www.iiste.org

Induction of Pathogenesis Related Proteins and Phenol in Chickpea Plants Treated with Bio-Agents in Response to Infection by *Fusarium oxysporum* f.sp. *ciceri*

Firas T. Rasheed¹, Hameed A. Hadwan¹ and Farkad A. Fattah²*
1. Integrated Management of Plant Production and Protection Center, Plant Protection Directorate, Ministry of Agriculture, Baghdad, Iraq
2. Department of Plant Protection, College of Agriculture, University of Baghdad,Baghdad,Iraq
*E-mail of the corresponding author: farkad.fatah@gmail.com

Abstract

Soil and seed treatments with bio-agents, bio root care (BRC), non pathogenic *Fusarium oxysporum* (NFo) and *Rhizobium leguminisarum* (*R.1*) indicated induced acquired resistance against *Fusarium oxysporum* f.sp. *ciceri* (*Foc*) in chickpea plants. This induced resistance was manifested by the accumulation of phenols and pathogenesis related protein in treated plants compared with control treatments (BRC, NFo and *R.1* and plants inoculated with the pathogen alone and untreated plants). Significantly (p=0.05), the highest rate of accumulation of phenols, $286.5\mu g \, \text{gfw}^{-1}$ and peroxidase activity, $68.3\min^{-1} \text{gfw}^{-1}$ when soil was treated with NFo before inoculation with *Foc* compared with other test treatments. Maximum accumulation of phenols, $228.0 \, \mu g \, \text{gfw}^{-1}$ was at day 5 after *Foc* inoculation, and maximum peroxidase activity $62.3 \, \text{min}^{-1} \, \text{gfw}^{-1}$ was at day 4 after *Foc* inoculation. The highest rate of phenylalanine ammonia lyase activity was scored when seeds were treated with BRC and NFo with no significant differences. PAL activity was 139.6 for BRC and 141.3 nM cinnamic acid min⁻¹ gfw⁻¹ for NFo and scored maximum activity of 99.7 nM cinnamic acid min⁻¹ gfw⁻¹ at day 5 after *Foc* inoculation. The highest rate of glucanase activity was 33.5 μ M min⁻¹ gfw⁻¹ when seeds were treated with BRC compared with other test treatments and scored maximum activity of 29.0 and 29.5 μ M min.⁻¹ gfw⁻¹ at day 4 and 5, respectively, after *Foc* inoculation.

1. Introduction

Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) is one of the most important pulse crops worldwide. The global chickpea area was about 11 million ha with production of 8.8 million tons and an average yield of nearly 800 kg ha⁻¹ (Gaur, *et al.*, 2010). The importance of chickpea is because of its role in human food and domestic animal feed and increase of soil fertility especially in dry lands. Iraq is considered as one of the major chickpea producing countries comprising 1% of world production (Gaur, *et al.*, 2010). In Iraq, chickpea cultivation is still limited because of its low yield and not complies to mechanical harvesting and high susceptibility to infection by pathogen.

The wide spread of Fusarium wilt caused by Fusarium oxysporum f. sp. ciceri (Padwick) Matu & Satu (Foc) in more than 33 countries is considered as one of the most important diseases which limit chickpea production (Pande, et al., 2012). The high incidence of chickpea Fusarium wilt was often observed in Nineveh province, Iraq and the increased demands for food prompted the use of chemical pesticides and fertilizers which achieved part of this aim. But because of the disadvantage of these chemicals on human and animal health, its high coast and the emergence of resistance in pathogen, research has focused on alternative control methods such as biological control and induced systemic resistance in plant against several diseases (Kaur, et al., 2007). Induced systemic resistance was reported against different plant pathogens since the thirties of the last century (Chester, 1933). Increased pathogenesis related proteins (PRP) like chitinases, β ,1-3 glucanse, peroxidase and Phenylalanin ammonia lyase (PAL) played an important role in inhibition of F.oxysporum f.sp.ciceri when plants were treated with Pseudomonas flourescens (Saikia, et al., 2004). Recent study indicated that treatment of seeds of two chickpea cultivars (ILC-482) susceptible and cv (INRAT87/1) moderate resistance with two isolates of *Rhizobium* before inoculation with *Foc* induced the production of PAL and isoflavon reductase (IFR) and increased phenolic compounds (Arfaoui, et al., 2005). Chickpea seedlings treated with Rhizobium isolates before inoculation with Foc showed increased accumulation of PAL and production of chalcone and IFR (Arfaoui, et al., 2007).

This study was conducted to determine the effects of BRC, NFo and R. leguminisarum (R.l) on phenols and PRP accumulation in *F.oxysporum* f.sp. ciceri infected chickpea plants.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Biological Materials

2.1.1. Chickpea Plants Chickpea, Cicer arietinum L. cv "Marakishi" susceptible to Foc was obtained from the local market and was used in the experiments.

2.1.2. Fusarium oxysporum f. sp. ciceri

This pathogen was isolated from chickpea plants with the characteristic Fusarium wilt symptoms from Nenivah province (400 km north of Baghdad) and propagated on potato dextrose agar medium and identified. The fungus was stored in autoclaved soil at 4 C and used in the experiments.

2.1.3. Non Pathogenic Fusarium oxysporum

A non pathogenic *F.oxysporum* isolate (NFo) was isolated from chickpea plants from Nenivah province. This isolate caused no disease symptoms on inoculated chickpea cv Marakishi.

2.1.4. Rhizobium leguminisarum (R.1)

This bacterial isolate was obtained from the Integrated Management of Plant Production and Protection, Plant Protection Directorate, Ministry of Agriculture, Baghdad, Iraq. This isolate was originally isolated from chickpea plants with active bacterial nodules.

2.1.5. Bio-Root Care (BRC)

BRC bio pesticides (Dr. Ragan laboratories, Chennal, India) is a mixture consisting of various bio control agents such as: *Pseudomonas flourescens*, *Trichoderma viride*, *T. harzianum*, *Bacillus subtilis* and *Paceilomyces lilacinus*.

3. Experimental Work

3.1. Chickpea Sowing and Treatments

Chickpea seeds were surface sterilized with 2% sodium hypochlorite solution for 10 min, and washed with sterile distilled water. Seeds then were planted in plastic pots (18cm diam, 3 seeds pot⁻¹) and maintained in a plastic house. When seedlings were 30 days old, the soil was treated with 100 ml of 1×10^6 spores ml⁻¹ of NFo, 1×10^8 spores ml⁻¹ of *R.l* and BRC (5g kg soil⁻¹). After 24 hours the pots were treated with suspension of Foc 1×10^3 spores ml⁻¹. Soil treated with NFo, *R. leguminisarum*, BRC, Foc and intact healthy plant represents control treatment. Chickpea seeds were similarly treated with the bio agents and the pathogen. Phenol content and activities of PAL, chitinase, β ,1-3-glucansae and peroxidase were estimated at 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7and 8 days after Foc inoculation.

3.2. Estimation of Phenol and Pathogenesis Related Proteins

3.2.1. Estimation of Phenol

Fresh plant samples, 1g were homogenized in 10 ml of 80% methanol and agitated for 15 min at 70 C (Zieslin and Ben–Zaken, 1993). One ml of the methanolic extract was added

was kept at 25 C. The absorbance of the developed blue color was measured using a spectrophotometer at 725 nm. Catechol was used as a standard. The amount of phenol was expressed as phenol equivalents in $\mu g \ g f w^{-1}$.

3.2.2. Assay of Peroxidase (PO)

Fresh plant samples, 1g were homogenized in 2ml of 0.1M phosphate buffer, pH 6.5 at 4C. The homogenate was filtered through 4-layers of cheese cloth and the filtrate was centrifuged at 6000g at 4C for 20 min and the supernatant was used as the enzyme source. Enzyme extract (100µl) and 1.5ml of 0.05M pyrogallol were measured by a spectrophotometer at wave length 420nm. In reference cuvette, contain 100µl of boiled inactivated enzyme extract and 1.5ml of pyrogallol. To initiate the reaction 100µl of (1%, v/v) H_{202} was added. The changes in absorbance at 420nm were recorded at 30 sec intervals for 3 min. The enzyme activity was expressed as changes in absorbance min⁻¹ gfw⁻¹ (Hammerschmidt, et al., 1982).

3.2.3. Determination of Phenylalanine Ammonia Lyase (PAL) Activity

Fresh plant material 1g were homogenized in 5ml of ice cold 0.1M sodium borate buffer (pH 7.0) containing 0.1g of polyvenylpyrrolidone. The extract was filtered through cheese cloth and the filtrate was centrifuged at 20000g for 30 min. The supernatant was used to determined PAL activity as the rate of conversion of L-phenylalanine to trans-cinnamic acid at 290 nm (Dickerson *et al.*, 1984). Sample containing 0.4 ml of enzyme extract was incubated with 0.5ml of 0.1M borate buffer (pH 8.8) and 0.5ml of 12mM L-phenylalanine in the same buffer for 30min at 30C. The amount of trans-cinnamic acid was calculated using its extinction coefficient of 9630 M cm⁻¹ (Dickerson *et al.*, 1984). Enzyme activity was expressed as n mol trans-cinnamic acid min⁻¹ gfw⁻¹.

3.2.4. Assay of β -1, 3-glucanase

B-1,3-glucanase activity was assayed by the laminarin dinitrosalicylic acid method (Pen et al., 1991). Chickpea plant samples 1g was extracted with 5 ml of 0.05 M (pH 5.0) sodium acetate buffer and centrifuged at 10000g for 15 min at 4C. The supernatant was used in the enzyme assay. The reaction mixture consisted of 62.5µl of 4% laminarin and 62.5µl of the enzyme extract. The reaction was carried out at 40C for 10 min. The reaction was then stopped by adding 375µl of dinitrosalicylic acid and heating for 5 min using a boiling water path, and was diluted with 4.5ml of water, vortexes and its absorbance was measured at 500 nm. The blank was the crude enzyme preparation mixed with laminarin with zero time incubation. The enzyme activity was expressed as μ

mol equivalent glucose released min⁻¹ gfw⁻¹

3.3. Statistical Analysis

The data were subjected to analysis of variance and means were separated by the least significant method at (p=0.05) using GenStat 12^{th} Edition.

4. Resuts

4.1. Estimation of Phenol

Significantly (p=0.05), the maximum accumulation of phenols, $286.5\mu g.g fw^{-1}$ was observed in chickpea cv Marrakeshi when soil and seeds were treated with NFo before inoculation with Foc compared with other test treatments. This was followed by $275.35\mu g fw^{-1}$ for BRC treatment and $196.5\mu g fw^{-1}$ for *R.leguminisarum*. These treatment were significantly outperformed the test control treatment, BRC, NFo and *R. leguminisarum*, Foc alone and untreated plants (Table 1). The accumulation of phenols was higher in all test treatments compared with the untreated control plants which showed no marked change in phenol content. The highest accumulation of phenol, 228.0 $\mu g g fw^{-1}$ in all treatment was observed on day 5 with a significant difference compared with the other test periods. The highest significant phenol accumulation, 294.7 and 292.2 $\mu g fw^{-1}$ and outperformed all the test control treatments. The highest average phenol, 204.4 $\mu g g fw^{-1}$ in all treatment was observed on day 5 with a significant difference compared with the other test control treatments. The highest average phenol, 204.4 $\mu g g fw^{-1}$ in all treatment was observed on day 5 with a significant difference compared with the other test control treatments. The highest average phenol, 204.4 $\mu g g fw^{-1}$ in all treatment was observed on day 5 with a significant difference compared with the other test period with *R.l.* 210.6 $\mu g fw^{-1}$ and outperformed all the test control treatments. The highest average phenol, 204.4 $\mu g g fw^{-1}$ in all treatment was observed on day 5 with a significant difference compared with the other test period except that at day 4 (Table 1). More phenol was significantly accumulated when the bio agent treated plants were challenged with *Foc* compared with pathogen unchallenged treatments and controls.

4.2. Assay of Peroxidase (PO)

S0il treatment with NFo caused significantly (p=0.05) the highest average rate of peroxidase activity, 68.3min⁻¹ gfw⁻¹ (absorbance) compared with 65.8min⁻¹ gfw⁻¹ BRC treatment (Table 2). The latter treatment showed significantly more PO activity than *R.l* treatment which recorded 44.7 min⁻¹ gfw⁻¹. However, this treatment were superior over all test control treatments (pathogen unchallenged BRC, NFo, and *R.l* and the pathogen alone and healthy plants). Significantly highest average Δ absorbance 62.3min⁻¹ gfw⁻¹ was reached at 4 days after *Foc* compared with other test periods after *Foc* inoculation. Results of seed treatments were similar to those of soil treatments. Treatment with NFo showed significantly (p=0.05) the highest Δ absorbance of 71.5 min⁻¹ gfw⁻¹ respectively. Pathogen challenged treatments BRC, NFo and *R.l* showed significant highest PO activity compared to the test control treatments. Significantly highest average activity was recorded at 4 days after *Foc* inoculation compared with the other test period after pathogen inoculation.

4.3. Determination of PAL Activity

Significantly more PAL activity, 141.3 and 139.6 nM cinnamic acid min⁻¹ gfw⁻¹ was recorded in chickpea plants when the seeds were treated with NFo and BRC respectively followed by 104.4 nM cinnamic acid min⁻¹ gfw⁻¹ for *R.1* treatment. The enzyme activity was more in the bio agent treatments compared with the other control treatments. Significantly (p=0.05) highest rates of PAL activity was reached at day 5 after *Foc* inoculation for all the test treatments, scoring 99.7 nM cinnamic acid min⁻¹ gfw⁻¹ compared with other test time periods after *Foc* inoculation.

4.4. Assay of β -1, 3-glucanase

The highest rate of glucanase activity in chickpea plants was when soil was treated with BRC before inoculation with *Foc* reaching 31.1 μ M min⁻¹gfw⁻¹ with a significant difference compared with NFo and R. *l* treatments (Table 4). The enzyme activity in NFo treated plants before inoculation with *Foc*, 27.7 μ M min⁻¹gfw⁻¹ was superior over to *R.l* treatment, 23.3 μ M min⁻¹ gfw⁻¹. These treatments intern were significantly superior over control treatments. The highest rate of glucanase activity, 29.0 and 29.5 μ M min⁻¹ gfw⁻¹ were at 4 and 5 days after *Foc* inoculation for all treatment with a significant difference compared with the other test time periods. In the seed treatment experiment, the highest rate of glucanase activity was when chickpea seeds were treated with BRC before inoculation with *Foc* recording 33.5 μ M min⁻¹ gfw⁻¹ with a significant difference compared with treatments with NFo and R. *l*. while treatments with NFo before inoculation with *Foc* was 30.0 μ M min⁻¹ g fw⁻¹, *R.l* scored significantly less enzyme activity, 24.0 μ M min⁻¹ gfw⁻¹. The highest rate of glucanase activity was significantly more, 26.2 and 26.6 μ M min⁻¹ gfw⁻¹ in the fourth and fifth days following *Foc* inoculation respectively, compared with other test time periods.

5. Discussion

Results of this study indicated that bio agent treatment when chickpea plants were inoculated with the wilt pathogen *Foc* caused increased phenol accumulation in chickpea plants. Furthermore, the highest rate of phenol accumulation was in day 5 after bio agent treatment. These results were similar to and support previous reports indicated that seedling root treated with *P.flourescens* before *Foc* inoculation induced resistance in chickpea

plants against *Foc*, and the phenolic compound in chickpea plants treated with bio agent before treated with *Foc* inoculation was significant more compared with control treatment (Saikia, *et al.*, 2004). Chickpea seedlings treated with two *Rhizobium* isolates before *Foc* treatment led to increase phenolic compound, peroxidase, and poly phenol peroxidase significantly compared with control treatment (Arfaoui, *et al.*, 2005). The results of this study, however, was different from results of other previous studies indicated that the highest rate of phenol accumulation was in day 6 after chickpea seedling roots were treated with *P. flourescens* before *Foc* inoculation (Saikia, *et al.*, 2004) and 3 days after chickpea root were treatment with *Rhizobium* before *Foc* (Arfaoui, *et al.*, 2005). The reason for these different results is perhaps duo to the different chickpea cultivars, the bio agent used in this study and experiment conditions. The accumulation of phenolic compound and the increased of its concentration in short time in plants led to increase plant resistance to pathogen as it works to inhibit enzymes secreted by plant pathogens. Enzymes such as cellulase, pectinases, laccase, xylanase and others, plays significant role of pathogen-host interaction and inhibit the process of oxidative phosphorylation, deprive minerals, proteins and anti-oxidant in plant tissue (Jersh, et al., 1989; Scalbert, 1991).

The increased peroxidase activity in chickpea plants treated with bio agent in this study which reached its highest level in day 4 after Foc inoculation were consistent with the results of previous studies indicate that chickpea seedling root treated with *P. flourescens* before *Foc* led to increase peroxidase activity significantly compared with control treatment with maximum activity at day 3 day after Foc inoculation (Saikia, et al. 2004). Chickpea seedlings root treated with two isolates of *R.leguminisarum* before *Foc* inoculation caused maximum increase in peroxidase activity in day 4 after Foc treatment (Arfaoui, et al., 2005). Another study indicated that chickpea seedlings root treated with non pathogenic F. oxysporum f.sp.ciceri and another isolate of F.oxysporum (Chickpea is a non host) before treated with Foc led to increase peroxidase activity in chickpea root at day 4 after Foc treatment (Cachinero, et al., 2002). The results of this study indicated that the maximum increase of peroxidase activity was in day 4 which were different from other previous report indicated that the maximum peroxidase activity was in day 3 after Foc treatment. The reason for this difference is probably due to the different test plant and the bio agent isolates used as well as experimental conditions. Peoxidase affects defense mechanisms in plant in response to plant pathogens by deposition and polymerization of proteins, lignin and sobarin in the cell walls and vessels, transmission of an antioxidant during the invasion of pathogens (Mehdy, 1994; Bradly, et al., 1992; Dicko, et al., 2006). It also affects the oxidation of some compounds and converted it into more toxic compounds like oxidation of phenols to quinone (Chen, et al., 2000; lavania, 2002) and IAA oxidation (Beffa, et al., 1990).

The results of this study also indicated that increased PAL activity as a result of treatement with the bio agents BRC, NFo and *R.leguminisarum* before plant inoculation with *Foc* were consistent with previous results stating that the treatment of the seeds of two chickpea varieties susceptible and resistance to *Foc* with *T. harzianum* led to increased PAL activity (Jayalakshmi, *et al.*, 2011). Treatment of chickpea seedlings roots with *P. flourescens* before inoculation with *Foc* led to increase in PAL which reached the highest rate in day 4 after *Foc* treatment (Saikia, *et al.*, 2004). PAL is considered as one of the most important enzymes, because of its responsibility for the manufacture of phenolics, coumarin and cinnamic acid which are associated with resistance to pathogens as well as its role in configure legnin, oxidation of phenols and bio manufacturing of phenyl propanoid and flavonoid (MacDonalds and D'Cunha, 2007).

The increased glucanase activity as a result of treatment with bio agents before *Foc* inoculation and the highest rate of increase in the day 4 and day 5 after *Foc* treatement, may be linked to resistance to disease pathogens. These results were also consistent with results of previous studies which indicated that chickpea seedling root treated with *P. flourescens* before *Foc* led to significant increase in glucanase activity compared with control treatment and the maximum activity was reached at day 3 after *Foc* inoculation (Saikia, *et al.*, 2004). Also chickpea seedling root treated with non pathogenic *F. oxysporum* f.sp. *ciceri* and another isolate of *Fusarium oxysporum* (chickpea is a non host) before treated with *Foc* led to increase glucanase activity was in day 4 and 5 after *Foc* inoculation was differed from other study indicated that the highest increased rate of PAL was recorded 3 days after *Foc* treatment (Saikia, *et al.*, 2004; Cachinero, *et al.*, 2002). β -1,3-glucanase is considered as one of the PRP Which leads to destruction of β -1,3-glucane which is one of the main components of the various cell walls of pathogen especially in fungi (Leubner-Metzger and Meins, 1999). This enzyme affects plant pathogen directly by hydrolyzing cell walls or indirectly by stimulating the cell to release materials derived from the cell wall which work as inducers of other defense mechanisms (Meins, *et al.*, 1992; Boller,*et al.*, 1988; Bowles, 1990).

The increased accumulation of phenol and PRP in chickpea plants following soil or seed bio agent treatments in this study was reflected on the significantly (p=0.05) low percentages of Fusarium wilt disease incidence (data are not presented) compared with treated but *Foc* challenged chickpea plants.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank the Integrated Management of Plant Production and Protection Centre, Plant Protection Directorate, Ministry of Agriculture, Baghdad, Iraq for granting a study leave to the first author. Thank is also to Abdulkader Khudair and Emad A. Slaiby (Integrated Management of Plant Production and Protection Centre) for their valuable assistance.

Reference

Arfaoui, A., El Hadrami, A., Mabrouk, Y., Sifi, B., Boudabous, A. El Hadrami, I., Daayf, F., and Cherif, M. (2007). Treatment of chickpea with *Rizobium* isolates enhances the expression of phenyl propanoid defense related genes in response to infection by *Fusarium oxysporum f. sp. ciceri*. *Plant physiology and Biochemistry* 451: 470-479.

Arfaoui, A., Sifi, B., El Hassni, M., El Hadrami, I., Boudabbous, A. and Cherif, M. (2005). Biochemical analysis of chickpea protection against Fusarium wilt afforded by two *Rhizobium* isolates. *Plant Pathology Journal* 4: 35-42.

Bradley, D.J., Kjellbom, P. and Lamba, C.J. (1992). Elicitor – and wound-induced oxidation cross-linking of a plant cell wall proline-rich protein L a novel, rapid defense response .*Cell*, 70: 21-30.

Beffa, R.Martin, H.V.and Pilet, P.E. (1990). In vitro oxidation of indole – acetic acid by soluble auxin – oxidases and peroxidase from maize roots. *Plant physiol*.94:485-491.

Boller, T. (1988). Ethylene and the regulation of antifungal hydrolases in plants. *Plant Mol. & Cell Biol.* 5:145-174.

Bowles, J.D. (1990). Defense-related proteins in higher plants. Annu. Rev. Biochem. 59: 873-907.

Cachinero, J.M., Hervas, A., Jimenez-Diaz, R.M. and Tena, M. (2002). Plant defense reactions against Fusarium wilt in chickpea induced by incompatible race 0 of *Fusarium oxysporum* f.sp.ciceri and nonhost isolates of *F.oxysporum*. *Plant Pathology*, 51: 765-776.

Chen, C., Belanger, R., Benhamou, N. and Paulitz, T.C. (2000). Defense enzymes induced in cucumber roots by treatment with plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) and *Pythium aphanidermatum*. *Physiological and Molecular Plant Pathology*, 56:13-23.

Chester, K.S.(1933). The problem of acquired physiological immunity in plants. Quat Rev Biol. 8: 275-324.

Dickerson, D.P., Pascholati,S.F., Hagerman, A. E., Butler, L. G. and Nicholson, R.L.(1984). Phenylalanine ammonia-lyse and hydroxycinnamate : CoA ligase in maize mesocotyls inoculated with *Helminthosporium maydis* or *Helminthosporium carbonum*. *Physiological Plant Pathology*, 25: 111-123.

Dicko, M.H., Gruppen, H., Traore, A.S., Voragen, A.G.J. and Van Berkel, W.I.H. (2006). Phenolic compounds and related enzyme as determinats of sorghum for food use. *Biotecnology and molecular biology reveiew*, 1: 21-38.

Gaur, P.M., Tripath, S., Gowda, C.L.L., Ranga Rao, G.V., Sharma, H.C., Pande, S. and Sharma, M. (2010). Chickpea seed production manual. Patancheru 502 324, Andhro Pradesh , India :International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics. 28pp.

GenStat .(2010). Release 12.1 (PC/Windows XP) 31 October 2013. 16:12:25. VSN International Ltd.

Hammerschmidt, R., Nuckles, F. and Kuc, J. (1982). Association of eenhance activity with induced systemic resistance of cucumber to *Colletotrichum lagenarium*. *Physiol.Plant Pathol*.20:73-82.

Jayalakshmi, S.K., Raju,S., Usharani, S., Kurucheve, V., Benagi, V.I. and Sreeramulu, K.(2011). Differential expression of defense related enzymes and protease inhibitors in two different genotypes of chickpea by *Trichoderma harzianum* L1. *Australian Journal of Crop Science*,5: 885-894.

Jersh, S., Scherer, C., Huth, G., and Schlosser, E. (1989). Proanthocyanidins as basis for quiescence of *Botrytis ciberea* in immature strawberry. *Journal of Plant Pathology*, 22: 67-70.

Kaur, R., Kaur, J., Singh, R.S. and Alabouvette, C. (2007). Biological control of *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. ciceri by non pathogenic *Fusarium* and *pseudomonas fluorescent*. *International Journal of Botany*, 3: 114-117.

Lavania, M.P, Ghauhan, S., Ghauhan, S.V.S., Singh, H.B. and Nautiyal, C.S. (2002). Induction of plant defense enzyme and phenolics by treatment with plant growth promoting *Rhizobacteria, Serratia marcescens* NBRI 1213. *Current Microbiology*, 52: 363-368.

Leubner-Metzger, G. and Meins, F. J.r. (1999). Functions and regulation of plant ß-1,3-glucanases (PR-2). Review in: Datta, S.K. and Muthukrishnan, S. (eds).1999. Pathogenesis-related proteins in plants. *CRC Press LLC, Boca Raton, Florida*, pp 49-76.

MacDonald, M.J. and D'Cunha, G.B. (2007). Amodern view of phenyalanine ammonia lyase. *Biochem. Cell Biol.* 85: 273-282.

Mehdy, M.C. (1994) . Active oxygen species in plant defense against pathogens. *Plant physiology*, 105: 467-472.

Meins, F., Neuhaus, J.M., Sperisen, C.and Ryals, J.(1992). The primary structure of plant pathogenesis-related glucanohydrolases and their genes. In: Boller, T., Meins, F. Jr., eds. Genes Involved in Plant Defense. Vienna, New York: Springer-Verlag, pp: 245-282.

Pande, S., Sharma, M., Nagavardhini, A.and Rameshwar, T. (2012). High throughput phenotyping of chickpea diseases: Stepwise identification of host plant resistance. *Information Bulletin* No. 92 *Patancheru* 502 324, *Andhra Pradesh, India*: International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics. 56 pp. ISBN 978-92-9066-552-6. Order code: IBE 092.

Pen,S.Q.,Ye,X.S. and Kuc,J.(1991). A technique for detection of chitinases, -1,3-glucanases and protein patterns, after single separation using PAGE or isoelectric focusing. *Phytopathology*, 81: 970-974.

Saikia, R.; Kumar, R.; Singh, T.; Srivastava A.K.; Arora, D.K. and Lee, M.W. (2004). Induction of defense related enzymes and pathogenesis related proteins in *Pseudomonas fluorescens* – treated chickpea in response to infection by *Fusarium oxysporum* f.sp.ciceri. Mycrobiology, 32:47-53.

Scalbert, A.(1991). Antimicrobial properties of tannins. Phytochemistry, 30: 3875-883.

Singh,R., Sindhu,A.,Singal,H.R. and Singh,R.(2003). Biochemical basis of resistance in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) against *Fusarium* wilt. *Acta phytopathologica entomologica hungarica*, 38:13-19.

Zieslin, N. and Ben–Zaken, R.(1993) Peroxidase activity and presence of phenolic substances in peduncles of rose flowers. *Plant Physiol. Biochem.*, 31: 333–339.

| Table 1. Phenol accumulation in chickpea, Cicer arietinum L. plants grown in pots after induction by bio agents | S |
|---|---|
| against Fusarium oxysporum f.sp.ciceri | |

| Coll tracture and | | Phenol (| µg gfw⁻ | ¹) after in | noculatio | on with a | Foc (day) |) | Маан |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| Soil treatment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Mean |
| BRC+ Foc | 88 | 205 | 245 | 360 | 365 | 320 | 318 | 302 | 275.3 |
| BRC (Contro) | 90 | 110 | 125 | 180 | 192 | 180 | 165 | 143 | 147.6 |
| NFo + Foc | 90 | 198 | 250 | 370 | 368 | 355 | 339 | 322 | 286.5 |
| NFo (Control) | 92 | 106 | 130 | 182 | 200 | 191 | 168 | 148 | 152.1 |
| R. l + Foc | 87 | 180 | 197 | 230 | 248 | 218 | 211 | 201 | 196.7 |
| R. l (Control) | 86 | 94 | 105 | 123 | 137 | 118 | 108 | 103 | 109.3 |
| Foc (Control) | 90 | 165 | 192 | 218 | 227 | 198 | 168 | 149 | 175.8 |
| Control | 85 | 88 | 86 | 86 | 87 | 88 | 86 | 88 | 86.6 |
| Mean | 88.5 | 143. 2 | 166. 2 | 218.6 | 228. 0 | 208. 5 | 195.3 | 182.1 | |
| LSD ($P = 0.05$) for | days $= 2.$ | 7, for tre | eatment | = 2.7, fo | r inter a | ction = 7 | 7.8 | | |
| Seed treatment |] | Phenol (| µg gfw⁻¹ |) after in | noculatio | on with I | Foc (day) |) | Mean |
| beed deathent | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | wican |
| | | | | | | | | - | |
| BRC+ Foc | 104 | 215 | 265 | 375 | 372 | 348 | 338 | 321 | 292.2 |
| BRC+ Foc (Control) BRC | 104 106 | 215 105 | 265 108 | 375 106 | 372 107 | 348 108 | 338 108 | 321 107 | 292.2 106.8 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| (Control) BRC | 106 | 105 | 108 | 106 | 107 | 108 | 108 | 107 | 106.8 |
| (Control) BRC NFo + Foc | 106 107 | 105 208 | 108 257 | 106 377 | 107 375 | 108 363 | 108 342 | 107 329 | 106.8 294.7 |
| (Control) BRC NFo + Foc Control) NFo(| 106 107 106 | 105 208 106 | 108 257 107 | 106 377 106 | 107 375 107 | 108 363 107 | 108 342 108 | 107 329 107 | 106.8 294.7 106.7 |
| (Control) BRC $NFo + Foc$ $Control) NFo($ $R. l + Foc$ | 106 107 106 102 | 105 208 106 191 | 108 257 107 208 | 106 377 106 248 | 107 375 107 257 | 108 363 107 237 | 108 342 108 224 | 107 329 107 218 | 106.8 294.7 106.7 210.6 |
| (Control) BRC $NFo + Foc$ $Control) NFo($ $R. l + Foc$ $R. l (Control)$ | 106 107 106 102 103 | 105 208 106 191 103 | 108 257 107 208 104 | 106 377 106 248 103 | 107 375 107 257 103 | 108 363 107 237 104 | 108 342 108 224 104 | 107 329 107 218 103 | 106.8 294.7 106.7 210.6 103.3 |
| (Control) BRC $NFo + Foc$ $Control) NFo($ $R. l + Foc$ $R. l (Control)$ $Foc (Control)$ | 106 107 106 102 103 90 85 100.4 | 105 208 106 191 103 165 88 147. 5 | 108 257 107 208 104 192 86 165. 8 | 106 377 106 248 103 218 86 202.3 | 107 375 107 257 103 227 87 204. 4 | 108 363 107 237 104 198 88 194. 1 | 108 342 108 224 104 168 86 184.7 | 107 329 107 218 103 149 | 106.8 294.7 106.7 210.6 103.3 175.8 |

Each number represent three replicate, each replicate is 3 pots with 2 plants. Bio agents was added (100ml kg soil⁻¹) after 30 days of germination as follows: NFo isolate (10^6 spore ml⁻¹), *R. leguminisarum* suspension (10^8 spore ml⁻¹), BRC (5g kg⁻¹). After 24h, spore suspension of *Foc* was added (100ml kg soil⁻¹) with concentration (10^3 spore ml⁻¹). Chickpea seeds cv Marakishi were treated with bio agent and *Foc* as above. Total content of phenol was estimated 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 days after inoculated with *Foc*. BRC = Biopesticide Bio Root Care,

NFo = Non pathogenic Fusarium oxysporum , Foc = Fusarium oxysporum f.sp. ciceri , R.l = Rizobium leguminisarum.

| Table 2. Change in peroxidase activity in chickpea, Cicer arietinum L. plants grown in pots after induction | by |
|---|----|
| bio agents against Fusarium oxysporum f.sp.ciceri | - |

| G . 11 (m (m | Chang | | | | w ⁻¹) after | r inocula | tion with | <i>Foc</i> | Maan |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Soil treatment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Mean |
| BRC+ Foc | 16 | 39 | 81 | 101 | 92 | 80 | 62 | 56 | 65.8 |
| BRC (Contro) | 16 | 30 | 44 | 56 | 50 | 41 | 31 | 25 | 36.6 |
| NFo + Foc | 18 | 44 | 83 | 105 | 94 | 83 | 63 | 57 | 68.3 |
| NFo (Control) | 15 | 32 | 47 | 60 | 53 | 47 | 37 | 29 | 40.0 |
| <i>R. l</i> + <i>Foc</i> | 15 | 29 | 51 | 66 | 60 | 50 | 48 | 39 | 44.7 |
| R. l (Control) | 15 | 27 | 36 | 46 | 37 | 31 | 28 | 22 | 30.2 |
| Foc (Control) | 15 | 24 | 37 | 49 | 43 | 38 | 34 | 27 | 33.3 |
| Control | 15 | 15 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 15.5 |
| Mean | 15.6 | 30.0 | 49.3 | 62.3 | 55.6 | 48.2 | 39.7 | 33.7 | |
| LSD ($P = 0.05$) for | days = 1.0 |), for tre | atment | = 1.0, fo | r inter ac | tion $= 2$. | 9 | | |
| | Change | in absor | btion (n | nin ⁻¹ gfw ⁻ | ¹) after in | noculatio | on with F | ос | |
| | | | | - | / | | | | M |
| Seed treatment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Mean |
| Seed treatment BRC+ Foc | 1 23 | 2 45 | | - | | | r | 1 | Mean 70.3 |
| | - | | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| BRC+ Foc | 23 | 45 | 3 85 | 4 105 | 5 97 | 6 82 | 7 68 | 8 58 | 70.3 |
| BRC+ Foc BRC (Contro) | 23 21 | 45 23 | 3 85 22 | 4 105 22 | 5 97 22 | 6 82 21 | 7 68 23 | 8 58 23 | 70.3 22.1 |
| BRC+ Foc BRC (Contro) NFo + Foc | 23 21 25 | 45 23 49 | 3 85 22 86 | 4 105 22 108 | 5 97 22 99 | 6 82 21 84 | 7 68 23 65 | 8 58 23 56 | 70.3 22.1 71.5 |
| BRC+ Foc BRC (Contro) NFo + Foc NFo (Control) | 23 21 25 21 | 45 23 49 22 | 3 85 22 86 23 | 4 105 22 108 22 | 5 97 22 99 22 | 6 82 21 84 22 | 7 68 23 65 22 | 8 58 23 56 22 | 70.3 22.1 71.5 22.0 |
| BRC+ Foc BRC (Contro) NFo + Foc NFo (Control) R. l + Foc | 23 21 25 21 20 | 45 23 49 22 32 | 3 85 22 86 23 53 | 4 105 22 108 22 72 | 5 97 22 99 22 65 | 6 82 21 84 22 52 | 7 68 23 65 22 49 | 8 58 23 56 22 42 | 70.3 22.1 71.5 22.0 48.1 |
| BRC+ Foc BRC (Contro) NFo + Foc NFo (Control) R. l + Foc Control)(R. l | 23 21 25 21 20 19 | 45 23 49 22 32 21 | 3 85 22 86 23 53 22 | 4 105 22 108 22 72 21 | 5 97 22 99 22 65 21 | 6 82 21 84 22 52 22 | 7 68 23 65 22 49 22 | 8 58 23 56 22 42 21 | 70.3 22.1 71.5 22.0 48.1 21.5 |
| BRC+ Foc BRC (Contro) NFo + Foc NFo (Control) R. l + Foc Control)(R.l Foc (Control) | 23 21 25 21 20 19 15 15 20.1 | 45 23 49 22 32 21 24 15 28.3 | 3 85 22 86 23 53 22 37 16 43.0 | 4 105 22 108 22 72 21 49 16 51.8 | 5 97 22 99 22 65 21 43 16 48.0 | 6 82 21 84 22 52 22 38 16 42.1 | 7 68 23 65 22 49 22 34 15 36.8 | 8 58 23 56 22 42 21 27 | 70.3 22.1 71.5 22.0 48.1 21.5 33.3 |

Each number represent three replicate, each replicate is 3 pots with 2 plants. Bio agents was added (100ml kg soil⁻¹) after 30 days of germination as follows: NFo isolate (10⁶ spore ml⁻¹), *R. leguminisarum* suspension (10⁸ spore ml⁻¹), BRC (5g kgl⁻¹). After 24h, spore suspension of *Foc* was added (100ml kg soil⁻¹) with concentration (10³ spore ml⁻¹). Chickpea seeds cv Marakishi were treated with bio agent and *Foc* as above. Total content of phenol was estimated 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 days after inoculated with *Foc*. BRC = Biopesticide Bio Root Care, NFo = Non pathogenic *Fusarium oxysporum*, *Foc* = *Fusarium oxysporum* f.sp. *ciceri*, *R.1* = *Rizobium leguminisarum*.

| Soil treatment | Cinr | amic ac | id (nM i | min ⁻¹ gfw | ⁻¹) after i | inoculati | on with | Foc | Маан |
|--------------------------|--------------|------------|----------|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------|-----------|------|-------|
| Soil treatment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Mean |
| BRC+ Foc | 40 | 132 | 138 | 151 | 163 | 148 | 123 | 118 | 126.6 |
| Foc (Control) | 44 | 70 | 82 | 90 | 87 | 72 | 60 | 52 | 69.6 |
| NFo + Foc | 42 | 128 | 136 | 138 | 152 | 146 | 132 | 128 | 125.2 |
| NFo (Control) | 43 | 68 | 81 | 87 | 82 | 67 | 59 | 49 | 67.1 |
| <i>R. l</i> + <i>Foc</i> | 39 | 88 | 102 | 108 | 123 | 119 | 114 | 109 | 100.2 |
| R. l (Control) | 39 | 46 | 57 | 62 | 59 | 51 | 47 | 42 | 50.3 |
| Foc (Control) | 41 | 70 | 85 | 93 | 88 | 77 | 62 | 48 | 70.5 |
| Control | 42 | 44 | 44 | 43 | 44 | 42 | 42 | 41 | 42.6 |
| Mean | 41.3 | 80.7 | 89.9 | 96.4 | 99.7 | 90.2 | 79.8 | 73.4 | |
| LSD ($P = 0.05$) for | days $= 1.7$ | 7, for tre | atment | = 1.7 for | inter act | ion = 4.9 |) | | - |
| | Cinn | amic ac | id (nM 1 | min ⁻¹ gfw | ⁻¹) after i | inoculati | on with a | Foc | Maria |
| Seed treatment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Mean |
| BRC+ Foc | 52 | 140 | 157 | 166 | 175 | 157 | 138 | 132 | 139.6 |
| BRC (Control) | 51 | 54 | 52 | 54 | 55 | 53 | 54 | 52 | 53.1 |
| NFo + Foc | 54 | 136 | 158 | 169 | 177 | 162 | 147 | 128 | 141.3 |
| NFo (Control) | 49 | 52 | 51 | 54 | 51 | 53 | 51 | 50 | 51.3 |
| R. l + Foc | 44 | 92 | 108 | 122 | 133 | 121 | 112 | 104 | 104.4 |
| <i>R. l</i> (Control) | 45 | 47 | 47 | 48 | 47 | 46 | 45 | 45 | 46.2 |
| Foc (Control) | 41 | 70 | 85 | 93 | 88 | 77 | 62 | 48 | 70.5 |
| Control | 42 | 44 | 44 | 43 | 44 | 42 | 42 | 41 | 42.6 |
| Mean | 47.2 | 79.3 | 87.2 | 93.0 | 96.2 | 88.8 | 81.3 | 75.0 | |
| LSD ($P = 0.05$) for | days $= 1.8$ | 8, for tre | atment | = 1.8, for | r inter ac | tion $= 5$. | 3 | | |

Table 3. Change in phenylalanine ammonia- lyase activity in chickpea, *Cicer arietinum* L. plants grown in pots after induction by bio agents against *Fusarium oxysporum* f.sp. *ciceri*

Each number represent three replicate, each replicate is 3 pots with 2 plants. Bio agents was added (100ml kg soil⁻¹) after 30 days of germination as follows: NFo isolate (10⁶ spore ml⁻¹), R. leguminisarum suspension (10⁸ spore ml⁻¹), BRC (5g kgl⁻¹). After 24h, spore suspension of Foc was added (100ml kg soil⁻¹) with concentration (10³ spore ml⁻¹). Chickpea seeds cv Marakishi were treated with bio agent and Foc as above. Total content of phenol was estimated 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 days after inoculated with Foc. BRC = Biopesticide Bio Root Care, NFo = Non pathogenic Fusarium oxysporum, Foc = Fusarium oxysporum f.sp. ciceri, R.l = Rizobium leguminisarum.

| Soil treatment | | μM r | nin ⁻¹ gfv | v ⁻¹ afte | er inocul | lation w | ith <i>Foc</i> | | Maan |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Soil treatment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Mean |
| BRC+ Foc | 14 | 28 | 32 | 41 | 47 | 38 | 31 | 18 | 31.1 |
| Foc (Control) | 14 | 18 | 22 | 27 | 29 | 22 | 21 | 19 | 21.5 |
| NFo + Foc | 14 | 25 | 31 | 37 | 42 | 31 | 25 | 17 | 27.7 |
| NFo (Control) | 14 | 21 | 26 | 27 | 31 | 23 | 22 | 16 | 22.5 |
| R. l+ Foc | 14 | 19 | 23 | 31 | 32 | 28 | 22 | 18 | 23.3 |
| R. l (Control) | 14 | 15 | 17 | 21 | 23 | 20 | 19 | 16 | 18.1 |
| Foc (Control) | 14 | 20 | 26 | 25 | 29 | 23 | 21 | 18 | 22.0 |
| Control | 13 | 14 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 13.6 |
| Mean | 13.8 | 20 | 23.7 | 29 | 29.5 | 24.8 | 21.8 | 17 | |
| LSD ($P = 0.05$) for | r days = 1 | .3, for t | reatment | t = 1.3, | for inter | action | = 3.7 | | |
| | SD (P = 0.05) for days = 1.3, for treatment = 1.3, for inter action = 3.7 μ M min ⁻¹ gfw ⁻¹ after inoculation with <i>Foc</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Cool transforment | | μM r | nin ⁻¹ gfv | v ⁻¹ aft | er inocu | | ith Foc | | Maan |
| Seed treatment | 1 | μM 1 2 | nin ⁻¹ gfv 3 | v ⁻¹ afte 4 | er inocu 5 | | ith <i>Foc</i> 7 | 8 | Mean |
| Seed treatment BRC+ Foc | 1 15 | 1 | 1 | | | lation w | | 8 19 | Mean 33.5 |
| | - | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | lation w | 7 | | |
| BRC+ Foc | 15 | 2 29 | 3 34 | 4 46 | 5 49 | lation w 6 41 | 7 35 | 19 | 33.5 |
| BRC+ Foc Foc (Control) | 15 16 | 2 29 16 | 3 34 17 | 4 46 16 | 5 49 17 | ation w 6 41 16 | 7 35 16 | 19 18 | 33.5 16.5 |
| BRC+ Foc Foc (Control) NFo + Foc | 15 16 16 | 2 29 16 27 | 3 34 17 32 | 4 46 16 41 | 5 49 17 43 | 6 41 16 34 | 7 35 16 29 | 19 18 18 | 33.5 16.5 30.0 |
| BRC+ Foc Foc (Control) NFo + Foc NFo (Control) | 15 16 16 16 | 2 29 16 27 17 | 3 34 17 32 17 | 4 46 16 41 17 | 5 49 17 43 18 | lation w 6 41 16 34 17 | 7 35 16 29 17 | 19 18 18 18 | 33.5 16.5 30.0 17.1 |
| BRC+ Foc Foc (Control) NFo + Foc NFo (Control) R. l + Foc | 15 16 16 16 14 | 2 29 16 27 17 18 | 3 34 17 32 17 25 | 4 46 16 41 17 32 | 5 49 17 43 18 32 | ation w 6 41 16 34 17 27 | 7 35 16 29 17 22 | 19 18 18 18 18 16 | 33.5 16.5 30.0 17.1 24.0 |
| BRC+ Foc Foc (Control) NFo + Foc NFo (Control) R. l + Foc R. l (Control) | 15 16 16 16 14 15 | 2 29 16 27 17 18 16 | 3 34 17 32 17 25 16 | 4 46 16 41 17 32 16 | 5 49 17 43 18 32 15 | lation w 6 41 16 34 17 27 16 | 7 35 16 29 17 22 16 | 19 18 18 18 16 16 | 33.5 16.5 30.0 17.1 24.0 15.7 |
| $\begin{array}{c} BRC+Foc\\ Foc \ (Control)\\ NFo+Foc\\ NFo \ (Control)\\ R. \ l+Foc\\ R. \ l \ (Control)\\ Foc \ (Control)\\ \end{array}$ | 15 16 16 16 14 15 14 | 2 29 16 27 17 18 16 20 | 3 34 17 32 17 25 16 26 | 4 46 16 41 17 32 16 25 | 5 49 17 43 18 32 15 29 | ation w 6 41 16 34 17 27 16 23 | 7 35 16 29 17 22 16 21 | 19 18 18 18 16 16 18 | 33.5 16.5 30.0 17.1 24.0 15.7 22.0 |

Table 4. Change in glucanase activity in chickpea, *Cicer arietinum* L. plants cultivated in pots after induction by bio agents against *Fusarium oxysporum* f.sp. *ciceri*

Each number represent three replicate, each replicate is 3 pots with 2 plants. Bio agents was added (100ml kg soil⁻¹) after 30 days of germination as follows: NFo isolate (10⁶ spore ml⁻¹), *R. leguminisarum* suspension (10⁸ spore ml⁻¹), BRC (5g kgl⁻¹). After 24h, spore suspension of *Foc* was added (100ml kg soil⁻¹) with concentration (10³ spore ml⁻¹). Chickpea seeds cv Marakishi were treated with bio agent and *Foc* as above. Total content of phenol was estimated 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 days after inoculated with *Foc*. BRC = Biopesticide Bio Root Care, NFo = Non pathogenic *Fusarium oxysporum*, *Foc* = *Fusarium oxysporum* f.sp. *ciceri*, *R.l* = *Rizobium leguminisarum*.

This academic article was published by The International Institute for Science, Technology and Education (IISTE). The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open Access Publishing service based in the U.S. and Europe. The aim of the institute is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the publisher can be found in the IISTE's homepage: <u>http://www.iiste.org</u>

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

The IISTE is currently hosting more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals and collaborating with academic institutions around the world. There's no deadline for submission. **Prospective authors of IISTE journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** <u>http://www.iiste.org/journals/</u> The IISTE editorial team promises to the review and publish all the qualified submissions in a **fast** manner. All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Printed version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <u>http://www.iiste.org/book/</u>

Recent conferences: <u>http://www.iiste.org/conference/</u>

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digtial Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

