

Aecial Host Range of *Puccinia substriata* var. *indica*

J. P. Wilson, USDA-ARS Forage and Turf Research Unit, and S. C. Phatak, Department of Horticulture, University of Georgia Coastal Plain Experiment Station, Tifton 31793, and G. Lovell, USDA-ARS Genetic Resources Unit, Griffin, GA 30223

ABSTRACT

Wilson, J. P., Phatak, S. C., and Lovell, G. 1996. Aecial host range of *Puccinia substriata* var. *indica*. Plant Dis. 80:806-808.

Potential aecial hosts of *Puccinia substriata* var. *indica* were tested for resistance or susceptibility to better understand their potential role in epidemics of pearl millet rust. Thirty-one accessions of *Solanum melongena*, each collected from a different country, and accessions of twenty-seven other *Solanum* species were evaluated. Resistance or susceptibility was determined from natural infection in an isolated field location and inoculations in the greenhouse. All accessions of *S. melongena* were susceptible, except PI 413784 from Burkina Faso and PI 401533 from the Ivory Coast, countries that are near the center of origin of pearl millet. Newly identified aecial hosts include *S. anguivi*, *S. ferox*, *S. gilo*, *S. incanum*, *S. lineanum*, *S. nodiflorum*, and *S. rostratum*. All other *Solanum* species evaluated were resistant. Accessions of two weed species from the United States, *S. americanum* and *S. aviculare*, were resistant and may play no role in the epidemiology of pearl millet rust in the United States.

Pearl millet (*Pennisetum glaucum* L.R. Br.) is primarily adapted to agriculture practiced in harsh environmental conditions, but there is increasing interest in its use for forage and grain in milder climates. Rust, caused by *Puccinia substriata* Ellis & Barth. var. *indica* Ramachar & Cummins, occurs in many countries of Asia and Africa and in the United States (8) and can cause considerable reduction in forage quality and grain yield (7,11). Several sources of resistance have been identified in pearl millet, the host of primary economic importance, but there have been limited evaluations of the aecial hosts, which may be important in the epidemiology of the disease.

Eggplant (*Solanum melongena* L.) was originally identified as the aecial host of *P. substriata* var. *indica* (4). Later studies revealed that *S. melongena* var. *insanum*, *S. pubescens*, *S. torvum*, and *S. xanthocarpum* were also aecial hosts, but *S. trilobatum* was resistant (5). In the United States, Wells (10) determined that eggplant is an aecial host of pearl millet rust but obtained no infection of *S. dulcamara*, *S. nigrum*, *S. sisymbriifolium*, *S. carolinense*, *S. floridanum*, and *S. perplexum*. In contrast to all other reports in the literature, a later study suggested that *Euphorbia pulcherimma* Willd. is another aecial host in India (6).

Pearl millet and eggplant are commonly cultivated in India, and rust is frequently observed on both crops (5). There is little published information concerning natural occurrence of rust on *Solanum* species in the Western Hemisphere. Natural infection of eggplant has been observed in Brazil (3), but the only infections reported in the United States have resulted from deliberate inoculations (10).

As pearl millet cultivation spreads into nontraditional areas, the potential exists for more widespread rust epidemics if other *Solanum* species can serve as a source of inoculum for early epidemic initiation. The objective of this study was to assess *Solanum* accessions collected from diverse geographic sites as possible aecial hosts of *P. substriata* var. *indica*.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Pearl millet hybrid Tifleaf 1 was planted in a 0.25-ha field at the Hodnett Farm near Tifton, GA, during August 1992. Plants were inoculated during mid-September with a bulk aqueous suspension of urediniospores by spraying inoculum into the whorls of plants along the length of several rows. Plants were severely infected by rust prior to being killed by frost and were allowed to remain standing during the winter. During the spring, four 2-m-wide strips were disked and rototilled to prepare beds for *Solanum* transplants. Beds were separated and surrounded by 4 m of undisturbed pearl millet debris.

Several *Solanum* accessions (Table 1) selected from the Germplasm Resources Unit (formerly the Southern Region Plant Introduction Station, Griffin, GA) were started in the greenhouse. Approximately five seeds were planted in each cell of polystyrene

transplanting flats. Plants at about the 5- to 8-leaf stage were transplanted into the field on 1 June 1993. Two to three hills of each accession with several plants in each hill were planted 0.6 m apart within rows spaced 1 m apart. An average of four plants of each accession was evaluated in each of four replications arranged in a randomized complete block design. Plots were irrigated after transplanting and periodically during growth. Plants were examined at 2- to 3-day intervals for spermatogonia on leaves. To reduce the possibility of developing and releasing new races of rust, plants with visible spermatogonia were counted and cut off at the base before aecia developed. Spermatogonia develop within hypertrophied leaf tissue, in which a yellow lesion surrounded by a well-defined orange border is formed. Plants with spermatogonia were considered susceptible, and infected plants were removed from the field and destroyed. After 7 weeks, the remaining uninfected plants were counted, and the plot area was disked to destroy the remaining plants.

Remnant seed of each of the accessions was planted in three 10-cm² pots (replications) in the greenhouse during December 1994. An average of four plants was grown and evaluated in each pot. Pots were arranged in a randomized complete block design.

Plants were inoculated at the 3- to 5-leaf stage. Dry pearl millet leaves with telia, collected during October 1994 from naturally infected field-grown plants, were hydrated by soaking in warm (approximately 38°C) water for 15 min. Hydrated leaves were draped over *Solanum* seedlings placed in an inoculation chamber. Seedlings were automatically misted with water for 60 s at 30-min intervals for 48 h. Inoculation-chamber temperatures averaged 16°C, and plants remained in the dark during the incubation interval. After the misting period was terminated, the inoculation chamber was opened for about 6 h until most of the foliage had dried, and plants were returned to the greenhouse bench.

Seedlings were examined for infection at 3- to 4-day intervals. Infections were allowed to progress to the formation of aecia before susceptible, infected plants were cut out. Plants without infection were reinoculated twice, as described above, to insure no plants escaped infection. Each subsequent inoculation of the *Solanum* seedlings was performed with pearl millet leaves not used in previous inoculations.

Corresponding author: J. P. Wilson
E-mail: jwilson@tifton.cpes.peachnet.edu

Accepted for publication 21 March 1996

Publication no. D-1996-0520-04R

This article is in the public domain and not copyrightable. It may be freely reprinted with customary crediting of the source. The American Phytopathological Society, 1996.

Field and greenhouse data were analyzed separately. Data of percent infected plants were analyzed by analysis of variance with sums of squares partitioned into replication and accession. Means of infected plants were differentiated by Fisher's LSD.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Of 31 accessions of *S. melongena*, all plants of 23 accessions were susceptible in the field and greenhouse (Table 1). Six accessions had some uninfected plants in the field, but all were susceptible in the greenhouse. Two accessions, PI 401533 and PI 413784, from the Ivory Coast and Burkina Faso, respectively, were resistant in both evaluations.

Most of the *Solanum* species other than *S. melongena* reacted similarly in the field and greenhouse evaluations (Table 1). All plants of *S. anguivi*, *S. ferox*, *S. incanum*, and *S. xanthocarpum* were susceptible in both evaluations. Some or all plants of *S. gilo*, *S. linnaeanum*, *S. nodiflorum*, and *S. rostratum* were uninfected in the field, but most or all plants were susceptible in the greenhouse.

Some of the differences in reaction between field and greenhouse evaluations may be the result of escape from infection in the field. Several accessions were unadapted to the growing conditions in the field. Small, poorly growing plants are less likely to become infected than more robust plants as a result of a lower probability of spore contact and less conducive microenvironmental conditions for spore germination and infection within the plant canopy. Later intermittent dry periods in the field and the onset of higher temperatures may have been less favorable for teliospore germination or infection by basidiospores.

Susceptibility predominated among the *S. melongena* accessions. This was expected because most of the accessions were collected in areas where pearl millet is not grown and, thus, there is little advantage for resistance. Resistance was identified in two eggplant accessions collected near the center of origin of pearl millet (1). Although rust is a monocyclic, minor disease of eggplant, resistance may confer a selective reproductive advantage in these areas. The evolutionary relationship between *P. substriata* var. *indica* and its hosts may be difficult to trace because the center of origin of eggplant is generally accepted to be India (2).

The species listed in Table 1 that were not infected in the field and greenhouse inoculations will require further evaluation to unequivocally determine that they are not hosts of *P. substriata* var. *indica*. The single accession of the species tested represents only a small portion of the variability within their respective gene pools. In addition, it also is possible that the rust population in the southeastern United States does not possess genes for virulence to these species. These species

may be susceptible to the rust population in other locations.

Regardless of the problems inherent in identifying nonhosts, host species were clearly identified. Although plants were removed from the field prior to the full development

of aecia, all plants that formed spermatogonia in the greenhouse evaluations also developed sporulating aecia. Newly identified aecial hosts identified in these evaluations include *S. anguivi*, *S. ferox*, *S. gilo*, *S. incanum*, *S. linnaeanum*, *S. nodiflorum*, and *S. rostratum*.

Table 1. Susceptibility of *Solanum* species to *Puccinia substriata* var. *indica*, determined by natural infection in the field and by inoculations in the greenhouse (GH)

| <i>Solanum</i> species | Country of origin | Accession number | Susceptible plants (%) ^y | |
|--|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| | | | Field | GH |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | India | PI 115506 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Afghanistan | PI 116953 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Turkey | PI 165059 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Lebanon | PI 181806 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Syria | PI 181807 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Philippines | PI 188816 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Greece | PI 199516 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Myanmar | PI 200856 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Pakistan | PI 217962 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Japan | PI 230333 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | South Africa | PI 232078 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | El Salvador | PI 233916 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Taiwan | PI 241594 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Puerto Rico | PI 263727 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | "USSR" | PI 267104 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Hungary | PI 290467 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Brazil | PI 304839 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Canada | PI 304840 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Papua/New Guinea | PI 349612 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | "Yugoslavia" | PI 358232 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Martinique | PI 408974 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Italy | PI 452124 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Republic of Korea | PI 508502 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Iran | PI 140446 | 94 ab | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Ethiopia | PI 193599 | 94 ab | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Thailand | PI 249568 | 94 ab | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Iraq | PI 179500 | 88 bc | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Uzbekistan | PI 102727 | 80 cd | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | China | PI 103077 | 75 d | 100 a |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Ivory Coast | PI 401533 | 0 e | 0 c |
| <i>S. melongena</i> L. | Burkina Faso | PI 413784 | 0 e | 0 c |
| <i>S. americanum</i> Mill. | U.S. | PI 268152 | 0 e | ... ^z |
| <i>S. anguivi</i> Lam. | India | PI 183357 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. atropurpureum</i> Schrank | Colombia | PI 305320 | 0 e | 0 c |
| <i>S. aviculare</i> G. Forster | U.S. | PI 280049 | 0 e | 0 c |
| <i>S. capsicoides</i> Guatteri ex All. | India | PI 370043 | 0 e | 0 c |
| <i>S. ciliatum</i> Lam. | Nicaragua | PI 196300 | 0 e | 0 c |
| <i>S. elaeagnifolium</i> Cav. | Mexico | PI 346963 | 0 e | 0 c |
| <i>S. ferox</i> L. | Myanmar | PI 200854 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. gilo</i> Raddi | Brazil | PI 441874 | 6 e | 71 b |
| <i>S. incanum</i> L. | India | PI 381155 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. lacianum</i> C.B. Clarke | India | PI 312108 | 0 e | 0 c |
| <i>S. laciniatum</i> Aiton | Hungary | PI 337284 | 0 e | 0 c |
| <i>S. linnaeanum</i> | | | | |
| Hepper & P. Jaeger | Colombia | PI 420415 | 86 bc | 100 a |
| <i>S. macrocarpon</i> L. | Brazil | PI 441915 | 0 e | 0 c |
| <i>S. mammosum</i> L. | Mexico | PI 245968 | 0 e | 0 c |
| <i>S. nigrum</i> L. | Japan | PI 304600 | 0 e | 0 c |
| <i>S. nodiflorum</i> Jacq. | Congo | PI 247828 | 0 e | 100 a |
| <i>S. pseudocapsicum</i> L. | "Yugoslavia" | PI 368425 | 0 e | 0 c |
| <i>S. quinquangulare</i> | | | | |
| Willd. Ex Roemer & Schultes | Colombia | PI 305325 | 0 e | 0 c |
| <i>S. rostratum</i> Dunal | Netherlands | PI 420997 | 0 e | 82 b |
| <i>S. sauveolens</i> Kunth & Bouche | Mexico | PI 203339 | 0 e | 0 c |
| <i>S. sessiliflorum</i> Dunal | Venezuela | PI 487467 | 0 e | ... |
| <i>S. sisymbriifolium</i> Lam. | Uruguay | PI 331140 | 0 e | 0 c |
| <i>S. spinosissimum</i> | | | | |
| Lodd. Ex Loudon | Peru | PI 390818 | 0 e | 0 c |
| <i>S. stramonifolium</i> Jacq. | Venezuela | PI 487464 | 0 e | 0 c |
| <i>S. xanthocarpum</i> | | | | |
| Schrader & Wendl. | India | PI 381293 | 100 a | 100 a |
| <i>S. yungasense</i> | South America | PI 265884 | 0 e | 0 c |

^y Means within a column followed by the same letter are not significantly different according to Fisher's LSD.

^z No germination of remnant seed.

The susceptibility of *S. anquivi*, *S. ferox*, *S. incanum*, *S. nodiflorum*, and *S. xanthocarpum* suggests that these species may contribute to epidemics of pearl millet rust in or near the areas where these species were collected. Accessions of two weed species collected from the United States, *S. americanum* and *S. aviculare*, were resistant and may play no role in epidemics of pearl millet rust in the United States. However, *S. rostratum* collected from the Netherlands was susceptible. Commonly known as buffalobur, *S. rostratum* also is found in the United States (9). Further evaluations of these species are warranted to more clearly determine their role in the epidemiology of pearl millet rust in the United States.

LITERATURE CITED

1. Brunken, J., De Wet, J. M. J., and Harlan, J. R. 1977. The morphology and domestication of pearl millet. *Econ. Bot.* 31:163-174.
2. Choudhury, B. 1976. Eggplant. Pages 278-279 in: *Evolution of Crop Plants*. N. W. Simmonds, ed. Longman, New York.
3. Figueiredo, M. B., Bastos Cruz, B. P., da Silveira, A. P., and Makishima, N. 1971. Uma ferrugem cuja forma ecidial ocorre sobre berinjela (*Solanum melongena* L.). *Arq. Inst. Biol. Sao Paulo* 38:173-175.
4. Ramakrishnan, T. S., and Soumini, C. K. 1948. Studies on cereal rusts. I. *Puccinia penniseti* Zimm. and its alternate host. *Indian Phytopathol.* 1:97-103.
5. Ramakrishnan, T. S., and Sundaram, N. V. 1956. Further studies on *Puccinia penniseti* Zimm. *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. B* 43:190-196.
6. Rao, B. M., Prakash, H. S., and Shetty, H. S. 1986. *Euphorbia pulcherimma*, Willd.—A new host of pearl millet rust. *Curr. Sci.* 55:576-577.
7. Singh, B. B., and Sokhi, S. S. 1985. Effect of rust severities on yield components of pearl millet. *Indian J. Mycol. Plant Pathol.* 13:361-362.
8. Singh, S. D., and King, S. B. 1991. Pearl millet rust—Present status and future research needs. *Int. J. Trop. Plant Dis.* 9:35-52.
9. Southern Weed Science Society, Weed Identification Committee. *Weed Identification Guide*. Southern Weed Science Society, Champaign, IL.
10. Wells, H. D. 1978. Eggplant may provide primary inoculum for rust of pearl millet caused by *Puccinia substriata* var. *indica*. *Plant Dis. Rep.* 62:469-470.
11. Wilson, J. P., Hanna, W. W., and Gates, R. N. 1994. Stability of forage yield and quality in pearl millet hybrids heterogeneous for rust resistance. *Euphytica* 72:163-170.