

Studies on Transmission of Cucumber Mosaic Virus (CMV) Through Seed in Tomato

P. Jalender^{1*}, Bharati N Bhat¹, K. Anitha² and Y. Prasanthi²

ABSTRACT: Tomato is under the constant threat of diseases and about 200 diseases are known to infect tomatoes worldwide. Among these, Cucumber mosaic virus (CMV) is most devastating disease, as it can completely destroy the crop. Thirty tomato genotypes/cultivars along with susceptible check Arka Vikas were screened for resistance to CMV by sap/mechanical inoculation with purified CMV inoculum under greenhouse conditions. After development of prominent symptoms on the inoculated plants, samples were collected from each test entry and confirmed by DAC-ELISA. Seeds from the CMV inoculated tomato plants were collected 60 days after inoculation and sown in earthen pots for the confirmation of transmission of CMV through seeds in tomato. None of the genotypes/cultivars shown development of symptoms/ transmission of CMV through seeds after germination when tested through ELISA.

Keywords: Cucumber mosaic virus, ELISA, Sap inoculation, Symptoms, Tomato.

INTRODUCTION

Tomato [Solanum lycopersicum (Mill.) Wettsd] is one of the most popular and widely grown vegetables in the world, ranking second in importance to potato in many countries. India stands fourth in production of tomatoes next to China, U.S.A. and Turkey. Tomato is under the constant threat of diseases and about 200 diseases are known to infect tomatoes worldwide (Jones et al., 1997). Among these, Cucumber mosaic virus (CMV) is most devastating disease, as it can completely destroy the crop (Galliteli et al., 1991). The characteristic field symptoms of CMV disease include stunting, yellowing, mottling of leaves, extreme filiformity or shoe stringing of leaf blades, depending on virus strain and the host (Carrere *et al.*, 1999 and Emy Sulistyowati et al., 2004). CMV also impairs the fruit yield and quality of tomato fruits as CMV infected plants often produce small and misshapen fruits, besides delaying the fruit maturity. CMV occurs worldwide and is considered as a very important disease in temperate, tropical and subtropical regions of the world. In tomato, subgroup I strains cause fern shaped filiform leaves and stunting (Hellwald et al., 2000; Stamova and Chetelat, 2000;

Akhtar *et al.*, 2008 and Pratap *et al.*, 2012), whereas subgroup II strains lead to severe mosaic, leaf puckering and stunting (Sudhakar *et al.*, 2006).

Transmission efficiency varies with the aphid species, virus strain, host plant species, environmental conditions, and crop season. The virus is not seed borne in tomato (Zitter, 1984 and ACES, 2011).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Thirty tomato genotypes, obtained from National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources Regional Station, Hyderabad were used in the study (Table 1), using cv. Arka Vikas as susceptible check. Seeds of Arka Vikas were obtained from Agricultural Research Institute, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad. The accessions consist of cultivated Solanum lycopersicum (23 accessions), Solanum lycopersicum var. cerasiforme (2), Solanum peruvianum (1), and Solanum pimpinellifolium (4). Tomato seeds of all the genotypes and the check were sown in earthen pots (60 cm dia) containing soil compost mixture (3:1 sandy loam and FYM). It was ensured that at the time of virus inoculation, three healthy seedlings were maintained per pot (replication) and three replications were maintained for each genotype.

¹ Department of Plant Pathology, PJTSAU, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad (500 030) India

² National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources (NBPGR), Rajendranagar, Hyderabad (500 030) India

Young leaves showing typical CMV symptoms were collected. The collected samples were ground in a chilled mortar and pestle using inoculation buffer/phosphate buffer. The Inoculation/Phosphate buffer (0.05 M; pH 7.0) is prepared by using Potassium di-hydrogen phosphate (KH₂PO₄) 2.40 g; di-potassium hydrogen phosphate (K_2HPO_4) 5.40g; mercaptoethanol 1.56 ml and distilled water1000 ml. Twenty days old seedlings at 4 leaves stage were inoculated with freshly prepared standard extract of virus inoculum @ 1:10 dilution. Uninoculated plants served as control. All plants were kept under observation up to six weeks for development of symptom under insect proof conditions. Second inoculation was done 14 days after first inoculation. Tomato cultivars/genotypes screened were further tested serologically by drawing representative leaf samples to confirm the presence of CMV using Direct Antigen Coating-Enzyme Linked Immunosorbent Assay (DAC-ELISA) (Hobbs *et al.*, 1987).

 Table 1

 List of tomato accessions evaluated for transmission of CMV through seeds

compost mixture (3:1 sandy loam and FYM). After germination the plants were examined for the transmission of CMV through seeds by observing the type of symptoms developed and confirmed by DAC-ELISA. Absorbance values were recorded at 405 nm with Biotek - ELISA micro plate reader. Samples were considered 'positive' when the absorbance value exceeded two times of that of the negative control.

Sixty days after inoculation the fruits were

harvested from the plants and seeds were collected

in the polyethylene bags both from inoculated and

uninoculated plants. The collected seeds were dried

and sown in earthen pots (60 cm dia) containing soil

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Transmission of CMV through seeds was not observed in thirty tomato genotypes/cultivars along with susceptible check Arka Vikas. All the test entries were found negative to CMV antisera when tested through ELISA. The negative control value in ELISA was recorded as 0.175. None of the genotypes/ cultivars absorbance value shown either greater or

S.No	Accession number	Species	 Table 2 DAC-ELISA absorbance values of tomato genotypes/cultivars 		
1	EC251672	Solanum lycopersicum Mill.	$- \frac{DAC}{S. No.}$	Accession number	ELISA absorbance values
2	EC251790	Solanum peruvianum	<u>3. INU.</u>	Accession number	LLISA ubsorbunce butues
3	EC514006	Solanum lycopersicum var.	1	EC251672	0.061 - 0.070
		cerasiforme	2	EC251790	0.052 - 0.071
4	EC514013	Solanum lycopersicum var.	3	EC514006	0.051 - 0.082
		cerasiforme	4	EC514013	0.056 - 0.072
5	EC514134	Solanum lycopersicum	5	EC514134	0.087 - 0.091
6	EC615014	Solanum lycopersicum	6	EC615014	0.036 - 0.046
7	EC615018	Solanum lycopersicum	7	EC615018	0.067 - 0.074
8	EC617056	Solanum lycopersicum	8	EC617056	0.066 - 0.072
9	EC617076	Solanum lycopersicum	9	EC617076	0.069 - 0.072
10	EC617080	Solanum lycopersicum	10	EC617080	0.070 - 0.074
11	EC617083	Solanum lycopersicum	11	EC617083	0.064 - 0.070
12	EC617084	Solanum lycopersicum	12	EC617084	0.069 - 0.076
13	EC617088	Solanum lycopersicum	13	EC617088	0.073 - 0.080
14	EC617089	Solanum lycopersicum	14	EC617089	0.026 - 0.028
15	EC620388	Solanum lycopersicum	15	EC620388	0.056 - 0.075
16	EC625642	Solanum lycopersicum	16	EC625642	0.057 - 0.062
17	EC620389	Solanum lycopersicum	17	EC620389	0.046 - 0.064
18	EC631430	Solanum lycopersicum	18	EC631430	0.035 - 0.080
19	EC654284	Solanum lycopersicum	19	EC654284	0.045 - 0.061
20	EC676742	Solanum lycopersicum	20	EC676742	0.074 - 0.087
21	BSBS - 47	Solanum pimpinellifolium	21	BSBS - 47	0.064 - 0.083
22	KARS - 425	Solanum pimpinellifolium	22	KARS - 425	0.042 - 0.076
23	Punjab Chauhara	Solanum lycopersicum	23	Punjab Chauhara	0.072 - 0.081
24	Marutham	Solanum lycopersicum	24	Marutham	0.070 - 0.075
25	PSR - 10693	Solanum pimpinellifolium	25	PSR - 10693	0.085 - 0.091
26	Pusa Ruby	Solanum lycopersicum	26	Pusa Ruby	0.075 - 0.084
27	SR - 6525	Solanum pimpinellifolium	27	SR - 6525	0.077 - 0.084
28	STH - 801	Solanum lycopersicum	28	STH - 801	0.072 - 0.074
29	STH - 816	Solanum lycopersicum	29	STH - 816	0.050 - 0.061
30	US - 1196	Solanum lycopersicum	30	US - 1196	0.031 - 0.068
Suscep	Arka Vikas	Solanum lycopersicum	31	Arka Vikas	0.063 - 0.042
tiblechecl		······································		(Susceptible check)	

double the value of negative control, hence all the test entries were considered as negative to CMV. Absorbance values of ELISA were given in the (Table 2). According to Zitter, 1984 and ACES, 2011 CMV is not seed borne in tomato and does not persist in plant debris in the soil. The results are in consonance with the findings of (Zitter, 1984 and ACES, 2011).

CONCLUSION

The results confirmed that the CMV was not transmitted through seed in tomato as the virus cannot persist in soil and plant debris. However, CMV is transmitted through seeds in 19 other crop species (ACES, 2011).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors are grateful to Dr. S. K. Chakrabarty, Principal Scientist and Officer In charge, National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources (NBPGR), Rajendranagar, Hyderabad for guidance, encouragement and providing laboratory and green house facilities.

REFERENCES

- ACES. (2011), Alabama Cooperative Extension System. June 2011. http://www.aces.edu/virus diseases of tomato.html
- Akhtar, K.P., Ryu, K.H., Saleem, M.Y., Asghar, M., Jamil, F.F., Haq, M.A and Khan, I.A. (2008), Occurrence of *Cucumber mosaic virus* subgroup IA in tomato in Pakistan. *Journal of Plant Diseases and Protection*. 115: 2-3.
- Carrere, I., Tepfer, M and Jacquemond, M. (1999), Recombinants of *Cucumber mosaic virus* determinants of host range and symptomatology. *Archives of Virology*. 144: 365-379.
- Emy Sulistyowatti, Neena Mitter, Shanna Bastiaan Net, Marilyn, J. Roossinck and Ralf G. Dietzen. (2004), Host

range, symptom expression and RNA 3 sequence analyses of six Australian strains of *Cucumber mosaic virus*. *Australasian Plant Pathology*. 33: 505-512.

- Gallitelli, D., Vovias, C., Franco, A., Dicariddi, C., Crescenzi, A and Ragozzino, A. (1991), *Cucumber mosaic virus* as a major [factor] responsible for tomato epidemics in southern Italy. *Acta Horticulturae*. 277: 241-245.
- Hellwald, K.H., Zimmermann, C and Buchenauer, H. (2000), RNA 2 of *Cucumber mosaic virus* subgroup I strain NTCMV is involved in the induction of severe symptoms of tomato. *European Journal of Plant Pathology*. 106: 95-99.
- Hobbs, H.A., Reddy, D.V.R., Rajeswari, R and Reddy, A.S. (1987), Use of direct antigen coating method and protein-A coating ELISA procedures for detection of three peanut viruses. *Plant Disease*. 71: 747-749.
- Jones, J.B., Jones, J.P., Stall, R.E. and Zitter, T.A. (1997), Compendium of tomato diseases. *The American Phytopathological Society*. 33 (40): 1087-1097.
- Pratap, D., Kumar, S., Snehi, S.K and Raj, S.K. (2012), Biological and molecular characterization of *Cucumber mosaic virus* isolate causing shoestring disease of tomato in India which has closer affinity to European or East Asian isolates of CMV. *Indian Journal of Virology*. 23 (1): 57-63.
- Stamova, B.S. and Chetelat, R.T. (2000), Inheritance of genetic mapping of *Cucumber mosaic virus* resistance introgressed from *Lycopersicon chilense* into tomato. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics*. 101: 527-537.
- Sudhakar, N., Nagendra Prasad, D., Mohan, N and Murugesan, K. (2006), First report of *Cucumber mosaic virus* subgroup II infecting *Lycopersicon esculentum in India. Plant Disease.* 90 (11): 1457.
- Zitter, T.A. (1984), Virus diseases and disorders of tomato. *Vegetable crops*. Cornell University, New York State, Agricultural Experiment Station, Geneva. 21: 735-740.