# A comparative study between some biocontrol agents and the nematicide furfural on growth of tomato plants and pathogenesis of meloidogyne javanica under green-house condition

Mohammed Jubair Hanawi Wasit University - College of Science - Department of Biology

دراسة مقارنة بين بعض العوامل الاحيائية ومبيد الفور فورال على معايير نمو نباتات الطماطة وإمراضية نيماتود تعقد الجذور Meloidogyne javanica في البيوت الزجاجية

محمد جبير حناوي جامعة واسط – كاية العلوم – قسم علوم الحياة

المستخلص

نفذت تجربة لدراسة تأثير ثلاث عوامل مكافحة أحيائية مع أحد فطريات المايكورايزا ومبيد الفور فورال ضد نيماتود العقد الجذرية Meloidogyne javanica التي تصيب نباتات الطماطة Lycopersicon esculentum في البيوت الزجاجية . عوامل المكافحة الأحيائية هي Meloidogyne lilacinus ، Paecilmyces lilacinus وفطر المايكورايزا Glomus المكافحة الأحيائية هي T.viride ، Trichoderma harzianum ، Paecilmyces lilacinus وفطر المايكورايزا Glomus المكافحة الأحيائية هي Mosseae الفور فورال . الفور فورال كان أفضل معاملة في تحفيز نمو النبات واختزال عدد العقد الجذرية لكل بنات. الفطر Mosseae والتي قورنت مع مبيد الفور فورال . الفور فورال كان أفضل معاملة في تحفيز نمو النبات واختزال عدد العقد الجذرية لكل نبات. الفطر Mosseae التي والتي كانت Action بنات . الفور فورال المكافحة الأحيائية في زيادة طول المجموع الخضري والجذري والتي كانت Action بنات . الفطر Mosseae الخيائية في المحافجة الأحيائية في زيادة طول المجموع الخضري والتي كانت Action بنات . مسم و 26.1 سم على التوالي . الفطر Paecilomyces lilacinus كان أفضل عوامل المكافحة الأحيائية في اختزال تعقد الجذور ( 57.53 سم% ) . دمج عوامل المكافحة الأحيائية وفطر المايكور ايزا ومبيد الفور فورال معاً كان أقل المعاملات تأثيراً في تحفيز نمو النبات واختزال تعقد الجذور حيث كانت النسبة المئوية للاختزال 31.4% .

#### Abstract

An experiment was conducted to study the effect of three fungal biocontrol agents along with *G.mosseae* and nematicide furfural against root knot nematode *Meloidogyne javanica* infecting tomato plants(*Lycopersicon esculentum*) under greenhouse condition. Bioagents are *Paecilomyces lilacinus*, *Trichoderma harzianum*, *T. viride* and mycorrhizal fungus *Glomus mosseae* which were compared with the nematicide furfural. The furfural compound was the best treatment in promoting plant growth and reduction the number of root galls/plant. The result showed that the *T. harzianum* was the best biocontrol agent in increasing shoot length and root length 16.2 %, 26.1% respectively . The *P. lilacinus* was the best biocontrol agent in reduction root galling (57.53%). Combination of biocotrol agents with *G. mosseae* and furfural was the least effective treatment in promoting plant growth and the reduction of root galling was 31.43%.

**Key words:** Biocontrol , Meloidogyne javanica, Glomus , Paecilomyces, Trichoderma , Furfural, Lycopersicon esculentum .

## Introduction

Tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum*, Mill.), an important vegetable crop in Iraq. It is regarded as a most favorable host for root – knot nematode. All the 4 major species of *Meloidogyne* and their known races readily attack tomato crops in indoor and outdoor cultivations. Root-knot nematodes cause as high as 85% suppression in the yield of tomatoes (1).

For the management of root knot nematode, chemical nematicides is a good strategy and were used till 1982. However public concern about nematicides residues in food and environment and also the development of nematicides resistance by pathogens has increased the search for alternative means of controlling disease. Due to the problems caused by chemical control, mainly their deleterious effects on human health and environment, development of alternative control methods is of great importance (2).

The present investigation was thus undertaken to attempt an eco-friendly management of root knot nematode infecting tomato through integrating potential and compatible management components viz. fungal bioagents (3,4). Recent study indicated that the combined effect of *Glomus moseae*, *Paecilomyces lilacinus* and Neem cake (*Azadirachta indica*) facilitated the sustainable management of *Meloidogyne incognita* on eggplant under field condition reported. Another study revealed that pre-inoculation of tomato, tobacco, oat and carrot with *Glomus moseae* reduced the penetration of *M. incognita* (5,6). The efficiency of *T. harzianum* was found to be comparable to that of carbofuran followed by *P. lilacinus*, *Arthrobotrys oligospora* and neem compound. Besides reducing nematode infestation, the biocontrol agents also enhanced the growth of the plant (7).

Raja & Renganathan (8) reported that the integration of different methods of application of P. *lilacinus* viz., seed treatment, seedling treatments and soil application treatments under field conditions exhibited an increase in plant growth parameters (shoot length, shoot weight, root length and root weight) in the fields trial.

The nematicidal potential of eco-friendly - furfural was discovered by Rodriguez-Kabana and Walters (9), and further demonstrated against a variety of phytoparasitic nematode including *Meloidogyne arenaria*, *M. incognita*, and *Pratylenchus* (10, 11). El-Mougy, *et al.* (12) indicated that the furfural combined with bioagent treatment proved to have suppressive effect against nematode *M. incognita* and the numbers of nematodes in soil declined sharply in direct response to furfural application with the sharpest reductions in its population.

The direct mode of action of furfural against nematodes has been described as the destruction of the nematode cuticle (13). Residues of furfural have not been detected in plant tissue or soil after multiple applications, because the compound, which has a short half life, is degraded through oxidative and reductive analogs to carbon dioxide and acetic acid. The nematophagous fungi *Paecilomyces* and *Trichoderma* are a biocontrol fungi with a potential range of activity to control the worldwide most important plant parasitic nematodes. This biological nematicides may be safe agents in an integrated approach to control mainly sedentary nematodes. The aim of this research was to compare between the effect of biocontrol agents (*P. lilacinus*, *T. harzianum*, *T. viride* and *G. mosseae*) and furfural on: 1) Growth parameters of tomato plants, 2) Pathogenesis of root knot nematode *M. javanica*.

### **Materials and Methods**

#### Nematode culture

Nematode eggs were extracted from two month old heavily galled tomato roots, using the modified extraction technique of Hussey and Barker (14). The suspension of eggs was then adjusted to 2000 eggs / ml , 3 ml of suspension per one pot were used in this study and added at the time of transplanting .

### **Plant culture**

Tomato cultivar (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.) seedlings were transplanted in 25 cm diameter plastic pots (one/pot) containing 2 Kg aerated sterilized sandy loam soil . Ten days after transplanting they were treated with antagonistic fungi .

#### **Fungal isolates**

Isolates of fungi (*P. lilacinus*, *T. harzianum*, *T. viride* and *G. mosseae*) used in this study were obtained from Department of Biotechnology-Directorate of Agriculture Research - Ministry of Science and Technology. The fungi *P. lilacinus*, *T. harzianum* and *T. viride* were cultured in a flasks (250 ml) containing 50 g of autoclaved wheat grains and incubated at  $25 + 1^{\circ}$ C for ten days.

### Inoculation

An inoculums of 100 gm of *G. moseae* containing 60 chlamydospores / gm was placed as a thin layer 2 cm below the soil surface in each pot. Three grams of wheat grains infected with the fungi (*P. lilacinus*, *T. harzianum* and *T. viride*) per 1 Kg soil were used.

The nematicide furfural (Group Guard ) was obtained from Deraawi Company for agricultural Service - Baghdad -Iraq .The rate of application of furfural was 1ml/Kg soil (9) , two days after transplanting the furfural added to the soil .

Treatments of the experiment were as follow :

- T1= Control <sub>1</sub> : Without any inoculation (Negative control)
- T2= Control <sub>2</sub>: Inoculation with nematode alone (Positive control)
- T3= Inoculation with *T. harzianum* + Nematode
- T4= Inoculation with *T.viride* + Nematode
- T5= Inoculation with *P. lilacinus* + Nematode
- T6= Inoculation with *G.mosseae* + Nematode
- T7= Treatment with furfural + Nematode
- T8= Recombination (T.h. +T.v. + P.l. + G.m. + fur.) + Nematode

The treatments were laid out in a completely randomized design (CRD) and each was replicated 3 times . Plants were harvested two months after nematode inoculation . Data dealing with length and weight of shoots and roots beside the gall number per plant were calculated. All obtained data were subjected to the analysis of variance and means compared according to the least significant difference (LSD) at the 5% level of probability in Wasit University, College of Agriculture.

## Results

The effect of biocontrol agents *P. lilacinus*, *T. harzianum*, *T. viride*, *G. mosseae* and furfural on the growth of tomato plants and pathogenesis of *M. javanica* are presented in Tables 1, 2. The results showed significant differences in plant growth parameters in all treatments compared with the positive control (T2 nematode alone) Tables 1. The most effective treatment in increasing growth parameters was the furfural treatment (T7) which produced maximum, shoot length (19.7 cm), Root length (26,9 cm), Wet weight of roots (0.97 gm) and dry weight of roots (0.096 gm) followed by the treatment *T. harzianum* for the same parameters (16.2 cm) ,(26.1 cm), (0.58 gm) and (0.054 gm) respectively. The furfural treatment was the most effective one also in increasing wet weight of shoot (3.18 gm) and dry weight of shoot (0.316 gm) followed by the treatment *G. mosseae* for the wet weight of shoot (1.72 gm) and *T. viride* for the dry weight of shoot (1.55 gm) and they differ significantly. There is no significant differences between biocontrol agents (*P. lilacinus*, *T. harzianum*, *T. viride*) in shoot length.

Recombination treatment (T8) was the least effective in all growth parameters except dry weight of root. *T. Viride* treatment(T4) gave lowest value in dry weight of root (0.035 gm).

Treatments	Shoot length (cm)	Root length (cm)	Wet weight of shoot (gm)	Dry weight of shoot (gm)	Wet weight of roots (gm)	Dry weight of root (gm)
Negative control T1	21.2 <sup>d</sup>	31.6 <sup>e</sup>	4.10 <sup>b</sup>	0.410 <sup>b</sup>	1.40 <sup>b</sup>	0.154 <sup>b</sup>
Positive control T2	8.50 <sup>a</sup>	9.10 <sup>a</sup>	0.62 <sup>a</sup>	0.060 <sup>a</sup>	0.20 <sup>a</sup>	0.021 <sup>a</sup>
<i>T. harzianum</i> + Nematode	16.2 <sup>bc</sup>	26.1 <sup>d</sup>	1.42 <sup>a</sup>	0.141 <sup>a</sup>	0.58 <sup>a</sup>	0.054 <sup>a</sup>
<i>T.viride</i> + Nematode	13.6 <sup>b</sup>	15.5 <sup>b</sup>	1.57 <sup>a</sup>	0.155 <sup>a</sup>	0.39 <sup>a</sup>	0.035 <sup>a</sup>
P. lilacinus + Nematode	13.9 <sup>b</sup>	20.2 <sup>c</sup>	1.35 <sup>a</sup>	0.132 <sup>a</sup>	0.45 <sup>a</sup>	0.044 <sup>a</sup>
G.mosseae + Nematode	12.3 <sup>a</sup>	16.5 <sup>b</sup>	1.72 <sup>a</sup>	0.127 <sup>a</sup>	0.41 <sup>a</sup>	0.043 <sup>a</sup>
Furfural + Nematode	19.7 <sup>cd</sup>	26.9 <sup>d</sup>	3.18 <sup>b</sup>	0.316 <sup>b</sup>	0.97 <sup>b</sup>	0.096 <sup>b</sup>
Recombination	113 a	13.5 <sup>b</sup>	1.35 <sup>a</sup>	0.099 <sup>a</sup>	0.31 <sup>a</sup>	0.044 <sup>a</sup>
LSD (0.05)	3.83	3.62	1.43	0.14	0.73	0.062

 Table (1) : Effect of biocontrol agents and furfural in growth criteria of tomato plants

\*Each value is an average of three replicates . Same letter(s) are not significantly different (P=0.05) by Least Significant Difference Test . Negative control : Without any inoculation . Positive control : Inoculation with nematode alone .

The results showed also significant differences in roots galling in all treatments compared with the comparison treatment ( $control_2$ ) Table 2. The most effective treatment in reduction the galls number on roots of the seedlings was the furfural treatment in which the number of galls per plant was 16 compared with the comparison treatment(105), followed by the treatments *T. viride*, *G. mosseae*, *T. harzianum* and *P. lilacinus* which were 57, 53.6, 49.3 and 44.6 respectively. Less reduction in galls formation was observed when the antagonistic microorganisms were combined with furfural application and the number of galls per plant was 72.

Data in table 2 indicated the activity of tested treatments on galls formation by nematode and the highest percent of reduction was recorded in the treatments of furfural (84.77%) followed by the treatments *P. lilacinus* and *T. harzianum* which were 57.53% and 53.05% respectively . *T. viride* and recombination treatments showed the less performance with values of 45.72% and 31.43% reduction respectively . There is no significant differences between *P. lilacinus* and *T. harzianum* treatments and between *T. viride* and *G. mosseae* treatments in reduction galls number .

Treatments	No. of Gall / Plant	Reduction %
Negative control T1	0	-
Positive control T2	105 <sup>a</sup>	-
T. harzianum + Nematode	49.3 <sup>de</sup>	53.05
<i>T.viride</i> + Nematode	57 <sup>c</sup>	45.72
P. lilacinus + Nematode	44.6 <sup>e</sup>	57.53
G.mosseae + Nematode	53.6 <sup>cd</sup>	49.96
Furfural + Nematode	16 <sup>f</sup>	84.77
Recombination (all Treatments)	72 <sup>b</sup>	31.43
LSD (0.05)	5.45	-

Table (2): Effect of BCAs and furfural in nematode galling on tomato plants

\* Each value is an average of three replicates . Same letter(s) are not significantly different (P=0.05) by Least Significant Difference Test . Negative control : Without any inoculation . Positive control : Inoculation with nematode alone .

#### Discussion

Results of the study indicate that using microbial agents and furfural suppressed the root-knot nematodes and resulted in positive changes in plant growth. Application of furfural to soil causes shifts in the composition of the soil microbial community and this is among many factors that affect the fate of agricultural chemicals in the soil. Microorganisms are either capable of utilizing a chemical as a nutrient source or cometabolizing compounds which, in turn, affect the entire soil food web and promote growth of plant (15).

Furfural also reduced gall formation by nematode, this reduction could result from a reduction of nematode population in soil. Moreover, many scientists supervised laboratory and field trails concerning the efficacy of furfural against soil microorganisms. They recorded that furfural is a natural bactericide, fungicide, insecticide and nematicide which interacts with the cuticle of the nematode, effectively stripping the protective layers which results in the cuticle swelling and disintegrating. Movement of the nematode is impeded and it subsequently dies through dehydration or attack by parasitic organisms. (16, 17).*T. harzianum* and then *P. lilacinus* were the best bioagents in reduction root galls and promoting growth of tomato. This effect may be attributed to the toxic, and enzymatic principles such as acetic acid and proteolytic and chitinolytic enzymes released during fungal interaction with nematode which

#### Wasit Journal for Science & Medicine

might cause killing /inhibiting the *M. javanic* directly or indirectly promoting plant growth and ultimately enhancing yield component of tomatoes . Similar results reported that soil application with *T. harzianum* resulted in the greatest reduction in nematode populations in soil and subsequent root knot disease severity in okra and mungbean . Similarly *T. harzianum* significantly increased plant height of okra and mungbean (18). *T. harzianum* were found to be most effective than *P. lilacinus* in controlling M. incognita and enhanced all plant growth characters , and they concluded that biocontrol agents are effective agents in controlling root-knot nematode and are ecologically safe for (19).

*Trichoderma* has not only been proved to parasitize nematodes and inactivate pathogen enzymes but also help in tolerance to stress conditions by enhanced root development. It participates in solubilization of inorganic nutrients. Thus, *Trichoderma* colonized roots require lesser supply of manmade nitrogen fertilizers (20). Moreover, the activity of *P. lilacinus* attributed to ability to infect eggs, juveniles and females of *M. javanica* by direct hyphal penetration (21).

G. mosseae inoculation also had a least but beneficial effect on plant growth and gall formation and this result coordinates with that of Khalil1, et al. (22) who indicate that G. macrocarpum was the least effective fungus on the formation of gall by Meloidogyne incognita. Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) are widely used in nurseries as they enhance nutrient and water availability. They have also been used to improve the growth of tomato plants (23, 24). The suggested mechanisms of Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi against plant parasitic nematodes are summarized as follow: i) improved plant vigor and growth to offset yield loss normally caused by nematodes, ii) physiologically alteration or reduction of root exudates that are responsible for chemotactic attraction of nematodes, iii) directly retarding nematode development or reproduction within the root tissue, and iv) enhance and encourage the endophytes and endoparasitic-nematodes to compete for the same site in the root. Also, higher chitinase activity and  $\beta$ -1, 3-glucana in roots was recorded (25, 26). From the other hand the synergistic effect of biocontrol agents and nematicide furfural (Recombination) was the least effective in most growth parameters as well as gall formation. This may be due to antagonistic effect between them or because of the qualitative as well as quantitative microbial changing that occur after the addition of treatment components. Similar results were reported by El-Mougy et al. (12) referred to that the combined treatments with furfural and either bacterial or fungal bioagents showed a lower effect, although they reduced the disease incidence by more than 41%. Another study revealed that combination of G. intraradices and T. viride to control root-knot nematode Meloidogyne hapla did not result in synergism (27).

#### References

**1- Liberti, F. 1979**. Economic importance of *Meloidogyne* spp in subtropical and Mediterranean climate . In Root-knot nematodes (*Meloidogyne* species), systematics.Biology and control F. Lamberti, and C.E. Taylor (eds), pp. 341 – 357. London, Academic Press.

**2- Sahebani, N. and Hadavi, N. 2008.** Biological control of the root-knot nematode *Meloidogyne javanica* by *Trichoderma harzianum*. Soil Biol. Biochem., 40: 2016–2020.

**3- Goswami, B. K., Pandey, R. K., Bhattachary, C. and Singh, L. 2005**. Evaluation of six isolates of *Trichoderma harzianum* against *F. oxysporum f. sp. Lycopercisi* and *M. incognita*. Internat J. Nematology 15(1): 79–82.

**4- Pandey, R. K., Goswami, B. K. and Singh, S. 2005**. Management of root Knot nematode and *Fusarium* wilt disease complex by fungal bioagents, neem oilseed cake and/or VA-Mycorrhiza on Chickpea. Internat Chickpea and Pigeonpea Newsletter. 12:32–34.disease of brinjal. Current Nematol, 12(1,2), 73-74.

**5- Rao, M. S. and parvathareddy , P. 2001.** Control of *Meloidogyne incognita* on eggplant using *Glomus moseae* integrated with *Paecilomyces lilacinus* and neem cake . Nematol. Medit. 29 : 153 – 157 .

**6- Sikora, R. A. 1979 .** Predisposition by the endotropic mycorrhizal fungus, *Glomus moseae* . pp . 399 – 404. IN root knot nematode (*Meloidogyne* species) systematic, biology and control . (F. Lamberti and C. E. Talor eds) Academic Press, London.

**7- Sharma, P. and Pandey, R. 2009**. Biological control of root-knot nematode; *Meloidogyne incognita* in the medicinal plant; *Withania somnifera* and the effect of biocontrol agents on plant growth. African Journal of Agricultural Research 4 (6): 564-567.

**8- Raja, K. and Renganathan, V. 2012**. Effect of Different Dose and Application Methods of *Paecilomyces lilacinus* (Thom.) Samson against Root Knot Nematode, *Meloidogyne incognita* (Kofoidand White) Chitwood in Okra. Journal of Agricultural Science 4(11): 119 – 127.

**9- Rodriguez-Kabana, R. and Walters, G. 1992 .** Method for the treatment of nematodes in soil using furfural. U.S. Patent 5084477.

**10- Rodríguez-Kábana, R., Kloepper, J. W., Weaver, C. F. and Robertson, D. G. 1993.** Control of plant parasitic nematodes with furfural—A naturally occurring fumigant. Nematropica 23:63-73.

11- Bauske, E. M., Rodríguez-Kábana, R., V. Estáun, V., Kloepper, J. W., Robertson, D. G., Weaver, C. F. and King, P. S. 1994. Management of *Meloidogyne incognita* on cotton by use of botanical aromatic compounds. Nematropica 24:143-150.

**12- El-Mougy, N. S., El-Gamal , N. G, Mohamed, M. M. M. and Abdel-Kader, M. M.** 2008 . Furfural approaches as control measures against root rot and root-knot incidence of tomato under greenhouse and field conditions . Journal of Plant Protection Research 48 (1): 93 – 105.

**13- Burger, G. J. 2005.** An overview of the development of furfural (Crop Guard®) as a nematicide in South Africa: The chemist Recombination of furfural within the soil and agricultural environment. Proceed ings of the Annual International Research Conference Methyl Bromide Alternatives and Emissions Reductions 27.1.

14- Hussey, R. S. and Barker, K. R. 1973. A comparison of methods of collecting inocula of *Meloidogyne* spp., including a new technique. Plant Disease Reporter 57: 1025-1028.

**15- Racke, K. D. 1990.** Pesticides in the soil microbial ecosystem. Pages 1-27 in Enhanced Biodegradation of Pesticides in the Environment. K. K. Racke and J. R. Coats, eds. ACS Symposium Series 426,\ American Chemical Society, Washington, DC.

**16- Rodriguez-Kabana R. 2006.** The nematicidal and herbicidal activities of furfural: A review. Annual International Research Conference on Methyl Bromide Alternatives and Emissions Reductions. Abstr., No. 41.

**17- Steyn A. 2006**. The efficacy of Crop® Guard (Furfural a.s.) as a nematicide on Meloidogyne sp. Annual International Research Conference on Methyl Bromide Alternatives and Emissions Reductions. Abstr., No. 44.

**18- Siddiqui, I. A., Amer-Zareen , M., Zaki, J. and Shaukat, S. S. 2001**. Use of *Trichoderma* Species in the Control of *Meloidogyne javanica* Root Knot Nematode in Okra and Mungbean. Pakistan Journal of Biological Sciences 4: 846-848.

**19- Usman, A. and Siddiqui, M. A. 2012**. Effect of some fungal strains for the management of rootknot nematode (*Meloidogyne incognita*) on eggplant (*Solanum melongena*). Journal of Agricultural Technology 8(1): 213-218.

**20- Harman, G. E. 2000.** The myths and dogmas of biocontrol: changes in perceptions derived from research on *Trichoderma harzianum* strains T-22. Plant Disease 84(4):377-393.

**21- Khan, A., Williams, K. L. and Nevalainen, H. K. M. 2006.** Infection of plant parasitic nematodes by *Paecilomyces lilacinus* and *Monacrosporium lysipagum*. Biological Control, 51: 659-678.

22- Khalil1, M. S., Kenawy, A., Gohrab, M. A. and Mohammed, E. E. 2012. Impact of microbial agents on *Meloidogyne incognita* management and morphogenesis of tomato. JBiopest. 5(1): 28-35.

23- Saad, A. S. A., Massoud, M. A., Ibrahim, H. S. and Khalil, M. S. 2011. Management study for the root- knot nematodes, *Meloidogyne incognita* on tomatoes using fosthiazate and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungus. Journal of Advance Agricultural Research, 16: 137-147.

**24- Saad, A. S. A., Massoud, M. A., Ibrahim, H. S. and Khalil, M. S. 2012.** Activity of nemathorin, natural product and bioproducts against root-knot nematodes on tomatoes. Archives Phytopathology and Plant Protection, 45(8): 955-962.

**25- Jothi, G. and Sundarababu, R. 2002**. Peroxidase and chitinase activities in brinjal inoculated with *Meloidogyne incognita* (Kofoid and White) Chitwood and endomycorrhiza. Journal of Biological Control 16: 161-164.

**26-** Pozo, M. J., Ordier, C. C., Umas –Gaudot, E. D., Ianinazzi, S. G., Barea, J. M. and Zcon-A Guilar, C. A. 2002. Localized versus systemic effect of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi on defence responses to *Phytophthora* infection in tomato plants. Journal of Experimental Botany, 53: 525-534.

**27- Masadeh,B., von Alten, H., Grunewaldt-Stoecker1, G. and Sikora, R. A. 2004.** Biocontrol of root-knot nematodes using the arbuscular mycorrhizal fungus *Glomus intraradices* and the antagonist *Trichoderma viride* in two tomato cultivars differing in their suitability as hosts for the nematodes. Journal of Plant Diseases and Protection 111 (4): 322–333.