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# a b s t r a c t

The efficacy of eight plant extracts (garlic, clove, garden quinine, Brazilian pepper, anthi mandhaari, black cumin, white cedar and neem) in controlling leaf rust disease of wheat was investigated *in vitro* and *in vivo*. *In vitro*, all treatments inhibited spore germination by more than 93%. Neem extract recorded 98.99% inhibition of spore germination with no significant difference from the fungicide Sumi-8 (100%). Under greenhouse conditions, seed soaking application in neem extract (at concentration of 2 ml/L) resulted in 36.82% reduction in the number of pustules/leaf compared with the untreated control. Foliar spraying of plant extracts on wheat seedlings decreased the number of pustules/leaf. Foliar spray- ing of plant extracts four days after inoculation led to the highest resistance response of wheat plants against leaf rust pathogen. Spray application of wheat seedlings with neem, clove and garden quinine extracts, four days after inoculation with leaf rust pathogen completely prevented rust development (100% disease control) and was comparable with the fungicide Sumi-8. Foliar spray application of wheat plants at mature stage with all plant extracts has significantly reduced the leaf rust infection (average coefficient of infection, ACI) compared with the untreated control and neem was the most effective treat- ment. This was reflected on grain yield components, whereas the 1000-kernel weight and the test weight were improved whether under one- or two-spray applications, with two-spray application being more effective in this regard. Thus, it could be concluded that plant extracts may be useful to control leaf rust disease in Egypt as a safe alternative option to chemical fungicides.

© 2016 Mansoura University. Production and hosting by Elsevier B.V.. This is an open access article under

the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Leaf rust disease of wheat, caused by *Puccinia triticina* Eriks. (syn. *P*. *recondita* Rob. Ex Desm. f.sp. *tritici* Eriks. and Henn.) has always been one of the major constraints in wheat production. It causes severe yield losses that could reach 50% in Egypt [[1]](#_bookmark14). Injudi- cious use of synthetic fungicides for controlling plant diseases has ultimate negative effects on human and animal health and agro- ecosystem. Eco-friendly control measures including plant extracts and organic materials, which act directly on the plant pathogens or indirectly by inducing resistance in plants [[2]](#_bookmark15), have gained consid- erable attention as alternative means to synthetic fungicides.

Efforts have been made to control plant diseases using plant extracts [[3–15]](#_bookmark16). They gave evidences that the plant extracts are effective bioagents against a wide range of plant pathogens viz., fungal, bacterial and viral pathogens. Plant seed oils had been also

\* Corresponding author.

*E-mail address:* [yassershabana2@yahoo.com](mailto:yassershabana2@yahoo.com) (Y.M. Shabana).

used to control plant pathogens [[16–19]](#_bookmark20). Plant extracts of many higher plants like neem have been reported to exhibit antibacterial, antifungal and insecticidal properties under laboratory trials [[20]](#_bookmark20). Some plants contain components that are toxic to pathogens when extracted from plant and applied on infected crops. These components are called botanical pesticides or botanicals. Com- monly used botanicals include plant extracts such as neem (*Aza- dirchta indica*, A. juss) and garlic (*Allium sativum*); and essential oils such as nettle (*Urtica* spp.), rue (*Ruta graveolens*, Linn), thyme (*Thymus vulgaris*, Linn), and tea tree (*Melaleuca alternifolia*) [[21]](#_bookmark20). Plants have the ability to synthesize aromatic secondary metabo- lites, like phenols, phenolic acids, quinones, flavones, flavonoids, flavonols, tannins and coumarins [[22]](#_bookmark21). The components with phe- nolic structures, like carvacrol, eugenol, and thymol, were highly active against the plant pathogens. These groups of compounds show antimicrobial effect and serve as plant defense mechanisms against pathogenic microorganisms [[23]](#_bookmark22). The underlying mecha- nisms are not clearly understood, but involvement of induced resistance is considered [[24]](#_bookmark23). These bioagents are nonpolluting,
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cost effective, non-hazardous and can be prepared with available materials in the field.

The ultimate aim of this research is to develop safe alternative control strategies to reduce dependency on synthetic fungicides. The present study investigated the role of some plant extracts in controlling wheat leaf rust disease under *in vitro* and *in vivo* conditions.

1. Materials and methods

The experiments of the study were carried out in the laboratory, greenhouse and field at the Wheat Disease Research Department, Sakha Agricultural Research Station, Plant Pathology Research Institute, Agricultural Research Center of Egypt, during the period from 2012 to 2014.

* 1. *Preparation of P. triticina inoculum*
  2. *In vitro assay*
     1. *Effect of plant extracts on spore germination of P. triticina*

Eight plant extracts listed in [Table 1](#_bookmark3) were tested for their inhi- bitory effect on spore germination of *P. triticina*. For each treat- ment, a concentration of 0.2% (v/v) was used *in vitro* and tested

using cavity slides with three replications, which were incubated at 15–18 °C. Ten microscopic fields were examined 8–10 h after treatment. A negative control treatment was maintained using dis- tilled water. Sumi-8 fungicide at 0.35 ml/L was used as a positive control (check treatment). The percent of spore germination was calculated by the following formula adopted by Ref. [[14]](#_bookmark20):

## PG = A/B × 100

where: PG = Percent of spore germination, A = Number of spores

germinated and B = Number of spores observed.

Inhibition percent of spore germination was calculated using the following formula [[34,35]](#_bookmark24):

Inhibition

## C — T

× 100

The causal fungus of leaf rust, *P. triticina* was isolated from infected wheat leaves collected from the commercial wheat fields and the Egyptian Wheat Rust Trap Nurseries during winter grow- ing seasons of 2012/13 and 2013/14.

Since the causal fungus of leaf rust is an obligate parasite, rust isolates were maintained on living plants. For multiplication of *P. triticina* uredospores, the collected samples were transferred onto seedlings of the highly susceptible wheat variety ‘‘Morocco” to obtain enough inoculum for further investigations.

The inoculation of wheat plants was carried out as described by Ref. [[25]](#_bookmark27), whereas seedling leaves were rubbed gently between moistened fingers with tap water and sprayed with water in the incubation chambers, then inoculated by sprinkling or brushing the collected uredospores over the plant leaves, and then re-

sprayed gently with water. The inoculated plants were incubated in a dark dew chamber at 18 °C for overnight then moved to the greenhouse and maintained at 18–25 °C. After incubation (12 to 15 days post-inoculation), uredospores were collected.

* 1. *Preparation of plant extracts*

Plant parts used in the present study were obtained from the Department of Medicinal Plants and Aromatic Research, Horticul- tural Research Institute, Agricultural Research Center (ARC), National Research Centre (NRC) and Faculty of Pharmacy, Cairo University, Egypt.

The extraction process was conducted at the Unit of Oil Extrac- tion, Department of Medicinal Plants and Aromatic Research, Hor- ticultural Research Institute, ARC. Plant extracts were prepared by grinding the used part ([Table 1](#_bookmark3)) of plants individually with steril- ized distilled water in a blender. The eight tested plant extracts and their extraction methods are presented in [Table 1](#_bookmark3).

Table 1

List of the plant extracts used for controlling leaf rust of wheat, common name,

## (%)= C

where: C = germination percent of spores in the negative control,

T = germination percent of spores in the treatment.

* 1. *Greenhouse assay*
     1. *Seed soaking treatment*

Plant extracts listed in [Table 1](#_bookmark3) were evaluated as seed-soaking treatment for their efficacy in suppressing leaf rust disease under greenhouse conditions. For each treatment, seeds of the highly sus- ceptible wheat variety Morocco were individually soaked in the tested plant extracts at concentration of 0.2% (v/v) for 24 h. Mean- while, Sumi-8 fungicide at 0.35 ml/L was used as standard treat- ment (positive control). Negative control treatment was made by soaking seeds in sterilized distilled water. After soaking, seeds were sown in pots (15 cm in diameter) with three replicates for each treatment. After 7 days, seedlings in each treatment were sprayed with water containing a few drops of Tween-20, then inoc- ulated with uredospores of *P. triticina* using rubbing technique according to Ref. [[25]](#_bookmark27). The plants were then incubated in a dark dew chamber at 100% relative humidity for 24 h, then moved to

the benches in the greenhouse and maintained at 18–25 °C under

a photoperiod of 16 h light (7600 Lux) and 8 h dark [[36]](#_bookmark24). After 15 days from inoculation, disease severity was recorded in terms of infection types and number of pustules/leaf. Infection types, from 0 to 4, were recorded as described by Ref. [[37]](#_bookmark24), where 0, 0, 1 and 2 are resistant, and 3 and 4 are susceptible while X is mesotheic ([Table 2](#_bookmark4)). The number of pustules/leaf was counted as described by Ref. [[38]](#_bookmark24).

Table 2

Infection types of wheat leaf rust used in disease assessment adopted from [[37]](#_bookmark24).

Infection type Host response Symptoms

Resistant 0 Immune No uredia or other macroscopic sign of

infection

scientific name, part used, and reference for extraction method.

0 Nearly

No uredia, but hypersensitive necrotic

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Plant name | Scientific name | Part used | Reference |  | 1 | immune  Very resistant | or chlorotic flecks present  Small uredia surrounded by necrosis |
| Garlic | *Allium sativum* | Bulbs | [[26]](#_bookmark31) |  | 2 | Moderately | Small to medium uredia surrounded |
| Clove | *Syzygium gromaticum* | Buds | [[27]](#_bookmark32) |  |  | resistant | by chlorosis or necrosis |
| Garden quinine | *Clerodendrum inerme* | Leaves | [[28]](#_bookmark33) | Susceptible | 3 | Moderately | Medium-sized uredia that may be |
| Brazilian pepper | *Schinus terebinthifolius* | Leaves | [[29]](#_bookmark35) |  |  | susceptible | associated with chlorosis |
| Anthi mandhaari | *Mirabilis jalapa* | Roots | [[30]](#_bookmark37) |  | 4 | Very | Large uredia without chlorosis or |
| Black cumin | *Nigella sativa* | Seeds | [[31]](#_bookmark24) |  |  | susceptible | necrosis |
| White cedar | *Thuja accidentalis* | Leaves | [[32]](#_bookmark24) | Mesotheic | X | Heterogeneous | Random distribution of variable-sized |
| Neem | *Azadirchta indica* | Seeds | [[33]](#_bookmark24) |  |  |  | uredia on a single leaf |
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Efficacy of treatments was calculated by the following equation:

Efficacy (%)= No. of pustules in the negative control — No. of pustules in the treatment × 100

No. of pustules in the negative control

* + 1. *Foliar spraying treatment on wheat seedlings*

The plant extracts were tested for their efficacy in controlling leaf rust using foliar spray application on wheat seedlings in the greenhouse. For each treatment, grains of the highly susceptible wheat variety Morocco were sown in pots (15 cm diameter) with three replicates (10–15 grains/pot). Sumi-8 fungicide was used as standard treatment (positive control). Seedlings sprayed with water supplemented with four drops of Tween 20 were served as negative control (untreated control). All extracts were separately sprayed one day before inoculation with uredospores and one and four days after inoculation with uredospores. Inoculation and incubation were performed as described by Ref. [[25]](#_bookmark27). After 15 days from inoculation, disease severity was rated in terms of infection types and number of pustules/leaf was recorded.

* 1. *Efficacy of plant extracts under field conditions*

The plant extracts were evaluated as foliar spray applications on mature wheat plants to determine their efficacy for controlling leaf rust disease and their effect on yield components. This experiment was carried out at the Experimental Farm of Sakha Agricultural Research Station during two winter seasons (2012/13 and 2013/14).

Split plot design with three replicates was adopted in this respect. The main plots were represented by one- and two-spray applications for each treatment. The first spray application was applied soon after the appearance of disease symptoms and the second spray application was carried out 15 days after the 1st spray application. Sub-plots were represented by the tested plant extracts.

Grains of the susceptible wheat varieties, ‘‘Gemmiza-7” (2012/13 season) and ‘‘Sids-1” (2013/14 season), were sown in experimental units (plots), each containing three rows with 3-m long and 30-cm apart at a rate of 8 g of grains/row. All plots were surrounded by a spreader area of one meter in width planted with the highly susceptible wheat variety ‘‘Morocco.” All cultural prac- tices recommended in the commercial fields, *i.e*., fertilization, irri- gation and other management practices, were applied. At boot stage, the spreader plants were inoculated according to the method of Ref. [[39]](#_bookmark24). The spreader plants were moistened by a fine spray with water then dusted with uredospores powder mixture (one volume of fresh uredospores: 20 volume of talcum powder). Dust- ing was carried out at sunset to be favored with high relative humidity at night. Fungicide ‘‘Sumi-8” (35 ml/100 L water) was used as check treatment (positive control). Plants sprayed with just water served as untreated control treatment (negative control).

Disease assessment based on average coefficient of infection (ACI) according to Ref. [[40]](#_bookmark24) was used by multiplying disease sever- ity (DS) by constant values of infection type (IT). The constant val- ues for infection types were used, where R = 0.2, MR = 0.4, MS = 0.8 and S = 1.0. Infection types were scoredaccording to Ref. [[37]](#_bookmark24). Dis- ease severity (DS) was estimated as percentage coverage of leaves with rust pustules using Modified Cobb’s scale [[41]](#_bookmark24).

At harvest, 1000 kernel weight and test weight (1000 ml) parameters were estimated as indicators of yield components. Yield reduction (%) was estimated using the following equation adopted by Ref. [[42]](#_bookmark24):

Yield reduction (%)= 1 — yd/yh × 100

where: yd = yield of untreated plants (negative control), yh = yield of treated plant.

The efficacy of treatment was determined according to the fol- lowing equation adopted by Ref. [[43]](#_bookmark25):

Efficacy (% C — T × 100

)=

## C

where: C = infection (%) in the negative control, T = infection (%) in the treatment.

The statistical analysis was done for each experiment individu- ally using Duncan’s new multiple range test according to the method adopted by Ref. [[44]](#_bookmark26).

* 1. *Statistical analysis*

Data were statistically analyzed using the Statistical Analysis System package (SAS software, Cary, NC, USA). Data were evalu- ated by one way ANOVA (analysis of variance) test. Pairwise com-

at *P* ≤ 0.05. parison was carried out with least significant difference (LSD) test

1. Results
   1. *Effect of the plant extracts on spore germination of P. triticina*

*In vitro*, treating of *P. triticina* uredospores with all plant extracts significantly inhibited spore germination by more than 93% ([Table 3](#_bookmark5)). The most effective plant extracts in this regard were neem (98.99% inhibition), clove (98.86%), anthi mandhaari (98.72%), and black cumin (98.61%) ([Table 3](#_bookmark5)). These were followed by white cedar (97.76% inhibition) and then Brazilian pepper (97.12%), while garden quinine and garlic extracts were the least effective inhibitors for uredospore germination. Sumi-8 fungicide has totally inhibited uredospore germination (100% inhibition) ([Table 3](#_bookmark5)).

* 1. *Efficacy of plant extracts under greenhouse condition*
     1. *Seed soaking treatment*

Results showed that seed treatment with Sumi-8 fungicide led to 100% protection against leaf rust infection ([Table 4](#_bookmark7)). Among the plant extracts tested, white cedar extract was the most

Table 3

Effect of plant extracts on spore germination of *Puccinia triticina* compared with the fungicide Sumi-8.

Treatment Germination (%) Inhibition (%)

Garlic 5.02 b[a](#_bookmark6) 93.71

Clove 0.91 e 98.86

Garden quinine 5.26 b 93.41

Brazilian pepper 2.30 c 97.12

Anthi mandhaari 1.02 e 98.72

Black cumin 1.11 e 98.61

White cedar 1.79 d 97.76

Neem 0.80 e 98.99

Sumi-8 (fungicide) 0.00 f 100.00

Control (untreated) 79.78 a 00.00

LSD: at 5% = 0.35, at 1% = 0.48

a Values followed by the same letter are not significantly different according to LSD test at *P* = 5%.
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Table 4

Effect of seed soaking with plant extracts on leaf rust severity of wheat at seedling stage.

Residual effect after 22 days for the last group (4 days after inoculation)

No. of pustules/ leaf

13.30 d

0.0 a

0.0 a

3.0 b

2.0 ab

1.0 ab

0.0 a

0.0 a

7.0 c

Efficacy (%)

83.00

100.00

100.00

96.17

97.45

98.72

100.00

100.00

91.06

00.00

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Treatment | Type of infection [a](#_bookmark7) | No. of pustules/leaf | Efficacy (%) |
| Garlic | 4 | 55.70 f [b](#_bookmark7) | 15.60 |
| Clove | 4 | 49.30 d | 25.30 |
| Garden quinine | 4 | 54.00 ef | 18.18 |
| Brazilian pepper | 4 | 50.00 d | 24.24 |
| Anthi mandhaari | 4 | 51.30 d | 22.27 |
| Black cumin | 4 | 53.30 e | 19.24 |
| White cedar | 4 | 39.33 b | 40.41 |
| Neem | 4 | 41.70 c | 36.82 |
| Sumi-8 (fungicide) | 0 | 0.01 a | 100.00 |
| Control (untreated) | 4 | 66.00 g | 00.00 |

LSD at 5% = 1.942, at 1% = 2.649

Infection type

3 (S)

0; (R)

0; (R)

2 (R)

1 (R)

2 (R)

2 (R)

1 (R)

4 (S)

4 (S)

78.30 e

2.062

2.813

a 4 = Susceptible, 0 = Resistant.

b Values followed by the same letter are not significantly different according to LSD test at *P* = 5%.

effective one, recording 40.41% efficacy followed by neem (36.82%), clove (25.30%), Brazilian pepper (24.20%) and *Anthi mandhaari* (22.27%), while garlic extract was the least effective one (15.60%) ([Table 4](#_bookmark7)). These results may indicate that such plant extracts are inducing resistance in wheat seedlings against leaf rust infection as seed soaking treatment.

Four days after inoculation

No. of pustules/ leaf

13.30 c

0.01 a

0.01 a

3.00 b

2.00 b

1.00 ab

0.01 a

0.01 a

0.01 a

Efficacy (%)

83.00

100.00

100.00

96.17

97.45

98.72

100.00

100.00

100.00

78.30 d

00.00

1.84

2.94

* + 1. *Foliar spraying on wheat seedlings*

Data in [Table 5](#_bookmark8) indicated that all the tested plant extracts reduced the number of pustules/leaf as foliar spraying on wheat seedlings compared with the untreated control. Foliar spray appli- cation four days after inoculation was the best timing treatment showing plant resistance response (R) compared with the applica- tion one day before or after inoculation. Among all plant extracts tested, neem extract was the most effective treatment and recorded 86.30% efficacy when applied one day before inoculation and 100% efficacy when applied one or four days after inoculation ([Table 5](#_bookmark8)). Its effect was equivalent to that of Sumi-8 fungicide ([Table 5](#_bookmark8)). After 22 days from inoculation, the tested plant extracts except garlic extract gave evidence to have positive residual/con- tinued protective effect even better than that of the fungicide Sumi-8 ([Table 5](#_bookmark8)).

Table 5

Effect of spraying the wheat seedlings with eight plant extracts on leaf rust and their residual effect.

One day after inoculation

No. of pustules/ leaf

17.00 e

0.01 a

0.01 a

11.70 d

3.00 b

9.30 cd

6.70 c

0.01 a

0.01 a

Efficacy (%)

78.29

100.00

[100.00](#_bookmark9)

85.06

96.17

88.12

91.44

100.00

100.00

Infection type

3 (S)

0; (R)

0; (R)

2 (R)

1 (R)

2 (R)

2 (R)

1 (R)

0 (R)

78.30 f

00.00

4 (S)

2.67

3.63

a Values followed by the same letter(s) are not significantly different according to LSD test at *P* = 5%.

* 1. *Effect of foliar spraying on mature plants under field conditions*

Infection type

3 (S)

0; (R)

0; (R)

4 (S)

0; (R)

3 (S)

3 (S)

0; (R)

0 (R)

4 (S)

The effect of foliar spraying of plant extracts on leaf rust infec- tion (average coefficient of infection, ACI) and wheat yield compo- nents (1000 kernel weight and test weight) was evaluated under field conditions during two seasons, 2012/13 and 2013/14.

Efficacy (%)

16.60

83.78

74.46

82.50

76.63

72.29

73.56

86.33

100.00

00.00

At the first season (2012/13), where wheat cultivar ‘‘Gemmiza 7” was used, data in [Table 6](#_bookmark13) revealed that the application of either one or two sprays of all plant extracts significantly reduced leaf rust infection, with neem extract being the most effective. It was more effective than the fungicide for one spray application, while equivalent to it for the two-spray application with regard to ACI, efficacy, and the 1000-kernel weight. In general, two-spray appli- cation was more effective than one-spray application ([Table 6](#_bookmark13)).

Time of application

One day before inoculation

No. of pustules/ leaf

65.30 d a

12.70 b

20.00 c

13.70 b

18.30 c

21.70 c

20.70 c

10.70 b

0.01 a

78.30 e

3.94

5.36

All the used plant extracts improved the 1000-kernel weight with two-spray application being more effective than one spray. With two-spray application, extracts of clove, Brazilian pepper, neem, and garlic were the best treatments, improving 1000 kernel weight by 19.13%, 19.11%, 19.06%, and 19.06% increase over the control, respectively. Their effect was significantly equivalent to that of the fungicide Sumi-8 (20.23% increase in 1000-kernel weight) ([Table 6](#_bookmark13)).

Treatment

Infection type

4 (S)

3 (S)

3 (S)

3 (S)

4 (S)

4 (S)

4 (S)

4 (S)

0 (R)

Garlic Clove

Garden quinine Brazilian pepper Anthi mandhaari Black cumin White cedar Neem

Sumi-8

(fungicide)

Control

(untreated) LSD at 5%

LSD at 1%

4 (S)

With regard to test weight parameter, data showed that two- spray application was better than one spray. Also, the used plant
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Table 6

Effect of foliar spraying of plant extracts on leaf rust infection (average coefficient of infection; ACI) and yield components of wheat (cv. Gemmiza 7) under field conditions during 2012/13 growing season.

Treatment ACI Efficacy (%) 1000-Kernel weight (g) Test weight (g)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | One spray | Two sprays |  | One spray | Two sprays |  | One spray | Two sprays | Difference | Increase (%) |  | One spray | Two sprays | Difference | Increase (%) |  |
| Garlic | 30.00 c [a](#_bookmark12) | 20.00 c |  | 66.67 | 77.78 |  | 49.66 a | 50.60 ab | 0.94\*\* | 19.06 |  | 692.00 e | 702.50 c | 10.50\*\* | 3.27 |  |
| Clove | 30.00 c | 20.00 c |  | 66.67 | 77.78 |  | 49.83 a | 50.63 ab | 0.80\* | 19.13 |  | 697.87 b | 704.57 b | 6.70\*\* | 3.57 |  |
| Garden quinine | 31.67 c | 23.67 b |  | 64.81 | 73.70 |  | 45.96 c | 47.98 d | 2.02\*\* | 12.89 |  | 694.67 c | 696.20 e | 1.53\*\* | 2.34 |  |
| Brazilian pepper | 38.33 b | 21.67 bc |  | 57.41 | 75.92 |  | 49.52 a | 50.62 ab | 1.10\*\* | 19.11 |  | 689.23 f | 690.77 g | 1.53\*\* | 1.54 |  |
| Anthi mandhaari | 30.00 c | 10.00 d |  | 66.67 | 88.89 |  | 43.46 e | 48.61 cd | 5.15\*\* | 14.38 |  | 693.00 de | 694.30 f | 1.30\*\* | 2.06 |  |
| Black cumin | 27.33 d | 10.00 d |  | 69.63 | 88.89 |  | 44.29 d | 49.92 b | 5.63\*\* | 17.46 |  | 692.63 de | 694.57 f | 1.93\*\* | 2.10 |  |
| White cedar | 20.00 e | 10.00 d |  | 77.78 | 88.89 |  | 43.80 de | 48.89 c | 5.09\*\* | 15.04 |  | 693.50 d | 698.67 d | 5.17\*\* | 2.70 |  |
| Neem | 11.67 f | 4.33 e |  | 87.03 | 95.19 |  | 43.86 de | 50.60 ab | 6.22\*\* | 12.08 |  | 700.10 a | 706.53 a | 6.43\*\* | 3.86 |  |
| Sumi-8 (fungicide) | 30.00 c | 5.00 e |  | 66.67 | 94.44 |  | 47.42 b | 51.10 a | 3.68\*\* | 20.33 |  | 684.83 g | 695.20 ef | 10.37\*\* | 2.19 |  |
| Control (untreated) | 90.00 a | 90.00 a |  | 00.00 | 00.00 |  | 42.50 f | 42.50 e | 0.00ns | 00.00 |  | 680.27 h | 680.27 h | 0.00ns | 0.00 |  |
| LSD at 5% |  | 2.710 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.641 |  |  |  |  | 0.900 |  |  |
| LSD at 1 % |  | 3.683 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.875 |  |  |  |  | 1.323 |  |  |

a Values followed by the same letter(s) are not significantly different according to LSD test at *P* = 5% (\*) and *P* = 1% (\*\*).

Table 7

Effect of foliar spraying of plant extracts on leaf rust infection (average coefficient of infection; ACI) and yield components of wheat (cv. Sids 1) under field conditions during 2013/14 growing season.[a](#_bookmark11) Treatment ACI Efficacy (%) 1000-Kernel weight (g) Test weight (g)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | One spray | Two sprays |  | One spray | Two sprays |  | One spray | Two sprays | Difference | Increase (%) |  | One spray | Two sprays | Difference | Increase (%) |  |
| Garlic | 33.33 b | 23.33 b |  | 58.34 | 70.84 |  | 42.23 c | 44.61 b | 2.83\*\* | 13.02 |  | 704.00 a | 708.73 b | 4.73\*\* | 4.13 |  |
| Clove | 30.00 c | 20.00 b |  | 62.50 | 75.00 |  | 40.52 f | 41.68 e | 1.16\*\* | 5.60 |  | 695.07 bc | 699.00 d | 3.93\*\* | 2.70 |  |
| Garden quinine | 30.00 c | 20.00 b |  | 62.50 | 75.00 |  | 41.57 de | 42.62 d | 1.05\*\* | 7.98 |  | 703.47 a | 711.10 a | 7.63\*\* | 4.48 |  |
| Brazilian pepper | 34.33 b | 23.00 b |  | 57.09 | 71.25 |  | 43.70 a | 45.69 a | 1.98\*\* | 15.73 |  | 696.07 b | 699.27 d | 3.20\*\* | 2.74 |  |
| Anthi mandhaari | 20.00 d | 9.33 d |  | 75.00 | 88.34 |  | 41.46 e | 42.62 d | 1.16\*\* | 7.98 |  | 693.53 cd | 698.80 d | 5.27\*\* | 2.67 |  |
| Black cumin | 30.00 c | 10.00 cd |  | 62.50 | 87.50 |  | 42.96 b | 43.79 c | 0.83\*\* | 10.94 |  | 694.57 bc | 699.07 d | 4.50\*\* | 2.71 |  |
| White cedar | 21.67 d | 5.00 e |  | 72.91 | 93.75 |  | 43.14 ab | 44.92 b | 1.78\*\* | 13.81 |  | 693.97 cd | 702.97 c | 9.00\*\* | 3.28 |  |
| Neem | 8.33 e | 5.00 e |  | 89.59 | 93.75 |  | 41.63 de | 42.90 d | 1.27\*\* | 8.69 |  | 694.13 cd | 699.70 d | 5.57\*\* | 2.81 |  |
| Sumi-8 (fungicide) | 30.00 c | 5.00 e |  | 62.50 | 93.75 |  | 42.08 cd | 45.07 b | 2.99\*\* | 14.19 |  | 692.83 d | 703.43 c | 10.60\*\* | 3.35 |  |
| Control (untreated) | 80.00 a | 80.00 a |  | 00.00 | 00.00 |  | 39.47 g | 39.47 f | 0.00ns | 00.00 |  | 680.77 e | 680.63 e | —0130ns | 0.00 |  |
| LSD at 5% |  |  | 3.506 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.567 |  |  |  |  | 1.389 |  |  |
| LSD at 1% |  |  | 4.766 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.774 |  |  |  |  | 1.895 |  |  |

a Values followed by the same letter(s) are not significantly different according to LSD test at *P* = 5% (\*) and *P* = 1% (\*\*).
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extracts increased the test weight compared with the untreated control. The best treatment was neem extract followed by clove and garlic extracts, which were all better than the fungicide Sumi-8 ([Table 6](#_bookmark13)).

In the second season (2013/14), where wheat cultivar ‘‘Sids 1” was used, data presented in [Table 7](#_bookmark10) revealed that the application of either one or two sprays of all used plant extracts showed high efficacy against leaf rust, reducing the ACI in comparison with the untreated control. The treatment of two-spray application seemed to be more effective than one spray. For one- or two-spray applica- tion, the most effective treatment was neem (89.59 and 93.75% efficacy, respectively), which was more effective than the fungicide Sumi-8 (for one-spray application) and had equal efficacy with the fungicide for the two sprays ([Table 7](#_bookmark10)).

All plant extracts significantly improved yield components by increasing the 1000-kernel weight and the test weight either under one- or two-spray application, but two-spray application was more effective. Under two-spray application, Brazilian pepper was the most effective extract, improving the 1000-kernel weight by 15.73% over the untreated control. It was followed by white cedar (13.81%) and garlic (13.02%), which were equivalent to the fungi- cide Sumi-8 (14.19%) ([Table 7](#_bookmark10)). With regard to the test weight, gar- den quinine was the most effective extract, increasing the test weight by 4.48% over the untreated control followed by garlic (4.13%) and both were significantly more effective than the chem- ical fungicide (3.35%); then came the white cedar extract, increas- ing the test weight by 3.28%. The latter was equivalent to the fungicide Sumi-8 ([Table 7](#_bookmark10)).

1. Discussion

Biological control of wheat rusts by using plant extracts is a modern, advanced and risk-free alternative method of rust man- agement [[45]](#_bookmark28). Several plant extracts are known to play an impor- tant role in the management of plant diseases [[7,9,12,14,15]](#_bookmark18). They act directly or indirectly against plant pathogens, either to inhibit fungal growth and multiplication or by inducing resistance in crop plants. In this study*, in vitro*-tested plant extracts (neem, clove, antha mandhaari, black cumin, white cedar, Brazilian pep- per, garlic and garden quinine) inhibited spore germination of wheat leaf rust *P. triticina* by 93% or more. Neem extract caused 98.99% inhibition to spore germination, which was not signifi- cantly different from the fungicide Sumi-8 treatment (100% inhibition).

Seed soaking or foliar spray treatments of wheat seedlings with the plant extracts reduced the number of pustules/leaf, with foliar spraying being more effective. In this regard, neem extract was the most effective treatment. It gave 100% control of the disease when applied one or four days after inoculation. After 22 days from inoc- ulation, pustules started to appear on plants treated with the fungicide (Sumi-8), while no pustules developed on plants treated with neem, white cedar, garden quinine, or clove extracts. Apply- ing a foliar spray at the mature plant stage showed high efficacy in reducing the leaf rust infection (ACI) and neem extract was the most effective treatment. Two-spray application seemed to be more effective than one spray.

All plant extracts improved the 1000-kernel weight and test weight under one- or two-spray application but two-spray applica- tion was more effective.

It is evident from several reports [[5,7–15]](#_bookmark17) that plant extracts are effective biocontrol agents against a wide range of plant pathogens. Plants have the ability to synthesize aromatic secondary metabo- lites, like phenols, phenolic acids, quinones, flavones, flavonoids, flavonols, tannins and coumarins [[22]](#_bookmark21). The components with phe- nolic structures, like carvacrol, eugenol, and thymol, were highly

active against pathogens. These groups of compounds show antimicrobial effect and serve as plant defense mechanisms against pathogenic microorganisms [[23]](#_bookmark22). Plants of Meliaceae family, espe- cially neem, contain at least 35 biologically active principles of which nimbin and azadirachtin [[46]](#_bookmark29) are the most active insectici- dal ingredients and are present predominantly in the seeds, leaves and other parts of the neem tree. The active ingredients of neem constitute mostly of triterpenoides, *e.g*. nimbin, nimbicidine, aza- dirachtin etc. [[47]](#_bookmark30). The inhibitory effect of the plant extracts might be attributed to the presence of antifungal components, *i.e*., Aza- dirchin in *Azadirachta indica*, Artemesium in *Artemisia annua*, Caratenes in *Ocimum sanctum*, Emodin in *Rheum emodi* and Euca- lyptolin in *Eucalyptus globulus* [[9]](#_bookmark19).

The underlying mechanisms of disease suppression by plant extracts are not clearly understood, but involvement of induced resistance is considered [[24]](#_bookmark23). The phenomenon of inducing resis- tance in plants by biotic and abiotic compounds, such as some microorganisms, natural active ingredients (allicin, fulvic acid and eugenol), salicylic acid, phosphates, and plant oils, potentially offers an alternate, more environmentally approach to crops pro- tection against infection with many diseases [[15,48,49]](#_bookmark20). These bioagents are nonpolluting, cost effective, non-hazardous and can be prepared with available materials in the field. The mode of action of abiotic inducers for controlling plant diseases may include acting as second messengers in enhancing the host defense mechanism [[50]](#_bookmark34), activating resistance by increasing the activity of peroxidase (PO), the synthesis of new POD isoforms, the accumula- tion of the phenolic compound [[51]](#_bookmark36), or through inhibition of some antioxidant enzymes and catalases, thereby leading to production of elevated amounts of H2O2 [[52]](#_bookmark38) and finally enhancing resistance by direct effects on multiplication development and survival of pathogens or indirect effects on plant metabolism with subsequent effects on the pathogen food supply [[53]](#_bookmark39).

Finally, it could be concluded that the used plant extracts hav- ing resistance mechanisms may be useful to control leaf rust dis- ease of wheat. On the basis of the results obtained during the experiment and reports of success of plant extracts in controlling plant pathogenic fungi, the tested plant extracts hold promise for the organic and ecofriendly management of foliar diseases of wheat. The findings of these studies may become the foundation for the use of biocontrol agents as a safe and cost-effective control method against leaf rust of wheat.
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