

1 **Rhizosphere *Trichoderma* isolates as potential biocontrol agent for maydis leaf blight**  
 2 **pathogen (*Bipolaris maydis*) in fodder maize**

3 Ashlesha<sup>1</sup>, Harpreet Oberoi<sup>1</sup> and Parminder Kumar<sup>2</sup>

4 - Author Affiliations

5 <sup>1</sup>Department of Plant Breeding and Genetics, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana,  
 6 India – 141004

7 <sup>2</sup>Department of Biochemistry, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, India – 141004

8 Corresponding author: Ashlesha. Email: [ashlesha-atr@pau.edu](mailto:ashlesha-atr@pau.edu)

9 ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6843-0766 (Corresponding author)

10 Running Title: *Trichoderma* isolates against maydis leaf blight

11  
 12 **ABSTRACT**

13 Two indigenous isolates of *Trichoderma* isolated from rhizosphere soils of maize plants  
 14 were identified as *T. harzianum* and assessed for antagonistic activity against *Bipolaris*  
 15 *maydis* causing maydis leaf blight in fodder maize *in vitro*, and under field conditions for  
 16 two consecutive kharif seasons of 2016 and 2017. Dual culture assay of *T. harzianum*  
 17 isolates showed significantly higher degree of mycelial inhibition (74.35%) against *B.*  
 18 *maydis*. Similarly, under field conditions, seed treatment and foliar spray of *T. harzianum* -  
 19 I provided highest reduction in leaf blight severity (54.86%) along with 19.03 percent  
 20 increase in green fodder yield in comparison to control. The efficacy of *T. harzianum*  
 21 isolates to boost defence responses against maydis leaf blight disease in maize was also  
 22 evaluated in bioagents treated leaves. Plants treated with biocontrol agents showed  
 23 significantly higher activities of antioxidative defence enzymes like peroxidase (POX),  
 24 superoxide dismutase (SOD) and catalase (CAT). In treated leaves, the activities of POX  
 25 and SOD reached maximum at 24 h and activity of CAT reached the highest at 36 h after  
 26 inoculation of pathogen *B. maydis*. Enzyme activities induced by *T. harzianum* isolates  
 27 were more obvious than that induced by pathogen only. This implies that biocontrol agent  
 28 induced defence responses against maydis leaf blight pathogen in fodder maize.

29 **Keywords:** Maize; *Bipolaris maydis*; biocontrol; defence enzymes; *Trichoderma*  
 30 *harzianum*; maydis leaf blight.

31  
 32 **1. Introduction**

33 Maize is the third major food grain crop after rice and wheat worldwide and is also used as  
 34 feed, specialty corn and starch. In Indian agriculture, maize has special significance due to  
 35 its wide diversity as food and fodder crop under varied agro-climatic conditions. It can be  
 36 successfully grown in rainy (*Kharif*), winter (*Rabi*) and spring summer (*Zaid*) crop  
 37 seasons. It has the potential to supply large amounts of energy-rich forage for dairy  
 38 animals and can be safely fed at all growth stages. In recent years, forage maize has  
 39 become a major constituent of dairy cow diets which increases animal palatability (Bhagat  
 40 *et al.*, 2017).

41 Maize is affected by several diseases such as leaf blight, stalk rot, root rot and  
 42 ear rot during different stages of growth. Among these, maydis leaf blight caused by  
 43 *Bipolaris maydis* is a serious fungal disease worldwide (White, 1999). The disease  
 44 appears in more severe form in warm, humid, temperate to tropical areas where  
 45 temperature ranges from 20-30°C during the cropping period (Singh and Srivastava, 2012).

46 This disease has great significance in the history of agriculture due to its epidemic in 1970s  
47 and caused huge yield losses to the extent of 28 to 91 percent (Reddy *et al.*, 2013). Thus,  
48 maydis leaf blight (MLB) is a major obstacle in the successful cultivation of maize.

49 Traditionally, various fungicides have been used to control the disease.  
50 However, over use of chemical fungicides causes health hazards to humans and animals;  
51 environmental pollution, soil residue and fungicide resistance in pathogens (Bajwa *et al.*,  
52 2003). Thus, there is need for alternative methods that would reduce reliance on  
53 fungicides. The use of microorganisms as biological control agents (BCA) therefore, offers  
54 an alternative ecofriendly approach to manage plant diseases which can reduce many ill  
55 effects of chemical fungicides on animal health and environment.

56 Plant growth promoting microbes are soil bacteria that stimulate plant growth  
57 by various means, often in association with plant roots, sometimes on leaves and/or within  
58 plant tissues (Glick, 2012). These rhizosphere microorganisms enhance the growth of  
59 plants either directly by fixing atmospheric nitrogen, production of siderophores,  
60 solubilization of minerals such as phosphorus and synthesis of phytohormones or  
61 indirectly by competing with pathogens for niches and nutrients, production of antifungal  
62 metabolites, secretion of enzymes and induction of systemic resistance (Nadeem *et*  
63 *al.*, 2014). *Trichoderma* is a group of fungi that belongs to ascomycetes widely distributed  
64 in soil. Numerous studies have been reported for the control of foliar and soil borne  
65 pathogens in maize plants against *B. maydis* by *Trichoderma* spp. and generate resistance  
66 in maize plants (Harman, 2011; Jie *et al.*, 2014).

67 Among various biochemical responses to pathogen attack, the antioxidative  
68 response is important due to production of large number of reactive oxygen species. These  
69 antioxidative responses include release of enzymes such as peroxidase (POX), superoxide  
70 dismutase (SOD) and catalase (CAT), which are induced by oxidative injury caused by  
71 plant pathogens (Chugh *et al.*, 2011). POX is a key enzyme that is involved in the  
72 synthesis of lignin and phytoalexins (Liao *et al.*, 2009). SOD scavenges oxygen free  
73 radicals and active oxygen to protect plant membrane and key enzymes in salicylic acid  
74 pathway. CAT participates in plant disease resistance (Polidoroset *al.*, 2001). In the  
75 current study, isolates of *Trichoderma* were isolated from rhizosphere soil of maize plants  
76 grown for fodder purpose and investigated under controlled and field conditions for the  
77 reduction in disease severity of maydis leaf blight infested by *B. maydis* and biochemical  
78 responses in terms of defence enzymes such as POX, SOD and CAT in maize.

## 80 **2. Materials and methods**

81 *2.1. Source of pathogen:* Fodder maize variety 'J 1006' susceptible to MLB pathogen was  
82 obtained from the Forage and Millet Section, Department of Plant Breeding and Genetics,  
83 Punjab Agricultural University (PAU), Ludhiana, India and was used throughout the study.  
84 *Bipolaris maydis*, a causal agent of MLB was isolated from infected leaves of maize plant  
85 collected from the fields of fodder section. Pathogen was isolated, purified and maintained  
86 on potato dextrose agar (PDA) and used for further evaluation. It showed same symptoms  
87 on maize leaves when reinoculated after isolation.

88  
89 *2.2. Isolation of rhizosphere Trichoderma isolates:* Soil samples were collected from the  
90 rhizosphere of maize plants growing in the fields of PAU, Ludhiana. The soil was loamy  
91 sand; low in organic carbon; and high in available nitrogen and potassium. For sampling,  
92 root system was dug out and rhizosphere soil was carefully taken in plastic bags to the  
93 laboratory for the isolation of rhizosphere fungi. Fungi were isolated by serial dilution and  
94 spread plate technique (Sundaraand Sinha, 1963) on potato dextrose agar and *Trichoderma*  
95 selective medium (TSM) (Askew and Laing, 1993). Plates were incubated at  $28 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$  for

96 48 - 72 h. Colonies of *Trichoderma* were picked and purified by hyphal tip method and  
97 maintained in TSM medium. *T. harzianum* isolates were identified upto species level on  
98 the basis of morphological keys described by Barnett and Hunter (1972) and stocked for  
99 further use.

100 2.3. *Biocontrol assay in vitro*: Antifungal activity of two isolates of *Trichoderma*  
101 *harzianum* was evaluated against *B. maydis*, on PDA medium using dual culture technique  
102 (Utkhede and Rahe, 1983). Five millimetre discs of actively growing seven day- old  
103 cultures of test pathogen as well as biocontrol agents were taken with the help of a cork  
104 borer. Two discs, one each of pathogen and biocontrol agent, were placed equidistantly (60  
105 mm) apart in each of the 90 mm petriplates containing PDA under aseptic conditions. The  
106 plates containing PDA medium inoculated with pathogen alone served as control. The  
107 plates were incubated at 25 + 1°C. The radial growth of the bioagents and the pathogens  
108 from the centre of disc towards the centre of the plate was recorded after the control plates  
109 were completely covered by pathogens. Each treatment was replicated four times. The  
110 experiment was repeated twice. Observations on the growth of biocontrol agent and  
111 pathogen were recorded after 10 days of incubation and percent mycelial inhibition was  
112 determined by following  $I = (C-T/C) \times 100$  [I = Percent inhibition of mycelium, C = Growth  
113 of mycelium in control (mm), T = Growth of mycelium in treatment (mm)].  
114

115 2.4. *Evaluation under field conditions*: Field trials were conducted to evaluate the efficacy  
116 of rhizosphere *T. harzianum* isolates against MLB pathogen in the fields of PAU,  
117 Ludhiana, during *Kharif* of 2016 and 2017. The experiment was laid out in a complete  
118 randomized block design (RBD) with three replications in unsterilized soil. There were  
119 eight treatments that are T<sub>1</sub> (Seed dressing with *T. harzianum*- I @ 20 g per kg seed), T<sub>2</sub>  
120 (Seed dressing with *T. harzianum*- II), T<sub>3</sub> (Foliar spray of *T. harzianum*- I @ 20 g per  
121 litre), T<sub>4</sub> (T<sub>1</sub>+ foliar spray of *T. harzianum*- I), T<sub>5</sub> (Foliar spray of *T. harzianum*- II), T<sub>6</sub> (T<sub>2</sub>  
122 + foliar spray of *T. harzianum*- II), T<sub>7</sub> (foliar spray of fungicide (Indofil M-45) as chemical  
123 check) and T<sub>8</sub> (untreated control). Susceptible variety J 1006 was sown in rows following  
124 recommended agronomic practices. The plot size was 5 x 5 m<sup>2</sup> and distance between row  
125 to row and plant to plant was 45 and 10 cm respectively. Thinning was done to maintain  
126 the proper distance between rows and plants. Plots of maize were irrigated when  
127 necessary. The inoculation of *B. maydis* was performed by culturing test pathogen on  
128 sorghum [*Sorghum bicolor* (Linn.) Moench] seeds following the method of Lim (1975).  
129 The plants were inoculated twice by placing a pinch of powdered inoculum in the whorl,  
130 first 15 days after sowing and second 15 days thereafter. After 20 days of sowing, first  
131 spray of spore suspension of biocontrol agent ( $1 \times 10^8$  conidia ml<sup>-1</sup>) was done on both leaf  
132 surfaces whereas the second spray was done after 30 days of sowing. Spraying with  
133 sterile water served as the control. The disease severity and bio control efficacy were  
134 evaluated at 35, 45 and 55 days after sowing. Disease severity was calculated by the  
135 formula  $\{\Sigma (nv) / (NG)\} \times 100$ , where  $\Sigma (n \times v)$  = sum of the score, N = total number of  
136 leaves counted and G = highest score. A scale of 0-5 was used to estimate the disease  
137 severity of corn leaf blight (Mir *et al.* 2015). Increase in green fodder yield was calculated  
138 by the formula  $(T-C)/C \times 100$ , where T = green fodder yield (q/ha) of treatment, C = green  
139 fodder yield (q/ha) of control  
140

141 2.5. *Defense enzyme activity assay*:

142 2.5.1. *Sample collection*: Leaves were treated with two isolates of *T. harzianum* at  $1 \times 10^8$   
143 conidia mL<sup>-1</sup> concentration and subsequently with *B. maydis* at the same concentration.  
144 Samples of maize leaves were collected at 0, 24, 36, 48, and 72 h after inoculation with

145 test pathogen. Maize plants inoculated with pathogen only served as control. All the  
146 samples were immediately frozen in liquid nitrogen, ground into powder and stored at –  
147 80°C for enzyme activity detection. Total protein content of all enzyme extracts was  
148 determined by the method of Lowry *et al.* (1951). Each treatment was studied in three  
149 replicates.

150

151 2.5.2. *Catalase (CAT)*: Activity of CAT was determined by taking 1.8 ml of 50 mM  
152 sodium phosphate buffer (pH 7.5) to which 0.2 ml of enzyme extract was added. The  
153 reaction was initiated by adding 1 ml H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and utilization of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> was recorded at an  
154 interval of 30 sec for 3 min by measuring the decrease in absorbance at 290 nm (Chance  
155 and Machly, 1955). Extinction coefficient for H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> was 0.0394 mM<sup>-1</sup>cm<sup>-1</sup>. The enzyme  
156 activity was expressed in U mg<sup>-1</sup> protein.

157

158 2.5.3. *Superoxide dismutase (SOD)*: Assay system of SOD contained 1.4 ml of 100 mM  
159 Tris HCl buffer (pH 8.2), 0.5 ml of 6 mM EDTA, 1 ml of 6 mM pyrogallol solution and  
160 0.1 ml of enzyme extract (Marklund and Marklund, 1974). Change in absorbance was  
161 recorded at 420 nm after an interval of 30 sec up to 3 min. A unit of enzyme activity was  
162 expressed as the amount of enzyme causing 50% inhibition of auto-oxidation of pyrogallol  
163 observed in blank. SOD activity is expressed in U mg<sup>-1</sup> protein.

164

165 2.5.4. *Peroxidase (POX)*: Assay system of POX contained 3 ml of 0.05 M guaiacol in 100  
166 mM phosphate buffer (pH 6.5), 0.1 ml of enzyme extract and 0.1 ml of 0.8 M H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>  
167 (Hammerschmidt *et al.*, 1982). The reaction mixture without H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> was taken as a blank.  
168 The reaction was initiated by adding H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and rate of change in absorbance was recorded  
169 at 470 nm for 3 min at an interval of 30 sec. POX activity was expressed as change in  
170 absorbance min<sup>-1</sup> mg<sup>-1</sup> of protein.

171

172 2.6 *Data analysis*: Statistical analyses were conducted using Duncan's Multiple Range  
173 Test (DMRT). Data on percentages were transformed to arcsine and analysis of variance  
174 (ANOVA) was carried out with transformed values. The means were compared for  
175 significance using DMRT (p<0.05).

176

### 177 **3. Results**

178 3.1. *Isolation of rhizosphere Trichoderma*: *Trichoderma* colonies grown on TSM medium  
179 (Askew and Laing, 1993) were isolated and evaluated for antifungal activity through dual  
180 culture technique. Total four colonies of *Trichoderma* were obtained and purified by  
181 hyphal tip method. Among them, two isolates showed more than 60 percent mycelial  
182 inhibition of *B. maydis* and rest were not effective against the test pathogen. Antifungal  
183 isolates of *Trichoderma* were identified on the basis of colour of the colony, formation of  
184 chlamydospores, conidiophores and phialides characters, shape of conidia as the main  
185 characters to identify the species as described by Barnett *et al.* (1972). These isolates were  
186 maintained on PDA slants for further studies.

187

188 3.2. *Efficacy of biocontrol agents in vitro*: *T. harzianum* isolates showed strong antifungal  
189 activity against MLB in dual culture method (Table 1). *T. harzianum*-I provided maximum  
190 mycelial inhibition of *B. maydis* that is 74.35 percent followed by that of *T. harzianum*-II  
191 (63.41%) as compared to control. This showed that both the tested isolates had strong  
192 antagonistic properties against the maize blight pathogen. All the *T. harzianum* isolates  
193 were found statistically at par with each other and *T. harzianum*-I significantly reduced the  
194 mycelial growth of test pathogen.

195

196 *3.3. Biocontrol assay in field conditions:* Isolates of *T. harzianum* were tested under field  
197 conditions against MLB in maize during 2016 and 2017. The observations showed  
198 reduction in disease severity and increase in green fodder yield. Maximum disease severity  
199 observed during two seasons was 56.00 and 67.33 percent respectively (Table 2). Seed  
200 treatment + foliar spray with *T. harzianum*-I provided highest 54.86 percent mean  
201 reduction in leaf blight severity followed by *T. harzianum*-II with 48.11 percent disease  
202 reduction. Foliar spray with *T. harzianum*-I and *T. harzianum*-II showed 41.08 and 37.03  
203 percent reduction in disease severity respectively as compared to untreated control. These  
204 isolates also gave better control of leaf blight than chemical check Indofil M-45 (0.25%)  
205 which exhibited only 31.63 percent reduction in leaf blight severity. Rest of the treatments  
206 exhibited reduction in disease severity in the range of 23.24 to 27.03 percent. It was  
207 observed that both the isolates of *T. harzianum* significantly reduced the leaf blight  
208 severity in maize. Treatment T<sub>4</sub> (Seed treatment + foliar spray with *T. harzianum*-I) was  
209 found statistically significant than rest of the treatments and provided least per cent disease  
210 severity. Other treatments were at par with each other during 2016 and 2017.

211

212 With reduction in disease severity, effective treatments significantly enhanced the green  
213 fodder yield of maize with the application of both the isolates of *T. harzianum*. Application  
214 of *T. harzianum*-I as seed treatment + foliar spray provided 416.93 quintal per hectare of  
215 green fodder yield followed by that of *T. harzianum*-II, (407.41 quintal per hectare) as  
216 compared to chemical and untreated control (384.13 and 350.27 quintal per hectare)  
217 respectively (Table 3). Results revealed that maximum 19.03 and 16.31 percent increase in  
218 green fodder yield was provided by both the *Trichoderma* isolates. Other treatments (T<sub>1</sub>,  
219 T<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>3</sub> and T<sub>5</sub>) showed 6.34 to 13.59 percent increase in yield than chemical (9.67%) and  
220 untreated check. Treatment T<sub>4</sub> (Seed treatment + foliar spray with *T. harzianum*-I) was  
221 found statistically significant than the rest of the treatments and provided highest green  
222 fodder yield during both the years.

223

224 *3.4. Effect of Trichoderma isolates on defence enzyme activity:* Activity of defence  
225 enzymes viz; POX, SOD and CAT was observed in seedlings of maize when subsequently  
226 inoculated with spore suspension of two *Trichoderma* isolates and leaf blight pathogen at  
227 four to five leaf stage.

228

#### 229 *3.4.1. Peroxidase (POX)*

230 POX activity was higher in treated leaves than untreated leaves during the sampling period  
231 of 0-72 h (Table 4). Increase in POX enzyme activity was recorded at 0-24 h after  
232 inoculation with *T. harzianum*-I, and maximum was 4.95 U mg<sup>-1</sup> at 24 h after inoculation,  
233 after which the activity started decreasing. Whereas, *T. harzianum*-II showed enzyme  
234 activity of 4.31 U mg<sup>-1</sup> at 24 h after inoculation, as compared to the chemical check and  
235 control treatment which generated an enzyme activity of 3.15 and 2.13 U mg<sup>-1</sup>  
236 respectively. These results indicate that POX in maize leaves was induced by *T. harzianum*  
237 isolates.

238

#### 239 *3.4.2. Superoxide dismutase (SOD)*

240 Similarly, increase in SOD enzyme activity was observed during 0–24 h after inoculation  
241 in maize leaves treated with both the isolates of *Trichoderma* and *B. maydis* and decreased  
242 at 36 h after inoculation (Table 5). However, at 48 h after inoculation, increase in the SOD  
243 activity was detected for the second time, that gradually declined again. Maximum SOD  
244 activity was exhibited by *T. harzianum*-I treated leaves at 24 h after inoculation (39.05U

245 mg<sup>-1</sup>) and then again at 48 h after inoculation (35.27U mg<sup>-1</sup>). *T. harzianum*-II also showed  
246 increased activity of SOD (31.09U mg<sup>-1</sup>) as compared to both the checks. This suggests a  
247 positive relationship of *T. harzianum* isolates in the induction of resistance to *B. maydis*.  
248

#### 249 3.4.3. Catalase (CAT)

250 Both the isolates of *T. harzianum* induced strong activity of CAT enzyme in treated  
251 maize leaves. CAT activity was highest at 36 h after inoculation (Table 6) after which it  
252 declined. *T. harzianum* isolates elicited the production of CAT enzyme and were effective  
253 in the induction of maize leaf resistance to *B. maydis*. The CAT activity was 29.91U mg<sup>-1</sup>  
254 as compared to the control treatment (22.16U mg<sup>-1</sup>). *T. harzianum* isolates significantly  
255 triggered the enzymatic activity which suppressed the growth of maize blight pathogen.  
256

### 257 3. Discussion

258 Plants have well organized defence system of biochemical reactions that are induced by  
259 invading phytopathogens and biocontrol agents. This can be one of the novel management  
260 strategies in agriculture (Kashyap and Dhiman, 2009). *Trichoderma* species especially *T.*  
261 *harzianum*, *T. viride* and *T. atroviride* exhibited variability with respect to their antifungal  
262 property against plant pathogens of different crops (Surekha *et al.*, 2014). The growth  
263 inhibition in the presence of *Trichoderma* species could be attributed to all the three modes  
264 of antagonism *in vitro viz.*, competition, antibiosis and mycoparasitism; and also due to its  
265 fast growing nature, rapid sporulation, secretion of gliotoxin and cell wall lytic enzymes  
266 (Shalini and Kotasthane, 2007).

267 In the present study, two isolates of *T. harzianum* isolated from rhizosphere soil of  
268 host plant exhibited potential biocontrol activity against MLB caused by *B. maydis in vitro*  
269 and under field conditions. Antagonistic activity of bioagents in dual culture may be  
270 ascribed to its ability to produce diffusible and volatile metabolites (Khamari and Beura,  
271 2014; Naglot *et al.*, 2015). The results obtained from present investigation indicate the  
272 strong antagonistic activity of bioagents when applied to crop as seed treatment, foliar  
273 spray and as both. These tested bioagents significantly reduced the leaf blight severity and  
274 increased the green fodder yield over untreated control. Present findings are in  
275 confirmation with observations of Malik *et al.* (2018) who have tested *T. harzianum* and *T.*  
276 *viride* against MLB and banded leaf and sheath blight under field conditions. It can be  
277 therefore assumed that the antifungal role of *Trichoderma* may be due to combination of  
278 hydrolytic enzymes and secondary antifungal metabolites such as trichodermin,  
279 trichodermal, etc. which play important role in the inhibition of pathogens (Dickinson *et*  
280 *al.*, 1995).

281 BCAs isolated from native sources have ability to induce systemic defence responses  
282 (Glick, 2014). Defence responses are also triggered by plant pathogens which induced the  
283 production of defence related antioxidant enzymes like POX, SOD and CAT which  
284 suppress the formation of free radicals and convert them into less harmful species (Gill and  
285 Tuteja, 2010). In the present study, inoculation of biocontrol agents on maize leaves  
286 induced antioxidant defence enzyme activity. Leaves treated with *T. harzianum* showed  
287 higher activities of POX, SOD and CAT enzymes, which further increases after *B. maydis*  
288 inoculation. These results suggested that *T. harzianum* triggered enzymatic activity which  
289 might have suppressed the growth and spread of maize blight pathogen.

290 According to Siddikee *et al.* (2012), the elevated activity of POX and CAT enzymes  
291 might be associated with the production of cell wall strengthening constituents acting as  
292 mechanical barrier for invading pathogens. During pathogen invasion, plant is protected  
293 from oxidative stress through degeneration, balancing and scavenging of ROS by  
294 enhanced SOD enzyme activity (Dixit *et al.*, 2016). Our results are in accordance with the

295 results reported by earlier researchers who have observed enhanced activities of POX,  
296 SOD, CAT, PAL, polyphenol oxidase (PPO) and cinnamyl alcohol dehydrogenase (CAD)  
297 enzymes against *Rhizoctonia solani* seedling blight in sunflower (Singh *et al.*, 2014) and  
298 *Sclerospora graminicola* in pearl millet (Siddaiah *et al.*, 2017) induced by  
299 *Trichoderma* species. Similarly, after inoculation with *T. atroviride* in maize and *T. viride*  
300 in black gram against *Cochliobolus heterostrophus*, *Fusarium oxysporum* and *Alternaria*  
301 *alternate* significantly enhanced the production of defence enzymes (POX, SOD & CAT)  
302 respectively (Wang *et al.*, 2015; Surekha *et al.*, 2014). Therefore, the present studies  
303 showed decrease in disease severity of leaf blight due to seed and foliar application of  
304 fungal biocontrol agents.

305 Thus, the rhizosphere competent, biocontrol agents with antagonistic activity toward  
306 plant pathogens by inducing enzymes, hormones or antifungal compounds are considered  
307 as potential tools to develop commercial formulations. The use of natural antagonistic  
308 microorganisms is considered as the alternative ecofriendly approach to manage the  
309 diseases of plants. This strategy may be an effective complementary option for maydis leaf  
310 blight management in fodder maize.

311  
312 **Acknowledgments:** Authors thank the Head of the Department of Plant Breeding and  
313 Genetics, PAU, Ludhiana for providing financial assistance and all laboratory and outdoor  
314 facilities.

315

316 **Conflict of Interest Statement:** Authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

317

## 318 **References**

- 319 Askew DJ and Laing MD (1993) An adapted selective medium for the quantitative  
320 isolation of *Trichoderma* species *Plant Pathol* **42** 686-690.
- 321 Bajwa R, Khalid A and Cheema TS (2003) Antifungal activity of allelopathic plant  
322 extracts III: growth response of some pathogenic fungi to aqueous extract of *Parthenium*  
323 *hysterophorus* *Plant Pathology J* **2** 503-507.
- 324 Barnett HL and Hunter B (1972) Illustrated genera of imperfect fungi, Burgess publishing  
325 company, Minnesota.
- 326 Bhagat S, Gupta M, Banotra M, Sharma A, Sandeep Kumar and Ashu Sharma (2017)  
327 Production potential and economics of fodder maize (*Zea mays*) varieties sown under  
328 varying intercropping systems with cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata*) *International Journal of*  
329 *Current Microbiology and Applied Science* **6** 4082-4087.
- 330 Chance B and Machly AC (1955) Assay of catalases and peroxidises *Methods Enzymology*  
331 **2** 764-775.
- 332 Chugh V, Kaur N and Gupta AK (2011) Evaluation of oxidative stress tolerance in maize  
333 (*Zea mays* L.) seedlings in response to drought *Indian J of Biochem Bio* **48** 47-53.
- 334 Dickinson JM, Hanson JR and Truneh A (1995) Metabolites of some biological control  
335 agents *Pestic Sci* **44** 389-393.
- 336 Dixit R, Agrawal L, Gupta S, Kumar M, Yadav S, Chauhan PS and Chandra SN (2016)  
337 Southern blight disease of tomato control by 1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylate (ACC)  
338 deaminase producing *Paenibacillus lentimorbus* B-30488 *Plant Signalling and Behavior* **11**  
339 e1113363 (11 pages).
- 340 Gill SS and Tuteja N (2010) Reactive oxygen species and antioxidant machinery in abiotic  
341 stress tolerance in crop plants *Plant Physiol Bioch* **48** 909-30.
- 342 Glick BR (2012) Plant Growth-Promoting Bacteria: Mechanisms and Applications  
343 *Scientifica* Article ID 963401 1-15.

344 Glick BR (2014) Bacteria with ACC deaminase can promote plant growth and help to feed  
345 the world *Microbiol Res* **169** 30-9.

346 Hammerschmidt R, Nuckles EM and Kuc J (1982) Association of enhanced peroxidase  
347 activity with induced systemic resistance of cucumber to *Colletotrichum lagenarium*  
348 *Physiol Plant Pathol* **20** 73-82.

349 Harman GE (2011) Multifunctional fungal plant symbionts: New tools to enhance plant  
350 growth and productivity *New Phytol* **189** 647–649.

351 Jie C, Kai D, Yong-Dong G and LI Ya-Qia (2014) Mechanism and application of  
352 *Trichoderma* spp. in biological control of corn diseases *Mycosystema* **33** 1154-1167.

353 Kashyap PL and Dhiman J S (2009) Induction of resistance in cauliflower against  
354 *Alternaria* blight using potassium and phosphonic salts *The Asian and Australasian*  
355 *Journal of Plant Science and Biotechnology* **3** 66–70.

356 Khamari B and Beura SK (2014) Efficacy of Biocontrol agents against maydis leaf blight  
357 of maize *Journal of Plant Protection and Environment* **11** 95-97.

358 Liao M, Li Y and Wang Z (2009) Identification of elicitor—Responsive proteins in rice  
359 leaves by a proteomic approach *Proteomics* **9** 2809–2819.

360 Lim SM (1975) Heterotic effect of resistance in maize to *Helmntosporium maydis* race O  
361 *Phytopathology* **65** 1117-1120.

362 Lowry OH, Rosebrough NT, Farr AL and Randall RJ (1951) Protein measurement  
363 with folin phenol reagent *J Biol Chem* **193** 265-275.

364 Malik VK, Singh M, Hooda K S, Yadav NK and Chauthan P K (2018) Efficacy of Newer  
365 Molecules, Bioagents and Botanicals against Maydis Leaf Blight and Banded Leaf and  
366 Sheath Blight of Maize *Plant Pathology J* **34** 121-125.

367 Marklund S and Marklund G (1974) Involvement of superoxide anion radical in  
368 the autoxidation of pyrogallol and a convenient assay for superoxide dismutase  
369 *Eur J Biochem* **47** 169-174.

370 Mir SD, Ahmad M, Parray GA, Razvi SM and Gul-Zaffar (2015) Screening of maize  
371 inbred lines under artificial epiphytotic conditions for turcicum leaf blight  
372 (*Exserohilum turcicum*) *Afr J Microbiol Res* **9** 481-483.

373 Nadeem SM, Ahmad M, Zahir ZA, Javaid A and Ashraf M (2014) The role of  
374 mycorrhizae and plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) in improving crop  
375 productivity under stressful environments *Biotechnol Adv* **32** 429–448.

376 Naglot A, Goswami S, Rahman I, Shrimali DD, Yadav Kamlesh K, Gupta Vikas K, Rabha  
377 Aprana Jyoti, Gogoi HK and Veer Vijay (2015) Antagonistic Potential of Native  
378 *Trichoderma viride* Strain against Potent Tea Fungal Pathogens in North East India *Plant*  
379 *Pathology J* **31** 278-289.

380 Polidoros AN, Mylona PV and Scandalios JG (2001) Transgenic tobacco plants expressing  
381 the maize Cat2 gene have altered catalase levels that affect plant–pathogen interactions  
382 and resistance to oxidative stress *Transgenic Res* **10** 555–569.

383 Reddy RT, Reddy PN, Reddy RR and Reddy SS (2013) Management of turcicum leaf  
384 blight of maize caused by *Exserohilum turcicum* in maize *International Journal of*  
385 *Scientific and Research Publications* **3** 1-4.

386 Shalini S and Kotasthane AS (2007) Parasitism of *Rhizoctonia solani* by isolates of  
387 *Trichoderma* spp *Electronic Journal of Environmental, Agricultural and Food Chemistry* **6**  
388 2272-2281.

389 Siddaiah CN, Satyanarayana NR, Mudili V, Gupta VK, Gurunathan S, Rangappa S,  
390 Huntrike SS and Srivastava RK (2017) Elicitation of resistance and associated defense  
391 responses in *Trichoderma hamatum* induced protection against pearl millet downy mildew  
392 pathogen *Science Report* **7** 43991.



393 Siddikee MA, Chauhan PS and Sa T (2012) Regulation of ethylene biosynthesis under salt  
 394 stress in red pepper (*Capsicum annuum* L.) by 1-aminocyclopropane- 1-carboxylic acid  
 395 (ACC) deaminase-producing halo tolerant bacteria *J Plant Growth Regul* **31** 265-72.  
 396 Singh R and Srivastava RP (2012) Southern Corn Leaf Blight- An Important Disease of  
 397 Maize: An Extension Fact Sheet *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education* **1**  
 398 (Special Issue), 334-337.  
 399 Singh BN, Singh A, Singh BR and Singh HB (2014) *Trichoderma harzianum* elicits  
 400 induced resistance in sunflower challenged by *Rhizoctonia solani* *J Appl Microbiol* **116**  
 401 654–666.  
 402 Sundara RWVB and Sinha MK (1963) Phosphate dissolving organisms in soil and  
 403 rhizosphere *Indian J Agr Sci* **33** 272-278.  
 404 Surekha CH, Neelapu NRR, Siva PB and Sankar Ganesh P (2014) Induction of defense  
 405 enzymes and phenolic content by *Trichoderma viride* in *Vigna mungo* infested with  
 406 *Fusarium oxysporum* and *Alternaria alternate* *International Journal of Agricultural*  
 407 *Science and Research* **4** 31-40.  
 408 Utkhede RS and Rahe JE (1983) Interaction of antagonist and pathogens in biological  
 409 control of onion white rot *Phytopathology* **73** 890-893.  
 410 Wang M, Jia Ma, Lili Fan, Kehe Fu, Chuanjin Yu, Jinxin Gao, Yaqian Li and Jie Chen  
 411 (2015) Biological control of southern corn leaf blight by *Trichoderma atroviride* SG3403  
 412 *Biocontrol Sci Techn* **25** 1133-1146.  
 413 White DG (1999) In: Compendium of Corn Diseases, 3rd ed., Amer. Phytopathol. Soc., St.  
 414 Paul, MN.

415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423

424 **Table 1: Antagonistic activity of *T. harzianum* isolates against *Bipolaris maydis* in**  
 425 **dual culture**

Bio-agent	Mycelial Growth (mm)*	Mycelial Inhibition (%)
<i>T. harzianum</i> I	1.29±0.088 <sup>a**</sup>	74.35
<i>T. harzianum</i> II	1.84±0.025 <sup>b</sup>	63.41
Control	5.03±0.284 <sup>c</sup>	0.00
CD (0.05%)	1.83	-

426 \* The values are the mean ±Standard Error.

427 \*\*The treatment means in a column with different lowercase alphabets show statistically  
 428 significant difference among treatments at p<0.05.

429

430 **Table 2: Field evaluation of *T. harzianum* isolates against maydis leaf blight**

Treatment	Disease Severity (%)*	Disease
-----------	-----------------------	---------

		2016	2017	Mean	reduction (%)
T <sub>1</sub>	Seed dressing with <i>Trichoderma harzianum</i> - I	43.00±0.577 <sup>b**</sup>	47.00±0.577 <sup>c</sup>	45.00±0.577 <sup>c</sup>	27.03
T <sub>2</sub>	Seed dressing with <i>Trichoderma harzianum</i> - II	44.67±0.882 <sup>b</sup>	50.00±0.577 <sup>b</sup>	47.34±0.726 <sup>b</sup>	23.24
T <sub>3</sub>	Foliar spray of <i>T. harzianum</i> - I	34.67±0.333 <sup>e</sup>	38.00±0.576 <sup>f</sup>	36.34±0.167 <sup>f</sup>	41.08
T <sub>4</sub>	T <sub>1</sub> + foliar spray of <i>T. harzianum</i> - I	25.00±0.000 <sup>g</sup>	30.67±0.333 <sup>h</sup>	27.84±0.166 <sup>h</sup>	54.86
T <sub>5</sub>	Foliar spray of <i>T. harzianum</i> - II	37.67±0.333 <sup>d</sup>	40.00±0.577 <sup>e</sup>	38.84±0.333 <sup>e</sup>	37.03
T <sub>6</sub>	T <sub>2</sub> + foliar spray of <i>Trichoderma harzianum</i> - II	29.67±0.882 <sup>f</sup>	34.33±0.333 <sup>g</sup>	32.00±0.288 <sup>g</sup>	48.11
T <sub>7</sub>	Foliar spray Indofil M-45 @ 0.25%	40.00±0.577 <sup>c</sup>	44.33±0.333 <sup>d</sup>	42.17±0.441 <sup>d</sup>	31.63
T <sub>8</sub>	Control	56.00±0.577 <sup>a</sup>	67.33±0.881 <sup>a</sup>	61.67±0.167 <sup>a</sup>	0.00
	CD (0.05%)	1.384	1.643	0.943	

431 \*The values are the mean ±Standard Error of experiment repeated in 2016 and 2017.

432 \*\*The treatment means in a column with different lowercase alphabets show statistically  
433 significant difference among treatments at p<0.05.

434 The treatment means in a column with common lowercase alphabets are statistically at par  
435 with each other at p<0.05.

436

437

438

439

440

441 **Table 3: Effect of *T. harzianum* isolates on green fodder yield of maize**

	Treatment	Green fodder yield (q/ha)*			Increase in yield (%)
		2016	2017	Mean	
T <sub>1</sub>	Seed dressing with <i>Trichoderma harzianum</i> - I	383.07±2.116 <sup>cd</sup>	378.84±2.116 <sup>cd</sup>	380.96±1.832 <sup>e**</sup>	8.76
T <sub>2</sub>	Seed dressing with <i>Trichoderma harzianum</i> - II	376.72±5.599 <sup>d</sup>	368.25±3.665 <sup>d</sup>	372.49±1.058 <sup>e</sup>	6.34
T <sub>3</sub>	Foliar spray of <i>T. harzianum</i> - I	400.00±12.698 <sub>bc</sub>	395.77±2.116 <sup>b</sup>	397.89±5.291 <sup>b</sup>	13.59
T <sub>4</sub>	T <sub>1</sub> + foliar spray of <i>T. harzianum</i> - I	421.16±2.116 <sup>a</sup>	412.70±3.665 <sup>a</sup>	416.93±2.799 <sup>a</sup>	19.03

T <sub>5</sub>	Foliar spray of <i>T. harzianum</i> - II	397.88±10.580 <sub>bcd</sub>	389.42±4.232 <sup>bc</sup>	393.65±6.608 <sup>cd</sup>	12.38
T <sub>6</sub>	T <sub>2</sub> + foliar spray of <i>Trichoderma harzianum</i> - II	416.93±4.232 <sup>ab</sup>	397.88±5.599 <sup>b</sup>	407.41±4.612 <sup>ab</sup>	16.31
T <sub>7</sub>	Foliar spray of Indofil M-45 @ 0.25%	385.19±4.233 <sup>cd</sup>	383.07±2.116 <sup>c</sup>	384.13±3.174 <sup>de</sup>	9.67
T <sub>8</sub>	Control	344.97±2.116 <sup>e</sup>	355.56±3.665 <sup>e</sup>	350.27±2.116 <sup>f</sup>	0.00
	CD (0.05%)	2.839	1.830	1.849	

442 \*The values are the mean ±Standard Error of experiment repeated in 2016 and 2017.

443 \*\*The treatment means in a column with different lowercase alphabets show statistically significant difference among treatments at p<0.05.

444 The treatment means in a column with common lowercase alphabets are statistically at par with each other at p<0.05.

445

446 **Table 4: Influence of *Trichoderma harzianum* isolates on peroxidase (POX) enzyme activity in maize leaves**

447

Treatment		Peroxidase enzyme activity (U mg <sup>-1</sup> protein)*					
		Time after inoculation (hours)					
		0	12	24	36	48	72
1	Indofil M-45	1.87±0.262 <sub>bc**</sub>	2.12±0.36 <sub>3<sup>b</sup></sub>	3.15±0.54 <sub>2<sup>bc</sup></sub>	2.62±0.45 <sub>1<sup>bc</sup></sub>	2.40±0.42 <sub>8<sup>ab</sup></sub>	2.04±0.52 <sub>6<sup>bc</sup></sub>
2	<i>T. harzianum</i> I	3.29±0.447 <sup>a</sup>	4.28±0.35 <sub>8<sup>a</sup></sub>	4.95±0.44 <sub>9<sup>a</sup></sub>	4.49±0.51 <sub>4<sup>a</sup></sub>	3.89±0.55 <sub>6<sup>a</sup></sub>	3.62±0.43 <sub>9<sup>c</sup></sub>
3	<i>T. harzianum</i> II	2.85±0.293 <sup>a</sup> <sub>b</sub>	3.23±0.33 <sub>6<sup>a</sup></sub>	4.32±0.27 <sub>4<sup>ab</sup></sub>	3.59±0.42 <sub>2<sup>ab</sup></sub>	2.70±0.43 <sub>5<sup>a</sup></sub>	2.64±0.59 <sub>6<sup>b</sup></sub>
4	Control	0.87±0.319 <sup>c</sup>	1.37±0.22 <sub>8<sup>b</sup></sub>	2.13±0.22 <sub>7<sup>c</sup></sub>	1.39±0.12 <sub>3<sup>c</sup></sub>	1.27±0.22 <sub>1<sup>b</sup></sub>	1.01±0.23 <sub>9<sup>c</sup></sub>
CD (0.05%)		0.480	0.563	0.618	0.748	0.701	0.619
F- VALUE		62.505	64.096	51.057	39.373	29.286	38.968
P-VALUE		<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05

450 \*The values are the mean ±Standard Error.

451 \*\*The treatment means in a column with different lowercase alphabets show statistically significant difference among treatments at p<0.05.

452 The treatment means in a column with common lowercase alphabets are statistically at par with each other at p<0.05.

453

454 **Table 5: Influence of *Trichoderma harzianum* isolates on superoxide dismutase (SOD) enzyme activity in maize leaves**

455

Treatment		Superoxide dismutase enzyme activity (U mg <sup>-1</sup> protein)*					
		Time after inoculation (hours)					
		0	12	24	36	48	72
1	Indofil M-45	12.96±0.54 <sub>5<sup>c**</sup></sub>	20.07±0.5 <sub>82<sup>b</sup></sub>	30.41±0.3 <sub>91<sup>c</sup></sub>	24.48±0.2 <sub>45<sup>c</sup></sub>	28.11±0.2 <sub>94<sup>c</sup></sub>	19.25±0.2 <sub>58<sup>b</sup></sub>
2	<i>T.</i>	19.99±0.32	28.09±0.3	39.05±0.4	32.02±0.4	35.27±0.2	24.12±0.3

	<i>harzianum</i> I	9 <sup>a</sup>	35 <sup>a</sup>	35 <sup>a</sup>	59 <sup>a</sup>	73 <sup>a</sup>	03 <sup>a</sup>
3	<i>T. harzianum</i> II	15.31±0.54 5 <sup>b</sup>	20.98±1.0 00 <sup>b</sup>	31.99±0.5 71 <sup>b</sup>	26.86±0.5 24 <sup>b</sup>	29.03±0.2 20 <sup>b</sup>	23.13±0.4 45 <sup>a</sup>
4	Control	11.76±0.60 6 <sup>c</sup>	14.64±0.3 34 <sup>c</sup>	18.75±0.3 84 <sup>d</sup>	17.39±0.3 08 <sup>d</sup>	18.32±0.1 82 <sup>d</sup>	14.48±0.2 83 <sup>c</sup>
CD (0.05%)		1.359	2.291	1.489	1.223	0.390	1.036
F- VALUE		89.009	72.388	397.936	307.379	4016.624	222.549
P-VALUE		<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05

458 \*The values are the mean ±Standard Error.

459 \*\*The treatment means in a column with different lowercase alphabets show statistically  
460 significant difference among treatments at p<0.05.

461 The treatment means in a column with common lowercase alphabets are statistically at par  
462 with each other at p<0.05.

463

464 **Table 6: Influence of *Trichoderma harzianum* isolates on catalase (CAT)enzyme  
465 activity in maize leaves**

Treatment		Catalase enzyme activity (U mg <sup>-1</sup> protein)*					
		Time after inoculation (hours)					
		0	12	24	36	48	72
1	Indofil M-45	10.38±0.31 3 <sup>c**</sup>	11.79±0.1 46 <sup>c</sup>	21.14±0.3 29 <sup>c</sup>	29.09±0.2 18 <sup>a</sup>	24.14±0.2 55 <sup>b</sup>	16.98±0.1 10 <sup>b</sup>
2	<i>T. harzianum</i> I	12.94±0.15 8 <sup>a</sup>	14.83±0.4 82 <sup>a</sup>	27.61±0.3 08 <sup>a</sup>	29.91±0.1 44 <sup>a</sup>	26.02±0.4 01 <sup>a</sup>	19.61±0.3 39 <sup>a</sup>
3	<i>T. harzianum</i> II	11.40±0.30 7 <sup>b</sup>	13.40±0.2 28 <sup>b</sup>	24.34±0.3 57 <sup>b</sup>	27.24±0.3 52 <sup>b</sup>	22.74±0.2 57 <sup>c</sup>	17.87±0.2 17 <sup>b</sup>
4	Control	9.09±0.087 d	10.07±0.5 36 <sup>d</sup>	17.97±0.2 94 <sup>d</sup>	22.16±0.2 77 <sup>c</sup>	19.01±0.3 92 <sup>d</sup>	14.98±0.4 27 <sup>c</sup>
CD (0.05%)		0.620	0.992	0.489	0.398	1.121	0.502
F- VALUE		86.117	53.303	894.348	949.334	87.082	182.936
P-VALUE		<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05

466 \*The values are the mean ±Standard Error.

467 \*\*The treatment means in a column with different lowercase alphabets show statistically  
468 significant difference among treatments at p<0.05.

469 The treatment means in a column with common lowercase alphabets are statistically at par  
470 with each other at p<0.05.

471