INTRODUCTIO

Ert. Phyt. Applied bank bis age of by a large and varied particle is in the end of the physical back of the second by a large and super second by the second

LEAF SURFACE MYCOFLORA OF DISEASED AND NON - DISEASED PEA

(Pisum sativum L.)¹ NAMEIRAKPAM IRABANTA SINGH² & 3 MISS PANGABAM MEMCHA DEVI³

SUMMARY Purjas asthe and Bhattachat, a

crop productivity

The investigation on leaf surface mycoflora (Phylloplane & phyllosphere) of diseased and non - diseased pea (*Pisum sativum* L.) leaves were carried out by using leaf washing technique for one complete crop season (October 1984 to March 1985) Analysis of the diseased and non - diseased leave surfaces revealed 23 fungal types out which 15 belongs to Deuteromycetes, 3 to Ascomycetes, 2 to Phycomycetes, 2 sterile mycelia and one to Actinomycetes. *Cladosporium* sp; *Alternaria* sp. were dominant types on diseased leaves while *Cladosporium* sp; *Alternaria* sp. *Mucor* sp. *Penicilium* sp. were dominant types in case of non - diseased leaves. It was also observed that the total population of the leaf surface mycoflora in diseased (341) was higher than that of non diseased (297). The present investigation would be useful for further study of antagonistic and stimulation relationship between leaf surface microorganisms and its pathogens *Uromyces fabae* Pers (de Bery) etc.

- 1 Received for publication, February 10, 1986.
- 2 For correspondence.
- 3 Plant pathology & Aerobiology Laboratory, Department of Life Sciences, Manipur University, Canchipur, Imphal - 795003, INDIA.

INTRODUCTION

Leaf surfaces are covered by a large and varied population of microorganisms (Dickinson 1976; Sharma Gupta and Dixit 1984). Various microbes, both parasites and saprophytes, are colonized on the leaf-surface due to the richness of the nutrients (Mishra and Srivastava 1970). Some of these colonizers are responsible for disease development (Last 1955, Kerling 1958, Sinha 1971). The age of the plant, season, maturity of leave and climatic factors play an important role in controlling the composition of surface mycoflora (Sharma, Gupta, Dixit 1971). Fungal colonization of aerial parts of terrestrial and crop plants were studied by various workers (Memcha Devi, 1984). The importance of microorganisms prosent on leaf surface indicates a cloeser lation between surface microbes and those microbes which are associated with foliar diseases and need to study it for increasing crop productivity by controlling the diseases (Purkayastha and Bhattacharya, 1982; Mishra and Srivastava, 1970).

The aim of the present investigation has been, therefore, to isolate the fungal population of diseased and non - diseased pea leaves by using leaf washing technique. Further, the qualitative and quantitative analysis of diseased and non - diseased surface mycoflora of pea (*Pisum sativum* L.) in relation to climatic conditions are also taken into consideration.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The diseased and non - diseased sea (*Pisum savivum* L.) cultivar Makhyat Mubi (Local variety) leaves were collected at random from a field grown in Imphal (24.44, N. Latitude, 93. 58, E. Longitude), India measuring an area of one hectare at monthly interval from Octoboer 1984 to March 1985. The leaf surface mycoflora was studied following leaf washing technique of Voznyakovaskya and Kudyakov (1960). The mycoflora were divided into two categories, viz. *Phyllosphere* and *Phylloplane* for both diseased and non diseased leaves.

The field infections of the pea crop were noticed when the plants are

28 days old. Thirty leaves were collected at random from the field described above for both types of experiments. After cutting into pieces, equal amounts of leaves for both types (diseased and non - diseased) were introduced separately into 50 ml of sterile water contained in a 250 ml capacity conical flask. They were shaken vigorously by hand for 25 minutes. 5 ml each of such spore suspensions was inoculated separately into 3(three) petridishes (9 cm. in dia.) containing Czapek's Dox agar medium for isolation of diseased and non - diseased phyllosphere fungi.

The leaf pieces were again washed for 5 times with sterilized water. Then pieces (separately for diseased and non - diseased leaves)were introduced directly into 3 (three) petridishes (9 cm in diam) containing Czapek's Dox agar medium for isolation of diseased and non - diseased phylloplane fungi.

All such petridishes were incubated at $27 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C} \pm 1^{\circ}\text{C}$ for 7 days. The colonies thus developed were counted and identified with the help of published literatures.

RESULTS

The fungi isolated from the phyllosphere and phylloplane regions of diseased and non - diseased pea leaves are listed in Table I & II.

The seasonal variations in the total population of the surface mycoflora inhabiting diseased and non - diseased pea leaves revealed that the highest count (59) of diseased phyllosphere population was recorded in October 1984 while the lowest (11) was recorded in March, 1985. The highest count (62) of non - diseased phyllosphere population was recorded in December, 1984, while the lowest (11) was in March 1985 (Table I).

The highest count (52) of diseased phylloplane population was recorded in October 1984, while the lowest (11) was recorded in January, 1985. The highest count (34) of non-diseased phylloplane population was recorded in October, 1984 while the lowest (9) was in February, 1985 (Table I).

The total number of mean fungal types both in diseased and non - di seased pea leaves were 23 (Table III).

hadinarab black out more made DISCUSSION

Becker and Manning (1983) determined the phylloplane mycoflora of two scab immune (liberty and Nova Easy gro) and one scab - susceptible (Imperial Mc Intosh) apple (*Malus domestica* Berkh) cultivars. Fungi isolated from the leaves at monthly intervals unit harvest by leaf washing method revealed that phylloplane microflora for all these three cultivars were found quantitatively and qualitatively similar.

Mishra and Srivastava (1971) reported that leaf surface mycoflora of Virus (VMM) infected and non - infected *Petunia hybrida* are different. They recorded maximum number in the diseased leaves than the non diseased leaves. They suggested that more fungal population in diseased leaves was due to mutual antagonism between virus and fungal population. In the present investigation also, more surface mycoflora were recorded in the diseased (phylloplane and phyllosphere) leaves than the non - diseased (phylloplane and phyllosphere) pea leaves (Table IV).

A contradicting result was reported by Mishra and Kanaujia (1971) on *Lycopersicum asculantum* where they found lesser number of fungi on virus infected leaves than healthy ones. The reason might be due to cobalt treatment on the diseased leaves, the type of virus and test plant.

Pace and Campbel (1974) stated that population level was an important factor in disease incidence as it was directly related with the active growth of the saprophytes on leaf surface which might compete for nutrient or produced inhabiting substances against the growth of the pathogen.

According to Upadhya & Dwivedi (1977) fungi having the highest population level, least effective in inhibition of spore germination in vitro have considerable effect on percentage inhibition of disease incidence, while Gregory (1973) states «the occurrence of many fungi on aerial surfaces may be directly related to inoculation from the atmosphere».

In the present investigation, the total number of fungal population was more in the diseased leaves (phylloplane and phyllosphere) than the non-diseased leaves (phylloplane an dphyllosphere) (Table III). At this stage no conclusion can be drawn in respect antagonistic nature of Uromyces fabae and other surface mycoflora.

Antagonistic interaction between phylloplane microbes of Venturia inacqualis was reported by Andrews and Bergee (1981). They reported that the promising antagonistic were Chaetomium globosum, Aureobasidium pullulans, Trichoderma viride and an actinomycete. These fungi reduced lesion size and number, and conidial numbers apparently by nutrient competition and antibiosis.

Further infection of onion leaves by Alternaria sp. was reduced approximately 50% in the presence of Aureobasidium pullulans and Sporobolomyces roseus (Fokkema and Lorbeer 1974, Last and Warren 1972).

The result of the present study, however, are not in agreement with their findings. Here total fungal population in diseased leaf surface was higher both in phylloplane and phyllosphere than the non - diseased leaf surface . The only possible explanation might be in case of pea rust (Uromyces fabae) pathogen and surface antagonistic interaction do not come into the picturc in the natural condition.

However, the present finding was in agreement with that of Garg and Sharma (1983). They reported that the surface mycoflora of non - infected and rust infected leaves of Triticale showed higher fungal population in rust infected leaves than non - infected leaves. They also isolated more species of fungi from the infected leaves.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are thankful to the Head of the Department of Life Sciences, Manipur University, Canchipur for providing laboratory facilities. Thanks are also due to the Department of Science and Technology, Govt. of India for financial assistance to N I S under Young Scientists, Scheme.

61

	washing	Leaf	recumques	aro thu aro thu aro more aro more	Autagomitic unterest tequalis vias reported by e premising antagomistic rest-derms curitie and an re
	Diseased	Non - diseased	Type of leaves	l Juoin Juoin Set an	omber, and commenter aris. Further infection of sumately 6% in the pro-
non Lip hu surfa surfa	phyllosphere phylloplane	phyllosphers phylloplane	study, ho ondetion shere that	esetut ngal j tylkos	Table I. Seasonal variations in the total population (colonics) of the surface mycoflora inhabiting diseased and non - diseased leaves of pea (Pisum sativum L.)
niq niq	59 I	41 34	Oct. N	n no	l variations in th re surface mycof non - diseased 1 (Pisum sativum L.)
Garg	12 drive 1	21 13	Nov. 1984	Fu	s in the mycof mycof ased mr.
Ani -	46 26	62 17	Dec.	ngal I	ne tot flora leave
lores	40 11	30 16	Jan.	popula	al pop inhab
	16 15	30	Feb. N 1985	Fungal populations	pulation jting ea
n Scie	13 11 Li to incentrae	11	Nov. Dec. Jan. Feb. March 1984 1985	MARD/	
ie. T lo av	ullion contra no contra 204 137	195 102	- Total population	actipo natura M ES 1	

ASED Phyllosphare To δ of Oct.Nov.bec.Jah.Feb.Mar. To tal abun- 1 1 2 1 4 abun- 1 1 2 1 4 1 7 6 1 1 2 1 4 1 7 5.4 1 1 1 2 1 4 1 7 5.4 1 1 2 1 4 1 7 5.4 1 1 2 1 4 1 7 5.4 1 1 2 1 4 1 7 5.4 1 1 2 1 4 1 7 5.4 1 1 2 1 1 1 1.9 1.9 1 1 2 2 1 2 3 1.4 2 1 1 2 2 1 3 1.4 1 2 2 1 3 1.4 1.4<	ASED Phyllosphere Aor Phyllosphere Phyllosphere <th>Sterile mycelia(W) = 1 = = 2 1 4</th> <th>Sterile mycelia(W) - 1 2 1 4</th> <th></th> <th>Rhizopus sp. 2</th> <th>Linking and a second first</th> <th></th> <th>Phomasp 2 2</th> <th>P@nicilium sp₀ 1 2 1 - 4</th> <th>P. clavatum</th> <th>Mucorsp. 2 2 1 3</th> <th></th> <th>Herpographium ap 2 - 1 3</th> <th>Fuserium sp. 4 4</th> <th>Epicoccum ap 2 - 5 2 9</th> <th>Ureschlera sp</th> <th>Cladosporium sp. 40 15 15 4</th> <th></th> <th>p</th> <th>1 1 1 1 2 3</th> <th>Aschochyta sp</th> <th>sp 4 4 3 4 15</th> <th></th> <th>Actinomycetes sp. 2 2 (</th> <th></th> <th>Oct.Nov.Dec.Jan.Feb.Mar. To- 2</th> <th>-</th> <th>ma of the funcus</th> <th></th>	Sterile mycelia(W) = 1 = = 2 1 4	Sterile mycelia(W) - 1 2 1 4		Rhizopus sp. 2	Linking and a second first		Phomasp 2 2	P@nicilium sp₀ 1 2 1 - 4	P. clavatum	Mucorsp. 2 2 1 3		Herpographium ap 2 - 1 3	Fuserium sp. 4 4	Epicoccum ap 2 - 5 2 9	Ureschlera sp	Cladosporium sp. 40 15 15 4		p	1 1 1 1 2 3	Aschochyta sp	sp 4 4 3 4 15		Actinomycetes sp. 2 2 (Oct.Nov.Dec.Jan.Feb.Mar. To- 2	-	ma of the funcus		
Phyllosphere A of t.Nov.Dec.Jah.Feb.Mar. To- % of tal abundance 1 2 1 4 1 2 1 4 1.9 1 2 1 4 1.7 5.4 1 1 2 1 4 1.9 1 1 2 1 4 1.9 1 1 2 2 1 4 1.9 1 1 2 1 1 4 1.9 1.9 1 1 2 2 1 1 4 1.9 1.9 1 1 2 2 1 1 1.9 1.9 1.9 1 1 2 2 1 2 1.9 1.4 1.9 1 2 2 1 1 2 1.4 1.9 1.4 1 1 1 3 1.4 1.9 1.4 1 1 1 3 1.4 1.4 1.4	Phyllosphere Phyllosphere <th< td=""><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1.91</td><td></td><td>N R C</td><td>1.44</td><td>0.96</td><td>1.91</td><td></td><td>1.44</td><td>0.96</td><td>1.44</td><td>1.91</td><td>4.31</td><td>1</td><td>0.41</td><td>1</td><td>1.44</td><td>. 44</td><td>1.44</td><td>7.18</td><td>1</td><td>96.0</td><td>lance</td><td>-</td><td></td><td>DISEAS</td><td></td></th<>	1	1	1.91		N R C	1.44	0.96	1.91		1.44	0.96	1.44	1.91	4.31	1	0.41	1	1.44	. 44	1.44	7.18	1	96.0	lance	-		DISEAS		
100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100- 100-	100- 201-		•	1 1 -		•	•••	-		• • •		ا د ۱	1 1 . 1	6 1	• •	1			•	, , ,	1	1	1 1 1			Oct.Nov.Dec.J	Phyllo	ED		
1 1 <td>abon abon abon abon abon abon abon abon 1.9 1.9 abon abon 1.9 1.9 1.1 abon abon 1.9 1.9 1.1 abon abon abon 1.9 1.9 1.1 abon abon abon abon abon 1.4 1.9 1.1 abon abon</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td>ھ ھ</td> <td> </td> <td>1 1 1</td> <td>- - -</td> <td>۲ م ۱</td> <td>- 1 4</td> <td>1 1 1</td> <td>л II </td> <td>ן 1 נ 1 נ</td> <td>1</td> <td>-</td> <td>• •</td> <td>1</td> <td>30</td> <td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>6 1 A 117</td> <td>- I - I - I</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>And a second s</td>	abon abon abon abon abon abon abon abon 1.9 1.9 abon abon 1.9 1.9 1.1 abon abon 1.9 1.9 1.1 abon abon abon 1.9 1.9 1.1 abon abon abon abon abon 1.4 1.9 1.1 abon			-	ھ ھ	 	1 1 1	- - -	۲ م ۱	- 1 4	1 1 1	л II 	ן 1 נ 1 נ	1	-	• •	1	30	1 1 1 1 1 1				6 1 A 117	- I - I - I					And a second s	
			u. 9		1.4	0.4			1 48	1.9	2.4	4.4	1-4	5 (د	9	1	71.1	ı				5-4	1.9			1			
	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 $		ı		1	,	1		1	2	ı	u	6	1	-	1	ı	24	1	N	•		•			Uct.No				
				8	ເ ເ	8 8 1		1	- - - -	1 - 6	8 8 8	1 • 5	1 2	1 N	2 4	1	• 2	4 4 55	1 1 1	- 4 4	1 1 1	5 1 1	2 5 10				-F Mar Tr			
		1			2.9	8		1	2.9	5.8	1	4.9	1.9	1.9	3.9	,	1.9	53.9	1	3.9	ı	ı	9.8	1.9	8				NON	
		1		1	1	L	J	ı	I	2	ı	2		ı	ω	1	ı	30	1	•	ı	1	1	I.			Det.		-DISE	
Fab. Mar. Fab. Mar. To % off 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 1 1 1 3	1 3 1 1 0 0 1 1 3 1 1 0 0 1 1 3 1 1 0 0 1 3 1 0 0 1 2 1 3 1 0 0 2 1 3 1 0 0 2 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 <td>1</td> <td>Ň</td> <td>ı</td> <td>ω</td> <td>1</td> <td>i.</td> <td>I</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>ŧ</td> <td>t</td> <td>1</td> <td>ı</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>•</td> <td>15</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>•</td> <td></td> <td>'</td> <td>۱</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Nov De</td> <td>Phv11</td> <td>SED</td>	1	Ň	ı	ω	1	i.	I	1	1	ŧ	t	1	ı	1	1	•	15	1	1	•		'	۱			Nov De	Phv11	SED	
Fab. Mar. Fab. Mar. To % off 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 1 1 1 3	1 3 1 1 0 0 1 1 3 1 1 0 0 1 1 3 1 1 0 0 1 3 1 0 0 1 2 1 3 1 0 0 2 1 3 1 0 0 2 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td>•</td> <td></td> <td>•</td> <td>1</td> <td>•</td> <td>-</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>8 2</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>;</td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>;</td> <td>;</td> <td>;</td> <td>,</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>c.Jan</td> <td>nanhe</td> <td></td>	-	-		•		•	1	•	-	1	1	1	8 2	1	1	;		1	1	;	;	;	,	1		c.Jan	nanhe		
Fab. Mar. Fab. Mar. To % off 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 9 1 1 3 1 1 1 3	1 3 1 1 0 0 1 1 3 1 1 0 0 1 1 3 1 1 0 0 1 3 1 0 0 1 2 1 3 1 0 0 2 1 3 1 0 0 2 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 <td>•</td> <td>v</td> <td>ı</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>ı</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>ı</td> <td>-</td> <td>ı</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>ı</td> <td>1</td> <td>) 20</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>ï</td> <td>4</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>Feb</td> <td>B</td> <td></td>	•	v	ı	1		ı	1	1	2	ı	-	ı	2	1	ı	1) 20	-		1	ï	4	1	1		Feb	B		
Fab. Mar. To Non- 2 1 2 4 2 5 10 % 2 5 10 % 2 5 10 9 2 5 10 9 4 4 5 5 4 4 5 5 4 4 5 5 4 4 5 5 4 4 5 5 4 4 5 5 4 4 5 5 4 4 5 5 4 5 5 3 4 4 3 9 4 5 5 3 4 4 3 9 5 4 3 2 4 4 3 2 5 4 3 2 4 3 2 2 5 5 5 4 4 3	1 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 3 1 1 3 1 1 1 3 1 3 1 1 2 1 3 1 9 1 2 1 9 9 1 9 2 1 9 9 1 9 2 2 9 9 9 1 2 1 9 9 9 1 2 2 9 9 9 1 2 1 9 9 9 1 2 1 9 9 9 1 2 1 9 9 9 1 2 1 9 9 9 1 2 1 9 9 9 1 2 9 9 9 1 1 2 9 9 1 1 1 2 1 9 9 1 1 2 1 9 1 1 1 2 1 9 1 1 1 3 <td>100</td> <td>4</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>-- 5</td> <td>!</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>۱ د</td> <td>4 4</td> <td>5</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>N</td> <td>ا د</td> <td>26</td> <td>1</td> <td>1 1</td> <td>1 5</td> <td>1</td> <td>•</td> <td>tal</td> <td>Mar. To</td> <td></td> <td></td>	100	4	1	1		- - 5	!	1	1	1	2	۱ د	4 4	5	1	1	N	ا د	26	1	1 1	1 5	1	•	tal	Mar. To			
NON-DISEASED Phyllophere Phyllophere Tal abun- Cet. Nov. Dec. Jan. Feb. Max. Tal abun- Tal abun- Cet. Nov. Dec. Jan. Feb. Max. Tal abun- Tal abun- <th colspan<="" td=""><td>NON-DISEASED Anon- Phyllosphere abun- Phyllosphere dance Phyllosphere 41.9 1.9 1.9 1.9</td><td></td><td>2.01</td><td></td><td>3 1.51</td><td></td><td>2.51</td><td></td><td></td><td>5 2.51</td><td></td><td>2.51</td><td>1.51</td><td>2.01</td><td>2.51</td><td>,</td><td></td><td>147 73.87</td><td></td><td>3.02</td><td>ı</td><td>,</td><td>2.51</td><td></td><td></td><td>al abun- dance</td><td>o- % of</td><td></td><td></td></th>	<td>NON-DISEASED Anon- Phyllosphere abun- Phyllosphere dance Phyllosphere 41.9 1.9 1.9 1.9</td> <td></td> <td>2.01</td> <td></td> <td>3 1.51</td> <td></td> <td>2.51</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>5 2.51</td> <td></td> <td>2.51</td> <td>1.51</td> <td>2.01</td> <td>2.51</td> <td>,</td> <td></td> <td>147 73.87</td> <td></td> <td>3.02</td> <td>ı</td> <td>,</td> <td>2.51</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>al abun- dance</td> <td>o- % of</td> <td></td> <td></td>	NON-DISEASED Anon- Phyllosphere abun- Phyllosphere dance Phyllosphere 41.9 1.9		2.01		3 1.51		2.51			5 2.51		2.51	1.51	2.01	2.51	,		147 73.87		3.02	ı	,	2.51			al abun- dance	o- % of		

TABLE II. DISTRIBUTION OF DISEASED AND NON-DISEASED LEAF SURFACE FUNGI AND THEIR PERCENTAGE OF ABUNDANCE (BY LEAF WASHING TECHNIQUE)

•

Table III. Total number of mean fungal types in diseased

and non - diseased leaves of pea (Pisum sativum L.)

by leaf washing technique

Total number of	Dis	eased	Non - diseased				
mean fungal types	phylloplane	phyllosphere	phylloplane	phyllosphere			
23	16	14	13	13			

Table III. Total number of mean fungal types in diseased

Table IV. Surface mycoflora of diseased and non - diseased Pea (Pisum sativum L.) leaves (by leaf washing technique)

bocosih - novi	Dis	Non - diseased			
Fungal types	phyllo- plane	phyllo- sphere	phyllo - plane	phyllo sphere	
Cladosporium sp.	++	ai ++	++	++	
Fusarium sp.	+	+	+	+	
Mucor sp.	+	+	+	+	
Phythophthora sp.	+	+	+		
Penicilium sp.	+	+	++	+	
Rhizopus sp.	+	+	+	+	
Alternaria sp.	++	++	++	++	
Epicoccum sp.	+	+		-	
Leptospherulina sp.	+	+	+	+	
Sterile mycelia(Y)	-	+			
Aspergillus sp.	+		+	+	
Phoma sp.	+	+	+		
Alternaria alternata		+			
Sterile mycelia (W)	+	+	+	+	
Aschoch yta sp.	÷		_		
Dreschlera sp.			+		
Ascomycetes ?	+		_		
Penicilium clavatum		+			
Hergraphium sp.	+		+	+	
Actinom ycetes sp•	+				
Geotichum sp.			+	+	
Chaetomium sp.		1	_	+	
Torula sp.	_	_		+	

REFERENCES

- BECKER, M. C. and MANNING, W. J., (1983). Phylloplane microflora of apple cultivars immune and susceptible to *Venturia inacqualis*, Phytopath. Vol. 73 (9) 1342 Abstr.
- DICKINSON, C. H., (1976). Fungi on aerial surfaces of higher plants in Microbiology of Aerial Plant Surfaces Ed. C. H. Dickinson & T. F. Preece Academic Press, London, New York, 669.
- FOKKEMA, N. J. and LORBEER, J. W., (1974). Interaction between Alternaria porri and the saprophytic mycoflora of onion leaves. Phytopath. 64, 1128 - 1133.
- GARB, A. P. and SHARMA, P. D., (1983). Mycoflora of non infected and rust infected of Triticale. Indian Phytopath. 36 (4); 672 - 678.
- KERLING, L. C. P., (1958). De microflora ophet blad van Beta vulgaris, Tijd cher Plziekt 64 : 402 - 410.
- LAST, F. J., (1955). Seasonal incidence of sporobolomyces on cereal leaves. Trans. Brit. Mycol. Soc. 38 : 221 - 239.
- LAST, F. T. and WARREN, R. C., (1972). Non- parasitic microbes colonizing green leaves their form, function. Endeavour 31 : 143 - 150.
- MEMCHA DEVI, P., (1984). Studies on the fungal air spora and leaf surface mycoflora of pea (*Pisum sativum* L.) and their relationship with occurrence and intensity of some fungal diseases. M. Sc. Dissertation, Manipur University, 112 p.
- MISHRA, R. R. and SRIVASTAVA, V. B., (1971). Leaf surface fungi of Oryza sativa Linn. Myco - Pathologia et. Mycologia appl. Vol. 3 : 289 -294.
- MISHRA, R. R. and KANAWJIA, R. S., (1971). Studies on Phyllosphere fungi - III Leaf surface fungi of healthy and rust infected Lycepercicum esculentum in relation to cobalt. Sydowia, Annales Mycologia Ser II. Vol. XXV. Hebt 1 - 6.
- MISHRA, R. R. and SRIVASTAVA, V. B., (1971). Microflora of leaf surface in relation to virus infection Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci (India), XLI, 90-92.

- PACE, A. A. and CAMPBELL, R., (1974). The effect of Saprophytes on infection of leaves Brassica sp. by Alternaria brassicicola. Trans, Brit Mycol, 5 Oc, 63, 193 - 196.
- PURKAYASTHA, R. P. and BHATTACHARYYA, B. (1982). Phylloplane environment monitoring microbes, Science and Culture Vol. 48 (6) : 193 - 200.
- SHARMA, A. K., GUPTA, J. S. and DIXIT, R. B., (1984). Aquantitative and qualitative analysis of phylloplane microflora of yellow sarson and Taramira in relation to micro - climatic factors. Ind. Phytopath. 37 (1) : 107 - 110.
- SINHA, S., (1971). Census of microflora of Capsicum annum L. watt Solanum melongena L. S. tuberosum L. and Lycopersicum esculentum Mill. Proc. Int.
 Seminar on «Leaf surface Ecology» New Castle England, Abstr, pp. 115.
- UPADHYAY, R. K. and DWIVEDI, R. S., (1977). Phyllosphere microfungi of *Eucalyptus globulus* in relation to its leaf spot disease. Proc. Indian Nat. Sci. Acad. 43 : 33 - 36.
- VOZNYAKOVSKAYA, Y. M. and KHUDYAKOV, Y. P., (1960). Species composition of the epiphytic microflora of living plants. Microbiol. 29:97-103
- WARREN, R. C., (1972). Interference by common leaf saprophytic fungi with the development of *Phoma betae* lesions sugar beet leaves. Annals of Applied Biology, 72 : 137 - 144.

MISHRA, R. E. and KANAWILA, R. S. (1971). Soudies on Phyllophere flungi - III Loaf sociate fungi giblesalily and rust intered *Lyopercham* oradonesis in relation to cobalt Sydowia. Analo Mycologia Sci II. 774, NSV, Hebt I - R.

MUSHINA R. E. and SETVASTAVA, V. E. (1971). Microflora of leaf surface In relation to virus infection Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. (India), NLI, 90-92.