The Effect of Meloidogyne Incognita on Growth of Date Palm Seedlings

Abdul Nazi Chedekal

Kuwaitat Research Station Al Ain, UAE chedekal@hotmail.com

Abstract: In pot trial effect on growth factors of date palm seedlings due to root knot nematode, Meloidogyne incognita, infection was estimated. All factors were significantly affected by the nematode infection except shoot length where it was only 9.5% reduction. Maximum reduction was observed in fresh root weight (44.24%) followed by dry shoot weight (31.76%).

Key words: *Meloidogyne incognita, Date palm,* 2nd *stage juvenile, root gall index.*

1. Introduction

Because of root knot nematodes, particularly *Meloidogyne incognita*, it is very difficult and sometimes impossible to grow important vegetables, such as tomato, in the tropics and semitropics (W.F.Mai). The yield loss due to root knot nematodes, Meloidogyne spp, alone has been estimated to be 30 - 50% (Jain 1991). For many crops the problem due to root knot nematodes is overlooked because of lack of obvious above ground symptoms. One difficulty with assessing nematode impact is that damage resulting from nematode infection is often less obvious than that caused by many other pests or diseases (J. M. Nicol *et al.*). Many date palm trees were also found infected with these nematodes without showing any above ground symptom. The presence of many plant-parasitic nematodes in date palm rhizosphere that could be of potential importance (A. Mani, 2005). The study regarding the yield loss on date palm due nematodes has not been carried out so far. There are many unknown factors which affect the growth and productivity of date palm. It is possible that much of the unhealthy growth of palms, generally attributed to other causes, may be due to nematode attack (A. Zaid *et al.*).

The objective of present study is to estimate the effect of root knot nematode, *Meloidogyne incognita*, on growth parameters of date palm seedlings.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

36 date palm seedlings of 2 months old were transplanted in plastic pots containing sterilized soil & potting soil. These seedlings were kept in two sets each with 6 replications and 3 seedlings in each replication. After 4 weeks of transplanting the seedlings in the 1st set (18 seedlings) were inoculated with newly hatched active 2nd stage larvae of root knot nematode, *Meloidogyne incognita*, (2000 larvae per seedling). The second set containing 18 seedlings in 6 replications was kept without inoculation as control. All pots with seedlings were kept inside the glass house and watered regularly. After 1 year of inoculation all seedlings were uprooted, washed and the following data were taken.

- root gall index 1-5
- fresh total weight,
- fresh shoot weight,
- fresh root weight,
- shoot length,
- dry shoot weight,
- dry root weight.

©ARC Page | 11

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results show that even though the root gall severity was 50% in inoculated seedlings all growth factors were significantly affected by root knot nematode infection. Maximum effect was found in fresh root weight where 44.24% reduction occurred followed by dry shoot weight (31.76%). Similar effect was found in fresh shoot weight and dry root weight (28.85% and 28.84%). Least effect was found in shoot length showing only 9.5% reductions.

The result may indicate that the root knot nematodes infection on date palm should not be ignored and management practices should be followed to increase the growth and productivity of date palm.

Table 1. Data showing the root gall severity

Treatment		Severity of infection based on root gall index 1 – 5							
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	% severity		
Inoculated M.incognita	3	2	3	3	2	2	50		
Control	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Table 2. Data showing the effect in total weight

Treatment		Total Weight in gram.								
	R1	R1 R2 R3 R4 R5 R6 Mean.								
Inoculated M.incognita	188.49	206.35	122.85	98.74	93.90	151.30	143.605			
Control	248.05	291.58	204.13	196.91	191.85	225.68	226.3667			
Reduction	59.56	85.23	81.28	98.17	97.95	74.38	82.7617			

Table 3. Data showing the effect in fresh shoot weight

Treatment		Fresh Shoot Weight in gram.								
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	Mean.			
Inoculated M.incognita	96.62	81.48	95.07	54.09	45.87	109.29	80.40333			
Control	115.53	110.31	113.08	100.71	96.76	141.69	113.0133			
Reduction	18.91	28.83	18.01	46.62	50.89	32.4	32.60997			

Table 4. Data showing the effect in fresh root weight

Treatment	Fresh Root Weight in gram.								
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	Mean.		
Inoculated M.incognita	91.87	124.87	27.78	44.65	48.03	42.01	63.20167		
Control	132.52	181.27	91.05	96.2	95.09	83.99	113.3533		
Reduction	40.65	56.4	63.27	51.55	47.06	41.98	50.15167		

 Table 5. Data showing the effect in shoot length

Treatment		Shoot length in cm.							
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	Mean.		
Inoculated M.incognita	77	53.4	46	46	47	55	54.06667		
Control	88	60	38	50.5	54	68	59.75833		
Reduction	11	6.6	8	4.5	7	13	5.69166		

Table 6. Data showing the effect on dry shoot weight

Treatment		Dry Shoot Weight in gram.									
	R1	R1 R2 R3 R4 R5 R6 Mean.									
Inoculated											
M.incognita	36.11	45.89	18.28	38.96	18.24	30.61	31.34833				
Control	46.22	58.88	38.96	46.70	45.18	39.71	45.94167				
Reduction	10.11	12.99	20.68	7.74	26.94	9.1	14.59333				

Table 7. Data showing effect on dry root weight

Treatment	Dry Root Weight in gram.									
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	Mean.			
Inoculated				1						
M.incognita	21.72	32.33	17.12	5.21	9.73	21.99	19.68333			
Control	32.26	38.60	22.38	20.41	16.65	35.67	27.66167			
Reduction	10.54	6.27	5.26	5.2	6.92	13.68	7.978333			

Table 8. Data showing the percentage reduction in growth factors

Treatment	Total Weight in	Fresh Shoot Weight in	Fresh Root Weight in	Dry Shoot Weight in	Dry Root Weight in	Shoot length in
	gram.	gram.	gram.	gram.	gram.	cm.
Inoculated <i>M.incognita</i>	143.605	80.40333	63.20167	31.34833	19.68333	54.06667
Control	226.3667	113.0133	113.3533	45.94167	27.66167	59.75833
Reduction	82.7617	32.60997	50.15167	14.59333	7.978333	5.69166
% Reduction	36.5609	28.855	44.24364	31.76493	28.84258	9.5245

REFERENCES

- A. Mani, Z. A. Handoo, and S. Livingston, 2005. Plant-Parasitic Nematodes Associated with Date Palm Trees (Phoenix dactylifera L.) in the Sultanate of Oman, NEMATROPI 35 (2):135-144.
- A. Zaid, P. F. de Wet., M. Djerbi and A. Oihabi, 2002. Diseases and Pests of Date Palm, Date Palm Cultivation (Edited by Abdelouahhab Zaid), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- Jain.P.K. 1991. Nematode pests of vegetable crops, Nematode pests of crops (Edited by D.S.Bhatti and R.K.Walia), Cosmo Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi, India, pp. 77-97.
- J. M. Nicol, S. J. Turner, D. L. Coyne, L. den Nijs, S. Hockland and Z. Tahna Maafi. Current Nematode Threats to World Agriculture, Genomics and Molecular Genetics of Plant-Nematode Interactions, pp 21-39.
- W.F.Mai,(1985).Plant-Parasitic Nematodes:Their Threat to Agriculture, An Advanced Treatise on Meloidogyne (Edited by J.N.Sasser and C.C.Carter), vol.1: 11-16.