Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology

35(5): 1-9, 2019; Article no.CJAST.49260
ISSN: 2457-1024
(Past name: British Journal of Applied Science & Technology, Past ISSN: 2231-0843, NLM ID: 101664541)

Biocontrol of *Sclerotium rolfsii* Using Antagonistic Activities of Pseudomonads

Sangita Sahni[1*], Bishun Deo Prasad[2] and Tushar Ranjan[2]

[1]Tirhut College of Agriculture, Dholi, Dr. Rajendra Prasad Agricultural University, Pusa, Bihar, India.
[2]Department of Molecular Biology and Genetic Engineering, Bihar Agricultural University, Sabour, Bihar, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. Author SS designed the study, performed the work and wrote the manuscript. All the authors helped in manuscript writing. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/CJAST/2019/v35i530202
Editor(s):
(1) Dr. Rodolfo Dufo Lopez, Professor, Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Zaragoza, Spain.
(2) Dr. Farjana Sultana, Professor, College of Agricultural Sciences, International University of Business Agriculture and Technology (IUBAT University), Bangladesh.
Reviewers:
(1) Carlos Alberto Oliveira de Matos, UNESP, Brazil.
(2) Andrés Díaz García, Colombian Corporation for Agricultural Research, Colombia.
Complete Peer review History: http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/49260

Original Research Article

Received 13 March 2019
Accepted 29 May 2019
Published 07 June 2019

ABSTRACT

Thirty well-characterized pseudomonad isolates for plant growth-promoting traits were screened for their antagonistic activities against 20 isolates of *Sclerotium rolfsii*.

Out of the 30 pseudomonad isolates, PUR46 was found to be best against all 20 isolates of *Sclerotium rolfsii,* because of its unique ability to suppress the growth of mycelia as well as the sclerotia formation of most of the *S. rolfsii* isolates *in vitro* conditions. In our previous study, PUR46 was also found to be positive for growth promoting traits like phosphorus solubilization and ammonification. The results suggested that expression of one or more of the traits like antagonistic activity against *S. rolfsii* and solubilization of tri-calcium phosphate may help in controlling the pathogen besides enhancement of plant growth. In this study, our investigations clearly indicate that PGPR isolates PUR 46 may be exploited to be used as potential biocontrol agents against *S. rolfsii* in agriculture system.

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

Keywords: Pseudomonad; Sclerotium rolfsii; plant growth-promoting traits; antagonistic activities.

1. INTRODUCTION

Sclerotium rolfsii Sacc. is a polyphagous fungal plant pathogen around the world in the equatorial zone between the 45ºN and S latitudes where conditions are warm, humid and rainy. *S. rolfsii* is a devastating soil-borne fungus with a wide host range of crop plants and weeds in which the pathogen causes a great economic loss [1,2,3]. Though the fungus is seed and soil borne, soil borne inoculums are more important in causing infection and disease development. Management of *S. rolfsii*, a major soilborne plant pathogen, through the application of fungicides has been proved to be an enigma, as its broad host range and almost worldwide distribution precludes such strategy. In recent years, biological control of plant diseases involving indigenous microorganisms like plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) has proved to be a promising and eco-friendly strategy, especially, against soil-borne plant pathogens, because rhizosphere bacteria are ideal for use as biocontrol agents as they can provide the first-hand defence for plant roots against the attack by various soilborne plant pathogens [4,5,6]. Among the rhizobacteria, *Pseudomonas* spp. are emerged as the largest and most promising group of biocontrol agents owing to their potential of rapid and aggressive colonization, rhizosphere abundance, catabolic versatility, and their capacity to produce a diverse array of antifungal compounds [7,8,9,10]. Pseudomonads provide different mechanisms for suppressing plant pathogens [11,12,13]. They include competition for nutrients and space [14,15], antibiosis by producing antibiotics viz., pyrrolnitrin, pyocyanine, pyoluteorin, phenazines and 2, 4-diacetyl phoroglucinol [16] and production of siderophores (fluorescent yellow-green pigment), viz., pseudobactin which confines the accessibility of iron required for the growth of pathogens [17,18]. The production of lytic enzymes such as chitinases and β-1, 3 glucanases which degrade chitin and glucan present in the cell wall of fungi [19,20,21,22], HCN production [23] and degradation of toxin produced by pathogen are some key mechanisms exist in PGPR [24,25]. Several species of *Pseudomonas* are known to protect plant through eliciting induced systemic resistance (ISR) in plants [26,2,27,28,29]. Therefore, biocontrol agents have emerged to grasp promise in disease management. Since biological control is an important component of integrated disease management, it is important to look for broad-spectrum antifungal isolates of PGPR which are active against specific pathogens and further evaluate the antagonists for wider application. Hence the present investigation was taken up to screen and identify potent pseudomonad isolates among thirty isolates for traits associated with biocontrol of *S. rolfsii*. The proposed study would provide the information on exploiting the *Pseudomonad* sp, as an eco-friendly and sustainable alternative to the existing chemicals for growth promotion and management of diseases caused by *S. rolfsii*.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Test Organisms (*Sclerotium rolfsii)*

Twenty isolates of *S. rolfsii* were used in the present investigation were obtained from the Department of Mycology and Plant Pathology, BHU, Varanasi. All the isolates were sub-cultured into the fresh medium at 30 days intervals and stored at 4ºC.

2.2 Rhizobacteria

Soil isolates of *Pseudomonas* spp. as reported earlier [30] was used in the present study.

2.3 *In vitro* Screening of Bacterial Antagonists against *S. rolfsii* Isolates

The 20 isolates of *S. rolfsii* were used in the present study. Initial *in vitro* screening of *Pseudomonads* spp. against the *S. rolfsii* isolates was performed in KMB medium.

All pseudomonads isolates were screened for their antagonism by dual culture assays. The actively growing mycelial disc (8 mm diameter) of the respective isolate of *S. rolfsii* was placed at the centre of the Petri plate containing KMB medium and the respective bacterial isolate was streaked 4 cm away from the pathogen in a rectangular fashion and incubated at 28°C for 4 days. The Petri plate inoculated with pathogen alone in the absence of antagonist served as control and the experiment was done in triplicates. The radial growth of fungal mycelium on each plate was measured and the per cent inhibition of growth over control (absence of antagonists) was determined using the formula:

$$I = 100 (C - T) / C$$

where, I = inhibition of mycelial growth, C = growth of the pathogen in the control plate and T = growth of the pathogen in dual cultures.

Sclerotia quantification: The actively growing mycelial disc (8 mm diameter) of the respective isolate of *S. rolfsii* was placed at the centre of the Petri plate containing KMB medium and the respective bacterial isolate was streaked 4 cm away from the pathogen in a rectangular fashion and incubated at 28°C for 10 days. The Petri plate inoculated with pathogen alone in the absence of antagonist served as control and the experiment was done in triplicates. The number of sclerotia formation on each plate was counted and the percent inhibition of sclerotia formation over control (absence of antagonists) was determined using the formula:

$$S = 100\ (C - T) / C$$

where, S = percentage of sclerotia reduction, C = Number of sclerotia formation in control plate and T =Number of sclerotia formation in dual cultures.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Screening of Pseudomonad Isolates for Antagonistic Activity against Different Isolates of *S. rolfsii*

All the 30 pseudomonad (Table 1) isolates were evaluated for their potential as a biocontrol agent against *S. rolfsii*. They were screened for their antagonistic efficiency over a spectrum of *S. rolfsii* isolates collected from a wide range of hosts, following dual culture technique [31] (Table 2). Results showed that pseudomonad isolates varied in their ability to inhibit *S. rolfsii in vitro*. Among 30 pseudomonad isolates studied, 7 isolates (R1, R2, C1, C3, C5, CRM1 and PUR46) showed differences in inhibition pattern and exhibited various interactions with different isolates of *S. rolfsii.* This comprising inhibition of *S. rolfsii* at a distance and slight inhibition, e.g. PUR46 against *Cicer arietinum* (DL2), whereas some isolates (R1, R2, C1, C3, C5, CRM1 and PUR46) restricted the growth of some of *S. rolfsii* isolates at the point of interface, e.g. R1, C1, C3 and C5 against *Artrica* sp. isolates of *S. rolfsii*. Similar types of interactions were also observed by R1, R2, C1, C3, C5 and CRM1 against *Cladium* sp. isolate of *S. rolfsii*. However, other 23 isolates were found to overgrow by all tested isolates of *S. rolfsii*.

However, among the various pseudomonad isolates , PUR46 was found to be the best in antagonistic activity over a large number of *S. rolfsii* isolates showing maximum inhibition with clear inhibition zone for six *S. rolfsii* isolates, namely, *Artrica* sp., *Bombax malabaricum*, *Cicer arietinum* (DL2), *Cladium* sp., *Coccinia indica* and BGT soil (Fig. 1) whereas, it restricted the growth of four *S. rolfsii* isolates viz., *Amorphophallus companulatus*, *Ficus religiosa, Rauvolfia serpentine* and LPG, at the point of interface. The pseudomonad isolate R2 was next best in antagonistic activity against *S. rolfsii* isolates *in vitro*, which showed clear inhibition zone for three *S. rolfsii* isolates, viz., *Artrica* sp., *Cicer arietinum* (DL2), and *Coccinia indica* while it restricted the growth of three isolates, namely from *Bombax malabaricum*, *Cladium* sp. and BGT soil at the point of interface.

Table 1. Habitat of Pseudomonad isolates

S. No.	Pseudomonas isolates	Habitat (Host rhizosphere)
1	A1	Arhar
2	A2	Arhar
3	A3	Arhar
4	R1	Rajma
5	R2	Rajma
6	R3	Rajma
7	P1	Pea
8	P2	Pea
9	P3	Pea
10	P4	Pea
11	M1	Mungbean
12	L1	Lentil
13	L2	Lentil
14	L3	Lentil
15	L4	Lentil
16	C1	Chickpea
17	C2	Chickpea
18	C3	Chickpea
19	C4	Chickpea
20	C5	Chickpea
21	C6	Chickpea
22	C7	Chickpea
23	CRM1	Soil
24	CRM2	Soil
25	CRM3	Soil
26	KB133	Soil
27	PUR46	Soil
28	PUR171	Soil
29	PSB1	Soil
30	PSB2	Soil

Table 2. Screening of pseudomonas isolates against different isolates of *Sclerotium rolfsii* on the basis of inhibition pattern of pathogen by dual culture technique

Isolates of *Sclerotium rolfsii*	Pseudomonad isolates																												
	A1	**A2**	**A3**	**R1**	**R2**	**R3**	**P1**	**P2**	**P3**	**P4**	**M1**	**L1**	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**C1**	**C2**	**C3**	**C4**	**C5**	**C6**	**C7**	**CRM1**	**CRM2**	**CRM3**	**KB133**	**PUR46**	**PUR171**	**PSB1**	**PSB2**
Artrica sp.	I_0	I_0	I_0	**C_g**	**P_i**	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	**P_i**	I_0	I_0	I_0
Amorphophallus companulatus	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	I_0	I_0
Blepharis boerhaviaefolia	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0
Bombax malabaricum	I_0	I_0	I_0	**C_g**	**C_g**	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	I_0	I_0	**P_i**	I_0	I_0	I_0
Cicer arietinum	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0
Cicer arietinum (DL2)	I_0	I_0	I_0	**C_g**	**P_i**	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	I_0	I_0	**P_i**	I_0	I_0	I_0
Cladium sp.	I_0	I_0	I_0	**C_g**	**C_g**	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	I_0	I_0	**P_i**	I_0	I_0	I_0
Cladium sp. (L)	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0
Coccinia indica	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	**P_i**	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	I_0	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	I_0	I_0	**P_i**	I_0	I_0	I_0
Cynodon dactylon	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0
Ficus religiosa	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	I_0	I_0
Glycine max	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0
Hemidesmus indicus	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0
Lycopersicon esculentum	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0
Morus nigra	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0
Phaseolus vulgaris	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0
Rauvolfia serpentina	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	I_0	I_0
Vigna radiata	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0
BGT soil	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	**P_i**	I_0	I_0	I_0
LPG	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	I_0	**C_g**	I_0	I_0	I_0

P_i = Pathogen inhibited by pseudomonad isolate; C_g = Cessation of growth of pathogen at line of contact; I_0 = Pseudomonad isolate overgrow by pathogen

Table 3. Comparative studies of inhibition pattern of different isolates of *Sclerotium rolfsii* produced by pseudomonad isolate PUR46 by dual culture technique

Isolates of *Sclerotium rolfsii*	Interaction with pathogen	Inhibition zone (mm) ‡	Percent inhibition of mycelial growth over control	Lysis pattern	(No. of sclerotia/plate after interaction) ‡	Percent reduction of sclerotial no. over control
Artrica sp.	**P_i**	7.30	51.33 (45.41)	**TL**	-	-
Amorphophallus companulatus	**C_g**	-	-	**TL**	-	-
Blepharis boerhaviaefolia	I_0	-	-	IL	0.00	**100.00** (89.43)
Bombax malabaricum	**P_i**	15.67	75.90 (61.17)	**TL**	-	-
Cicer arietinum	I_0	-	-	DM	183.67	15.62 (29.48)
Cicer arietinum (DL2)	**P_i**	15.70	**82.56** (65.58)	**TL**	-	-
Cladium sp.	**P_i**	28.67	21.80 (27.91)	**TL**	-	-
Cladium sp. (L)	I_0			**TL**	-	-
Coccinia indica	**P_i**	26.33	31.32 (34.22)	**TL**		
Cynodon dactylon	I_0	**-**	-	IL	34.67	82.87 (65.61)
Ficus religiosa	**C_g**	**-**	-	IL	6.00	95.20 (77.44)
Glycine max	I_0	**-**	-	IL	17.70	90.05 (71.67)
Hemidesmus indicus	I_0	**-**	-	DM	136.00	47.00 (43.33)
Lycopersicon esculentum	I_0	**-**	-	IL	52.33	72.31 (58.38)
Morus nigra	I_0	**-**	-	DM	132.67	46.50 (42.97)
Phaseolus vulgaris	I_0	**-**	-	IL	12.33	92.00 (73.61)
Rauvolfia serpentina	**C_g**	**-**	-	**TL**	-	-
Vigna radiata	I_0	**-**	-	IL	0.00	**100.00** (89.43)
BGT soil	**P_i**	29.30	53.74 (47.05)	**TL**	-	-
LPG	**C_g**	**-**	**-**	**TL**	**-**	**-**

P_i = Pathogen inhibited by pseudomonad isolate; C_g = Cessation of growth of pathogen at line of contact; I_0 = Pseudomonad isolate overgrow by pathogen; TL = Total lysis; IL = Incomplete lysis; DM = Deformed mycelia; ‡ = Mean of three replication; Values in the parentheses are arc sin transformed values

3.2 Comparative Studies of the Inhibition Pattern of Different Isolates of *S. rolfsii* by the Pseudomonad isolate PUR46 by Dual Culture Technique

Present investigation indicated differential sensitivity of different isolates of *S. rolfsii* towards PUR46 (Table 3), showing differences in per cent inhibition of mycelial growth, and lysis pattern as well as per cent reduction in sclerotia formation over control. It restricted the growth of four *S. rolfsii* isolates at the point of interface, in which three isolates from *Amorphophallus companulatus*, *Rauvolfia serpentine* mycelia, whereas *Ficus religiosa* isolate was forced to incomplete lysis leading to 95.20 % inhibition in sclerotia number over control (Fig. 2). However, it was overgrown by ten isolates of *S. rolfsii*, where total lysis of mycelia was observed in *Cladium sp*. (L) isolate in the advanced stage of the antagonism (Table 3). Incomplete lysis was observed in six isolates of *S. rolfsii,* causing poor development and reduction in sclerotial number (72.31 to 100 % inhibition of sclerotia over control) (Table 3), whereas three isolates showed the deformation of mycelia with the reduced number of sclerotia (15.62 to 46.50 % inhibition over control). Interestingly, PUR46 showed clear inhibition zone against six isolates of *S. rolfsii*. It reduced maximum 82.56 % linear growth of mycelia in *Cicer arietinum* isolate (DL2), 75.90 % in *Bombax malabaricum* isolate, while approximately 50 % in *Artrica* sp. and BGT soil isolates, whereas less than 50 % in *Coccinia indica* and *Cladium* sp. isolates of *S. rolfsii* (Table 3).

Thus, our results clearly indicated that *Pseudomonas fluorescence* isolate PUR46 was best in antagonistic activity over a large number of *S. rolfsii* isolates (Fig. 2), and identified as high potential bioagent against *S. rolfsii*.



Fig. 1. Lysis pattern of different isolates of *S. rolfsii* by Pseudomonas isolates. (A) Incomplete lysis; (B) Complete lysis; (C) Inhibition zone *vs* control



Fig. 2. Inhibition patter of different isolates of *S. rolfsii* by Pseudomonans isolates PUR46

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 Plant Growth-promoting Attributes

Fluorescent *Pseudomonas* spp. are important for biological control [32] as they can suppress diseases caused by phytopathogenic fungi [11,4,33] and are candidates as hosts for the delivery of genes. *Pseudomonas* spp. secretes biocontrol toxin to the plant rhizosphere [34,35]. In present investigations, 30 pseudomonad isolates, 12 isolates produced fluorescent pigment on KBM, and most of them caused total lysis of mycelia of *S. rolfsii* (DL2). However, PSB2, R2 and A3 were negative in fluorescent pigment production but showed strong antibiosis against *S. rolfsii* and caused total lysis. So, antagonistic activity of the pseudomonads against *S. rolfsii* is not linked strictly with fluorescent pigmentation.

4.2 *In vitro* Evaluation of Antagonists for Antimicrobial Activity

The initial analysis of the pseudomonad isolates for their antagonistic activity against a large number of *S. rolfsii* isolates *in vitro*. It was observed that some isolates inhibited the growth of *S. rolfsii*. This suggested that some pseudomonad isolates can produce inhibitory metabolites against *S. rolfsii* that checked the growth of *S. rolfsii* isolates. The inhibitory property of the isolates reflects the inherent potential of the pseudomonads to produce inhibitory metabolites against *S. rolfsii*. A plethora of reports say that many bacteria produce antibiotics or antifungal proteins for their survival [36,37]. These antimicrobial factors play an important role in controlling several plant diseases [5,12,13,38,39].

Our results clearly indicate that different isolates of *S. rolfsii* showed differential sensitivity towards a pseudomonad isolate resulted in differences in the inhibition pattern. Different pseudomonad isolates also showed differences in inhibition pattern against the same *S. rolfsii* isolate and it might be attributed due to variable antifungal activity possessed by different pseudomonad spp. It is known that the extent of inhibition zone formation is related to the ability of the organism to produce inhibitory metabolites against the test organism [9].

Our findings indicated that the period of incubation played a highly significant role with inhibition at the beginning followed by maximum differential lysis of *S. rolfsii* in the advanced stage of antagonism. As a result, the natural fluffy growth of the fungal pathogen was suppressed and lead to total lysis of mycelia or partial lysis resulting in poor development of sclerotia, with reduced number and size. PUR46 produced differential lysis in different isolates of *S. rolfsii* indicating its strong antagonistic potential.

5. CONCLUSION

Our investigations clearly indicate that out of 30 PGPR isolates, PUR 46 was found to be best as potential biocontrol agents against S. rolfsii which may be exploited to be used as a potential biocontrol agent against S. rolfsii in agriculture system. Thus screening and identification of novel bioagent PUR46 reflects its potential to suppress *S. rolfsii* and suggest the usefulness of this super bioinoculant as a component of IDM of *S. rolfsii.* Although the occurrence of growth promoting traits *in vitro* does not assurance that an isolate will promote plant growth in nature, it is therefore considered essential to assess the performance of this isolate under natural environmental conditions. If the potential of this isolate is confirmed, it could in future be used as a component of IDM, which will help in developing cost-effective integrated biological control methods in agriculture to combat the pathogen *S. rolfsii*.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Punja ZK. Biology, ecology and control of *Sclerotium rolfsii*. Ann. Rev. Phytopathol. 1985;23:97-127.
2. Sarma BK, Singh DP, Mehta S, Singh HB, Singh UP. Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria-mediated alterations in phenolic profile of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*) infected by *Sclerotium rolfsii*. J. Phytopathol. 2002;150:277-282.
3. Kator L, Hosea ZY, Oche OD. *Sclerotium rolfsii*; Causative organism of southern blight, stem rot, white mold and sclerotia rot disease. Annals of Biological Research. 2015;6(11):78-89.
4. Weller DM. Biological control of soil borne plant pathogens in the rhizosphere with the

bacteria. Ann. Rev. Phytopathol. 1988;26: 261-272.

5. Thomashow LS, Weller DM. Role of a phenazine antibiotic from *Pseudomonas fluorescens* in biological control of *Gaeumannomyces graminis* var. *tritici*. J. Bacteriol. 1988;170:3499-3508.
6. Dowling DN, O'Gara F. Metabolites of *Pseudomonas* involved in the biocontrol of plant disease. Tibtech. 1994;12:133-141.
7. Anuratha CS, Gnanamanickam SS. Biological control of bacterial wilt caused by *Pseudomonas solanacearum* in India with antagonistic bacteria. Pl. Soil. 1990;124:109-116.
8. Yeole RD, Dube HC. Siderophore mediated antibiotics of rhizobacterial fluorescent pseudomonads against soilborne fungal plant pathogens. J. Mycol. Pl. Pathol. 2000;30:335-338.
9. Sivaprasad P. Microbial inoculant technology for plant disease management. Research Extension Interface, Farm information Bureau, Government of Kerala. 2002;23-30.
10. Saharan BS, Nehra V. Plant growth promoting rhizobacteria: A critical review. Life Science and Medicine Research. 2011;21:1-30.
11. Salman M, Abuamsha R, Barghouthi S. Interaction of fluorescent pseudomonads with *Pythium ultimum* and *Rhizoctonia solani* in cucumber roots. American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 2013;3:240-251.
12. Kumar SS, Rao RKM, Kumar RD, Sachin P, Prasad CS. Biocontrol by plant growth promoting rhizobacteria against black scurf and stem canker disease of potato caused by *Rhizoctonia solani*. Archives of Phytopathology and Plant Protection. 2013;46:487-502.
13. Beneduzi A, Ambrosini A, Passaglia LMP. Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR): Their potential as antagonists and biocontrol agents. Genetics and Molecular Biology. 2012;35:1044-1051.
14. Elad Y, Baker R. The role of competition for iron and carbon in suppression of chlamydospore germination of *Fusarium oxysporum*. Phytopathology. 1985;75:190-195.
15. Elad Y, Chet I. Possible role of competition for nutrition in biocontrol of *Pythium* damping-off by bacteria. Phytopathology. 1987;77:190-195.
16. Pierson LS, Thomashow LS. Cloning and heterologous expression of the phenazine biosynthetic locus from *Pseudomonas aureofaciens*. Mol. Plant-Microbe Interact. 1992;5:330-339.
17. Lemanceau P, Bakker PAHM, Dekogel, WJ, Alabouvette C, Schippers B. Effect of pseudobactin 358 produced by *Pseudomonas putida* WSC358 on suppression of *Fusarium* wilt of carnations by non pathogenic *Fusarium oxysporum*. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 1992;58:2978-2980.
18. Gull M, Hafeez FY. Characterization of siderophore producing bacterial strain *Pseudomonas fluorescens* Mst 8.2 as plant growth promoting and biocontrol agent in wheat. African Journal of Microbiology Research. 2012;6:6308-6318.
19. Frindlender M, Inbar J, Chet I. Biological control of soilborne plant pathogens by a β-1, 3 glucanase producing *Pseudomonas cepacia*. Soil Biol. Biochem. 1993;25:1211-1221.
20. Lim H, Kim Y, Kim S. *Pseudomonas stutzeri* YLP-1 genetic transformation and antifungal mechanism against *Fusarium solani*, an agent of plant root rot. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 1991;57:510-516.
21. Potgieter H, Alexander M. Susceptibility and resistance of several fungi to microbial lysis. J. Bacteriol. 1996;91:1526-1532.
22. Velazhahan R, Samiyappan R, Vidhyasekaran P. Relationship between antagonistic activities of *Pseudomonas fluorescens* isolates against *Rhizoctonia solani* and their production of lytic enzyme. J. Plant Dis. Prot. 1999;106:244-250.
23. Defago G, Berling CH, Burger U, Hass D, Kahr G, Keel C, Voisard C, Wirthner P, Wuthrich B. Suppression of black root rot of tobacco and other root diseases by strains of *Pseudomonas yuorescens*: potential applications and mechanisms. In: Hornby D. (Ed.), Biological Control of Soilborne Plant Pathogens. CAB International, Wellingford, Oxon, UK. 1990;93-108.
24. Borowitz JJ, Stankie-Dicz M, Lewicka T, Zukowska Z. Inhibition of fungal cellulase, pectinase and xylanase activity of plant growth-promoting fluorescent pseudomonads. Bull. OILB/SROP. 1992;15:103-106.
25. Duffy BK, Defago G. Zinc improves biocontrol of *Fusarium* crown and root rot of tomato by *Pseudomonas* f*uorescens*

and represses the production of pathogen metabolites inhibitory to bacterial antibiotic biosynthesis. Phyotpathology. 1997;87: 1250-1257.
26. Garcia-Gutierrez L, Romero D, Zeriouh H, Cazorla FM, Torés JA, Vicente A. Isolation and selection of plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria as inducers of systemic resistance in melon. Plant and Soil; 2012. DOI: 10.1007/s11104-012-1173-z
27. Singh UP, Sarma BK, Singh DP. Effect of plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria and culture filtrate of *Sclerotium rolfsii* on phenolic and salicylic acid contents in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Curr. Microbiol. 2003;46:131-140.
28. Mari SY, Sundin PB, Waechter-Kristensen J. Induction of phenolic compounds in tomato by rhizosphere bacteria. In: Ogoshi A, Kobayashi K, Homma Y, Kodama F, Kondo N, Akino S, (eds). Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria-present status and future prospects. Proceedings Fourth Int. Workshop on Plant Growth-Promoting Rhizobacteria Japan-OECD Joint Workshop, Sapporo, Japan. 1997;340-344.
29. Wei G, Kloepper JW, Tuzun S. Induction to systemic resistance of cucumber to *Colletotrichum orbiculare* by selected strains of plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria. Phytopathology. 1991;81: 1508-1512.
30. Sahni S, Prasad BD. Exploitation of pseudomonads for their plant growth-promoting traits. International Journal of Chemical Studies. 2018;SP4:05-10.
31. Johnson LF, Curl EA. Methods for research on ecology of soil borne plant pathogens. Burgess Publishing Co., Monneapolis. 1972;247.
32. Ganeshan G, Kumar MA. Pseudomonas fluorescens, a potential bacterial antagonist to control plant diseases. J Plant Interact. 2005;1(3):123-134.
33. Thomashow LS, Weller DM. Role of antibiotics and siderophores in biocontrol of take all disease of wheat. Plant and Soil. 1990;129:93-99.
34. Van Elsas JD, Van Overbeek LS, Feldmann AM, Dullemans AM, de Leeuw O. Survival of genetically engineered *Pseudomonas fluorescence* in soil in competition with the parent strain. FEMS Microbiology Ecology. 1991;85:53-64.
35. Araujo MAV, Mendoncea-Hagler LC, Hagler AN, Van Elsas JD. Survival of genetically modified *Pseudomonas fluorescence* introduced into subtropical soils microcosms. FEMS Microbiology Ecology .1994;13:205-216.
36. Kudryashova EB, Vinokurova NG, Ariskina EV. *Bacillus subtilis* and phenotypically similar strains producing hexaene antibiotics. Appl. Biochem. Microbiol. 2005; 41(5):486-489.
37. Antoun H, Prévost D. Ecology of plant growth promoting rhizobacteria. In: Siddiqui ZA. (Ed.), PGPR: Biocontrol and biofertilization, Springer, Dordrecht. 2005; 1–38.
38. Okamoto H, Sato M, Sato Z, Isaka M. Biocontrol of *Phytophthora capsici* by *Serratia marcescens* F-1-1 and analysis of bioc ontrol mechanisms using transposon-insertion mutants. Ann. Phytopathol. Soc. Japan. 1998;64:287-293.
39. O'Sullivan DJ, O'Gara F. Traits of fluorescent *Pseudomonas* spp. involved in suppression of plant root pathogens. Microbiol. Rev. 1992;56:662–676.

© 2019 Sahni et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/49260