Present status and future directions for management of root lesion nematode (Pratylenchus thornei) in chickpea

Ashish Kumar
JNKVV, College of Agriculture, Jabalpur, M.P., India

Vedant Gautam
JNKVV, College of Agriculture, Jabalpur, M.P., India

R. K. Tiwari
JNKVV, College of Agriculture, Rewa, M.P., India

Stuti Sharma
JNKVV, College of Agriculture, Jabalpur, M.P., India

Jayant Bhatt
JNKVV, College of Agriculture, Jabalpur, M.P., India

Radheskyam Sharma
JNKVV, College of Agriculture, Jabalpur, M.P., India

R. Shiv RamaKrishnan
JNKVV, College of Agriculture, Jabalpur, M.P., India

ARTICLE INFO
Received : 08 December 2021
Revised : 23 February 2022
Accepted : 11 May 2022
Available online: 23 May 2022

Key Words:
Chickpea
Eco-friendly Management
RLN and Resistance source

ABSTRACT
Chickpea is a popular legume crop in Asia and Africa's semi-arid regions. Crop production gains, on the other hand, have been modest, owing to biotic and abiotic stressors. Among the different biotic stresses, nematodes portray serious threat to chickpea production and colossal losses have been reported due to stress-free infection by other pathogens on infection with root lesion nematode (RLN). The worldwide distribution of two major species of RLN namely P. thornei and P. neglectus made them a focus research area especially on management aspect. In dryland farming areas of southeastern Australia, the P. thornei alone can cause yield losses of up to 40% in cereals and legumes. Despite the fact that chickpea breeders have been working persistently to generate superior chickpea varieties with increased resilience or tolerance to biotic and abiotic challenges, contemporary biotechnology technologies can help to speed up this process. To incorporate these tools and/or accelerate breeding programmes, identification of RLN resistant source with its genetic factor is first step in developing improved cultivars. However, study of resistance screening methods for chickpea against RLN is limited and standardization of different factors for development of a stable screening methodology distinguishing various levels of resistance is the need of the hour in RLN research.

Introduction
One of the most commercially important food legume crops is chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.). It is grown on an estimated 14.56 million hectares in more than 55 countries, producing 14.78 million tonnes (FAOSTAT, 2017). India, Australia, Myanmar, Ethiopia, Turkey, Pakistan, Russia, Iran, Mexico, the United States, and Canada are the top chickpea producers (FAOSTAT, 2019). It is planted on 10.22 mha in India, with a production of 9.53 mt and a productivity of 967 kg ha⁻¹. Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Rajasthan, Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, and Karnataka collectively produce 95.71 per cent of the country's chickpea production and 90 per cent of the country's area (Anon, 2013-14). Chickpea is a nutrient-rich cool-season pulse crop that plays a critical role in ensuring global food security as a source of dietary protein and key...
amino acids. Fixing atmospheric nitrogen, contributing to soil fertility, acting as a disease break, and suppressing weeds are all essential roles it performs in farming systems. The global average yield of chickpea is less than 1 t/ha, significantly less than the 6 t/ha potential output under favourable and irrigated circumstances (Varshney et al., 2017). This huge gap between actual and predicted chickpea yields is attributable to biotic challenges including insects, bacteria, fungi, nematodes, and viruses, as well as abiotic factors like drought, nutritional shortages, salinity, and cold (Roorkkiwal et al., 2016; Kumar et al., 2021).

Since 1961, chickpea productivity has consistently increased, but its vulnerability to biotic and abiotic stressors has also increased, presumably due to the restricted number of germplasm accessions/donor parents used and reused (Muehlbauer and Sarker, 2017). Chickpea is attacked by air borne, seed borne, and soil borne pathogens (Chattopadhyay et al., 2001). More than 75 pathogens have been reported to infect chickpea (Nene et al., 1984). Globally, the loss of chickpea output due to plant parasite nematodes is estimated to be 14 per cent among the various biotic stressors (Sasser and Freckman, 1987). Accurate nematode species determination necessitates a thorough understanding of nematode taxonomy and/or the use of molecular diagnostic methods. Root-knot nematodes (Meloidogyne arthiella, M. incognita, and M. javanica), chickpea cyst nematode (Heterodera ciceri), and root-lesion nematode (Pratylenchus thornei) are the most common worms that infect chickpea.

The root lesion nematodes, Pratylenchus spp. [Pratylenchus thornei Sher & Allen, 1953 (Tylenchida, Pratylenchidae)], is among one of the most important constraints to legume production and have a wide distribution in many regions in Turkey (82% of chickpea fields) and affect many agricultural crops around the world (Tanha et al., 2009; Behmand et al., 2019). Pratylenchus thornei, P. neglectus, Pratylenchus penetrans Cobb, 1917 and Pratylenchus crenatus Loof, 1960 (Tylenchida: Pratylenchidae), are the most important root lesion nematodes in the world (Vanstone et al., 1998). Among the root lesion nematodes, P. thornei and P. neglectus are globally distributed and they enter the root tissue of host plant for feeding and reproduction (Nicol et al., 2004). Also, some studies indicated that in terms of damage caused by these nematodes is of second importance as a nematode problem in the world after root-knot nematodes (Barker & Noe, 1987; Jatala & Bridge, 1990). P. thornei is one of the most dominating species of plant parasitic nematodes that can cause yield losses of up to 40% in cereals and legumes in dryland cropping areas of southeastern Australia (Thompson et al., 1995; Vanstone et al., 1998), chickpea in India with particular reference to Madhya Pradesh (Tiwari et al., 1992). Chickpea, infested with RLNs showed symptoms of stunted growth and leaf chlorosis and causes yield losses greater than 50% in chickpeas (Castilo et al., 1998; Castilo & Vovlas, 2007). Conventional breeding technologies are being continuously employed for development of elite chickpea varieties. However, success is limited and time consuming for incorporation of resistance factor against different biotic and biotic factors. The modern biotechnological tools have significantly facilitated generation of huge amount of genomic resources development to accelerate such activities. To incorporate these tools and/or accelerate breeding programmes, identification of RLN resistant source with its genetic factor is first step in developing improved cultivars. However, study of resistance screening methods for chickpea against RLN is limited and standardization of different factors for development of a stable screening methodology distinguishing various levels of resistance is the need of the hour in RLN research. Recent advancement in generation of genomic resources in chickpea (Hiremath et al., 2011, 2012; Gujaria et al., 2011) will certainly lead to identify of QTL conferring resistance to RLN in chickpea which can be utilized further for incorporation in molecular breeding platform.

**Root Lesion Nematode**

The Root Lesion Nematode (RLN), *Pratylenchus thornei* Sher and Allen, is a migratory endoparasite (Figure 1) that causes large yield losses and is regarded one of the most important plant-parasitic nematodes (Tiwari et al., 1992). Inside the root cortex, RLNs penetrate, feed, and migrate, causing necrotic lesions and root cavities (Figure 2). Under ideal conditions, the nematode reproduces mitotically and parthenogenetically (Fortuner, 1977), producing eggs in the cortex and completing its life cycle in 6 weeks. More than 60 species of
Table 1: Successful management of nematodes in crops using eco-friendly approaches.

| Management approach | Crop            | Reference                        |
|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| **Soil amendment by different plant bi-products** |                 |                                  |
| Oil cakes of neem, castor bean, groundnut, linseed, sunflower and soybean | Chickpea        | Tiyagi and Shamim, 2004          |
| Powdered (seed kernel, seed coat, and Achook at 20 per cent w/w) neem formulations | Chickpea        | Mojumder, 1999                   |
| Liquid (Neemark and Nimbecidine @5 per cent v/w) neem formulations | Chickpea        | Mojumder, 1999                   |
| Mustard and Linseed cakes | Groundnut | Sebastian and Gupta, 1995       |
| Jatropha cake @ 2 t/ha | Tomato          | Patel and Patel, 2007           |
| Mustard, castor and Jatropha cakes @ 30 g/plant | Bottle guard    | Verma and Nandal, 2007          |
| **Bioagents** |                 |                                  |
| *Trichoderma harzianum* | Chickpea | Pant & Pandey, 2002              |
|                       | Maize          | Windham et al., 1989             |
|                       | Tomato         | Rao et al., 1997                 |
| *T. koningii*         | Maize          | Windham et al., 1989             |
| *T. harzianum* with neem cake | Tomato | Reddy et al., 1998               |
| *Trichoderma and Gliocladium* | Sunflower | Shankaranarayanan et al., 1999  |
| *Trichoderma viride*  | Chickpea       | Pandey et al., 2003, Dwivedi et al., 2008 |
| **Pseudomonas fluorescens** | Chickpea | Dwivedi et al., 2008             |
| *Paecilomyces lilacinus* | Chickpea | Zaki and Maqbool, 1992; Vyas et al., 1997 |
|                       | Mashbean       | Shahzad et al., 1996             |
|                       | Groundnut      | Vyas et al., 1997                 |
|                       | Tomato         | Lin et al., 1993; Ekanayake and Jayasundara, 1994; Parveen and Gaffar, 1998; Khan and Saxena, 1996 |
|                       | Medicinal herbs | Park et al., 1993                |
|                       | betelvine      | Jonathan et al., 1995, Nakat et al., 1998, Hazarika et al., 1998; Pathak and Saikia, 1999 |
|                       | Mung bean, Okra | Shahzad and Gaffar, 1987, 1989; Esteshamul-Haque et al., 1995 |
| **Pochonia chlamydosporia** | Vegetables | Kerry and Diaz, 2004             |
|                       | Okra           | Dharwan et al., 2007             |
|                       | Pistachio      | Ebadi et al., 2018               |
|                       | Monocot and dicot hosts | Tolba et al., 2021 |
Pratylenchus exist (Loof, 1991), all of which can be distinguished only by small morphological and morphometric changes. In North Africa (Di Vito et al., 1994a), Turkey (Di Vito et al., 1994b), and Spain (Castillo et al., 1996), RLNs are the most common plant-parasitic nematode detected in chickpea crops.

The root-lesion nematode *Pratylenchus thornei* is the most common species that causes damage to chickpea crops around the world. *P. thornei* is found in major chickpea-growing countries such as Australia (Thompson et al., 2000), India, and Pakistan, India (Sharma et al., 1992), North Africa (Di Vito et al., 1994a), Turkey (Di Vito et al., 1994b), and Spain (Castillo et al., 1996). *P. thornei* is emerging as a serious threat to chickpea production in India, which is the world's largest producer and consumer of gram. High populations of *P. thornei* have been reported in Madhya Pradesh (Baghel and Singh, 2013), Rajasthan (Ali and Sharma, 2003), Maharashtra (Varaprasad et al., 1997), and Uttar Pradesh (Sebastian and Gupta, 2015). During chickpea crop surveys in North Africa and the Mediterranean region, Brazil, and North America, numerous more Pratylenchus species have been identified and reported.

Root-lesion nematodes are migratory endoparasites that cause severe necrosis of epidermal, cortical, and endodermal cells in chickpea roots by feeding in the cortical parenchyma. A combination of stylet thrusting and enzymatic weakening of the host cell walls facilitates both root penetration and migration inside root tissues (Castillo & Vovlas, 2007). Wheat, in addition to chickpea, has been identified as a possible RLN host (Di vito et al., 1987).

**Chickpea-RLN interactions**

Taylor et al. (2000) established parasitic behavior of *Pratylenchus thornei* in chickpea and further specified that its life cycle can be from 45 to 65 days depending upon different environmental features and host availability. However, under artificial conditions using carrot disk culture, *P. thornei* can take 25 to 35 days to complete its life cycle under the temperature incubation at 20 to 25°C (Castillo et al., 1995). Therefore, many generations of *P. thornei* can happen in one crop season (Sikora et al., 2018). Bridge and Starr (2007) affirmed that all the motile stages of *Pratylenchus* are parasitic. They further specified the behavior of migratory endoparasites and their feeding was confined inside the cortex, deposited eggs singly in the cavities formed by migration of nematode inside the parenchymatic cells of plant roots. De Waele and Elsen (2007) reported that reproduction in the females of *Pratylenchus thornei* is by mitotic parthenogenesis and males are rare. Pudasaini et al. (2008) confirmed that females of *P. thornei* deposit eggs in the soil. The eggs and nematodes of *P. thornei* can withstand in the soil under the conditions when host plants are not available. Under the circumstances of slow drying of soil, a high proportion of these nematodes can withstand and survive under these prevailing dry conditions (Thompson et al., 2017, 2018).

Depending upon the population of *P. thornei*, damage may vary and as a consequence of its infection huge segments of cortex are degraded, and subsequently absorption capacity of roots is also significantly reduced (Jaques and Schwass, 1956). The population of *P. thornei* remained inside the cortical tissues of chickpea roots, according to Tiwari et al. (1992). *P. thornei* infection results in dark brown to black lesions on chickpea roots. Root-lesion nematode damage is often less noticeable than root-knot or cyst nematode damage (Sharma et al., 1992), and signs of *P. thornei* root damage do not necessarily manifest themselves on above-ground plant parts. In addition to these symptoms, sometimes plant weight reduction, reduced per cent pollen fertility, lesser number of pods, lower water absorption capacity and lesser chlorophyll content of leaves could also be witnessed due to RLN when compared with healthy chickpea plant (Tiyagi and Parveen, 1992). The above ground symptoms imitate nutrient and water deficiencies symptoms (Taylor et al., 1999). The lesions generally first appear on roots as water-soaked area after initiation of penetration of root epidermis by *P. thornei*. The elliptical shaped water-soaked lesions of 1 to 2 mm in length are formed over time and change in colour takes place to olive green and finally to radish brown colour (De Waele and Elsion, 2007).

The roots of chickpea are significantly damaged upon infection by *P. thornei*. However, chickpea plant inoculation with different numbers of lesion nematodes (10, 100, 1000, and 10000 RLN/plant) identified 100 nematode/kg soil as threshold value for significant growth character reductions. At the lowest inoculum level, nematode multiplication
Table 2: Identification of resistance sources for *P. thornei* in chickpea.

| Total No. of lines screened | No. of lines | Source of germplasm | Reference |
|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|-----------|
|                            |              |                     |           |
|                            | Resistant    | Moderately resistant|           |
| 215                        | 35           | 68                  | Indian Institute of Pulse Research (IIPR), Kanpur; JNKVV, Jabalpur, India | Tiwari *et al.*, 1992 |
| 600                        | 0            | 17                  | International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-arid Tropics (ICRISAT), Pantancharu, Telangana, India and IIPR, Kanpur, India | Ali and Ahmad, 2000 |
| 453                        | 1            | 14                  | International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA), ICRISAT, Australian cultivars and breeding lines | Thompson *et al.*, 2011 |
| 147                        | 21           | 18                  | Collection of primary, secondary and tertiary gene pool (Primary: *C. echinospermum*, *C. reticulatum*; Secondary: *C. bijugum*, *C. judaicum*, *C. pinnatifidum*, *C. chorassanicum*; Tertiary: *C. cuneatum*, *C. yamasitae*) | Di Vito *et al.*, 1995 |
| 96                         | 2            | 0                   | ICRISAT accessions | Jatav and Tiwari, 2019 |
| 174                        | 13           | 40                  | Collection of primary, gene pool (*C. echinospermum*, *C. reticulatum*) | Reen *et al.*, 2019 |

was at its peak (Walia and Seshadri, 1985). Threshold damage level of RLN in chickpea has been identified as 2 nematodes/g of soil (Bhatt, 1994). The nematode’s reproduction index decreases with increase of inoculum densities greater than 5000 nematodes per plant (Castillo *et al.*, 1995). The temperature ranging from 10 - 25°C, favours the egg hatching in *P. thornei* with steady increase in root penetration in the first 11 days after inoculation. All the migratory stages of *P. thornei* are proficient enough for root penetration and give rise to symptom expression (Castillo *et al.*, 1996). In total, 47% to 84% of the population of RLN could be identified in the vertical layer of soil from the top 0–10 cm, and 64–94% of the RLN population could be recovered from the top 20 cm soil zone (Taylor and Evans, 1998). However, it may be present up to 30 cm (Smiley *et al.*, 2008; Jatav, 2019).

Management strategies for nematode population

Nematicides are nematode-killing chemicals which include two primary categories of synthetic nematicides, fumigants and nonfumigants. Fumigants are often sold as liquids that react with soil water to release gases that kill a variety of organisms (including plants). They're biocides that can be used in a variety of situations. When the soil temperatures are acceptable, fumigants should be used in the fall or spring. In soil water, nonfumigant nematicides do not volatilize. In some cases, they can be used before, during, or even after planting. The range of these substances is frequently not as extensive as that of fumigants. They not only control nematodes, but also reduce the population of beneficial nematodes. Besides using nematicides, eco-friendly management strategies like use of different plant bi-products and bioagents are eco-friendly approaches for management of nematodes. Plant-parasitic nematode management has traditionally relied on organic amendments. When disintegrating materials emit poisonous substances, nematode population levels may drop quickly, but longer-term impacts could include an increase in nematode antagonists. Plant-parasitic nematodes tolerance may be enhanced due to improved crop nutrition and plant development as a result of amendment application. The success in nematode control may be governed by several factors including the type of used material, processing/composting of material, rate of application, test arena, crop rotation practice adoption and different agronomic techniques, soil type, climate conditions, and other environmental factors. The suppressive effects of different plant bi-products as organic amendments have been reported to exhibit not only detrimental effects on
nematode populations but also in improvement of structure of soil and water holding capacity (WHC) ultimately resulting in enhanced growth and yield. Chickpea root-knot nematodes can be effectively suppressed adopting pre-sowing seed treatment practice using different biopesticides, insecticides, and bioagents (Mishra et al., 2003). Apart from soil amendments, different biagents have also been identified in the capacity of controlling nematode population in soil. Seed or soil application of bioagents not only increases the egg parasitization but also significantly enhances plant growth parameters. Successful application of these plant bi-products and bioagents in chickpea and other crops is listed in table 1.

**Resistance sources for RLN**

When it comes to screening germplasm for sources of resistance, precise and reliable phenotyping is critical. For generating the phenotypic data of different lines/varieties, precise phenotyping is required under controlled environmental conditions using a known initial population of nematodes and/or eggs. The RLNs need to be extracted and quantified (in terms of nematode population) either from both roots and soil or any one of them before and after experimentation in case of migratory root-nematode population. *P. thornei* resistance levels have been reported in connection to the reproduction factor (final nematode population/initial nematode population) by researchers (Tiwari et al., 1992; Di Vito et al., 1995), or as number of nematodes (population count) per unit of root and/or soil (Thompson et al., 2011; Reen et al., 2019). Visual lesions observed on infected roots should not be counted and measured for consideration of nematode population or indicator of resistant reaction because these lesions are just symptoms and not a direct indicator of population of nematodes (Ali and Ahmad, 2000). In India (Tiwari et al., 1992; Ali and Ahmad, 2000, Gautam, 2021) and Australia (Thompson et al., 2011), sources of *P. thornei* resistance and moderate resistance have been recognized in the *C. arietinum* cultivar, in breeding lines and in accessions in the ICRISAT genebank. Tiwari et al., 1992 reported 35 resistant and 68 moderately resistant varieties out of 215 screened varieties of chickpea for the resistance against *P. thornei* and found. Di Vito *et al.*, 1995 screened 141 varieties taken from primary and secondary gene pool and observed seventeen different varieties in each category of resistant and moderately resistant. A comprehensive list of chickpea varieties screened against *P. thornei* is provided in table 2. In general, it has been reported that wild chickpea exhibited higher level of resistance in comparison to of *C. arietinum* cultivars (Reen *et al.*, 2019; Zwart *et al.*, 2019).

**Conclusion**

Human population expansion coupled with stunning changes in global food consumption patterns under unpropitious climatic alterations is posing formidable obstacles towards attaining sustainable global food security. Chickpeas are recognized as cost-effective sources of plant-based protein for human consumption, as well as being good to the environment due to their intrinsic nitrogen-fixing capacity. Chickpea development is critical in the rapidly transitioning global landscape where booming anthropogenic activities are causing irreversible natural resource depletion. Nematodes are important pests of agricultural crops, causing annual global economic losses of more than 100 billion dollars. Furthermore, chickpea damage from nematodes can make it more susceptible to disease and other pressures. Three essential aspects for the integrated control of plant-parasitic nematodes in chickpea are accurate diagnosis, effective crop rotations or fallow times, and identification, development of tolerant/resistant crop cultivars. To accomplish these elements in nematode management, extensive expertise of nematode taxonomy and/or application of molecular diagnostic tools are essential. Due to the extensive host range of nematodes, crop rotation options are limited in nematode-infested farms, and nematicides are avoided for environmental and economic reasons. The employment of bioagents with resistant cultivars is the most successful and long-term technique for overcoming restrictions to chickpea production induced by plant-parasitic nematodes. Growing resistant cultivars offers the benefit of avoiding nematode reproduction and lowering existing crop output losses. Furthermore, when resistant cultivars are grown, nematode populations remaining in the soil to damage later crops are reduced, benefiting the entire farming system.
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