
	Sem ±		0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03	
	CD (5%)		0.12	0.13	0.14	0.13	0.10	0.09	0.08	

Note: PDI - Per cent Disease Index

Table 5. Bio-efficacy of novel fungicides on powdery mildew of tomato (pooled data)

Sl. No	Chemical treatments	Dosage/L (g/ml)	PDI at different intervals (Days)						Reduction over control (%)	
			Before First spray	10 days after first spray	Before second spray	10 days after second spray	Before third spray	10 days after third spray		A week before harvest
1	Tebuconazole 50% + Trifloxystrobin 25% WG	0.4	11.25 (3.43)	12.70 (3.63)	13.61 (3.76)	16.00 (4.06)	17.00 (4.18)	18.80 (4.39)	21.00 (4.64)	61.29
2	Azoxystrobin 18.2% + Tebuconazole 18.3% SC	1.0	10.75 (3.35)	12.83 (3.65)	13.70 (3.77)	13.00 (3.67)	15.70 (4.02)	14.25 (3.84)	15.75 (4.03)	70.97
3	Azoxystrobin 18.2% + Difenoconazole 11.4% SC	1.2	13.25 (3.71)	14.50 (3.87)	15.00 (3.94)	11.50 (3.46)	13.00 (3.67)	11.00 (3.39)	14.25 (3.84)	73.73
4	Picoxystrobin 6.78% + Tricyclazole 20.33% SC	2.0	12.75 (3.64)	12.00 (3.54)	12.50 (3.61)	11.00 (3.39)	12.00 (3.54)	12.50 (3.61)	13.75 (3.77)	74.65
5	Hexaconazole 5% SC	1.0	12.75 (3.64)	13.50 (3.74)	15.50 (4.00)	21.00 (4.64)	21.50 (4.69)	22.50 (4.80)	23.75 (4.92)	56.22
6	Carbendazim 50% WP	1.0	12.38 (3.59)	13.00 (3.67)	15.70 (4.02)	21.00 (4.64)	24.00 (4.95)	25.50 (5.10)	29.33 (5.46)	45.94
7	Control	-	20.50 (4.58)	32.50 (5.74)	34.00 (5.87)	40.00 (6.36)	49.05 (7.04)	52.00 (7.25)	54.25 (7.40)	-
	Sem ±		0.04	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03	
	CD (5%)		0.11	0.12	0.14	0.11	0.14	0.08	0.07	

Note: PDI - Per cent Disease Index

#### 4. DISCUSSION

The results of the efficacy study indicate that combination fungicides, or combo fungicides, are substantially more successful than solo fungicides at controlling tomato powdery mildew. The lowest percent disease index (PDI) was recorded with Picoxystrobin 6.78% + Tricyclazole 20.33% SC at 2 ml/l, which achieved a PDI of 14% in the first season and 13.50% in the second season, with overall reductions of 74.77% and 74.53% over control, respectively. Similarly, Azoxystrobin 18.2% + Difenoconazole 11.4% SC at 1.2 ml/l showed comparable efficacy, with PDIs of 14.50% and 14.00%, resulting in reductions of 73.87% and 73.58% over control in the respective seasons.

The efficacy of these combi fungicides may be attributed to their ability to target multiple sites within the pathogen, thus reducing the risk of resistance development [9]. This is particularly important as continuous usage of a single fungicide can lead to the development of resistant strains, diminishing the fungicide's effectiveness over time. Prakash [9] insights into fungicide resistance highlight the necessity for integrated use of fungicides to manage disease effectively. The pooled data across two seasons confirmed the superior performance of combi fungicides. Picoxystrobin 6.78% + Tricyclazole 20.33% SC recorded a PDI of 13.75%, with a 74.65% reduction over control, while Azoxystrobin 18.2% + Difenoconazole 11.4% SC achieved a PDI of 14.25% and a 73.73% reduction. These results are consistent with previous studies that emphasize the enhanced efficacy of combi fungicides in managing various plant diseases [10,5]. In contrast, solo fungicides such as Carbendazim 50% WP and Hexaconazole 5% SC were less effective, with PDIs of 30.33% and 24.50%, respectively, in the first season, and 28.33% and 23.00% in the second season. This lower efficacy may be due to the development of resistance in the pathogen populations, as suggested by several researchers [11-14]. The continuous use of these fungicides has likely led to a selection pressure favoring resistant strains of the pathogen, thereby reducing the fungicides' overall effectiveness.

The findings of this study align with previous research indicating that combi fungicides are

more efficient in disease management due to their multi-site action, which minimizes the likelihood of resistance development [9]. Additionally, the results corroborate the observations of [15], who reported the superior performance of combi fungicides in managing powdery mildew in mango and other crops. This study demonstrates the enhanced efficacy of combination fungicides in controlling powdery mildew of tomato. Biocontrol product AXP12 stimulates the tomato genes involved in plant defence pathways and has the capacity to combat in greenhouse and field both late blight (*Phytophthora infestans*) and powdery mildew (*Oidium neolycopersici* and *Leveillula taurica*) of tomato the importance of integrating multiple modes of action to manage fungicide resistance [15-18].

#### 5. CONCLUSION

The field study demonstrated that combination fungicides are significantly more effective in controlling powdery mildew of tomato compared to solo fungicides. Picoxystrobin 6.78% + Tricyclazole 20.33% SC and Azoxystrobin 18.2% + Difenoconazole 11.4% SC consistently achieved the lowest percent disease index (PDI) and highest reduction over control across two seasons. These findings underscore the importance of using combination fungicides to target multiple sites within the pathogen, thereby minimizing the risk of resistance development and improving disease management efficacy. Future research should explore the long-term sustainability and environmental impacts of combi fungicides, as well as their integration into broader integrated disease management strategies to crop protection and yield.

#### DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts.

#### ETHICAL STATEMENT

All the experimental procedures involving only on plant species were conducted following the University of Agricultural Science, Bangalore institutional guidelines.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to acknowledge Department of plant pathology, COA, GKVK, Bangalore for their support in conduct of the trials.

## COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES

1. Arushi AB, Malannavar, Banyal DK. Evaluation of IDM components for management tomato powdery mildew under cultivation. *Int.J.Curr.Microbiol. App. Sci.* 2018;7(07):21-31
2. Cerkauskas RF, Ferguson G, Banik M. Powdery mildew (*Leveillula taurica*) on greenhouse and field peppers in Ontario-host range, cultivar response and disease management strategies. *Can. J. Plant Pathol.* 2011;33:485-498.
3. Correll JC, Thomas RG, Vern JE. The epidemiology of powdery mildew on tomatoes. *California Agriculture.* 1988, March-April;8-10.
4. FAOSTAT Database. Available:<http://faostat.fao.org/site/339/default.aspx> (accessed on 19 September 2017).
5. Rana A, Malannavar AB, Banyal DK. Studies on biology and environmental factors affecting the development of tomato powdery mildew under protected cultivation. *Indian Phytopathology.* 2018, Sep;71(3):385-91.
6. Foolad MR. Genome mapping and molecular breeding of tomato. *Int. J. Plant Genomics.* 2007; 64358.
7. Kumar A, Solanki SC. Management of blossom blight and leaf anthracnose of mango using fungicides. *Int. J. Plant Prot.* 2014;7(2):453- 455.
8. Palti J, Pinkas Y, Chorin M. Powdery mildew of mango. *Plant Dis. Reprtr.* 1974; 58:45-49.
9. Prakash O, Singh UN. Evaluation of various fungicides for the control of powdery mildew of mango caused by *Oidium mangiferae*. *Pesticides.* 1982;16: 17-18.
10. Rajeev KV, Roberto T. Translational genomics for crop breeding, Volume I: Biotic Stress, First Edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc; 2013.
11. Rawal RD, Ullasa BA. Control of powdery mildew (*Oidium mangiferae* Berth.) of mango by fungicides. *Proc. Second International Symposium held at Bangalore in 1985 (India).* 1989;534- 536.
12. Ray SK. Efficacy of different fungicides for management of powdery mildew of mango in West Bengal; 2003.
13. Sharma H, Kalaria GB, Ghoghari PD, Khandelwal V. Bioefficacy of different chemical fungicides for the management of mango powdery mildew in south Gujarat. *J Mycol. Pl. Pathol.* 2012;42(4): 494-496.
14. Staub T. Fungicide resistance: Practical experience and anti-resistance strategies and the role of integrated use. *Annu. Rev. Phytopathol.* 1991;29:421-442.
15. Tahir HAS, Sahi ST, Iqbal M, Sahi GM, Atif M. Evaluation of new fungicides against powdery mildew of mango (*Mangifera indica*); 2009.
16. Troussieux S, Gilgen A, Souche JL. Fighting tomato fungal diseases with a biocontrol product based on amoeba lysate. *Plants.* 2023;12: 3603.
17. Wheeler BEJ. An introduction to plant disease. John Wiley and Sons Ltd., London. 1969;301.
18. Zhang LP, Khan A, Nino-Liu D, Foolad MR. A molecular linkage map of tomato displaying chromosomal locations of resistance gene analogs based on a *Lycopersicon esculentum* × *Lycopersicon hirsutum* cross. *Genome.* 2002;45: 133–146.

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the publisher and/or the editor(s). This publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. 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://prh.ikpress.org/review-history/12320>