

Screening methods of maize germplasm for resistance against maize stem borers: A review

Pradyumn Kumar¹ · Harshita Kaushik² · S. B. Suby³ · Sachin Suroshe⁴ · Jaswinder Kaur⁵ · Jawala Jindal⁶

Abstract: Screening of maize germplasm for resistance against stem borers is pre-requisite for the development of resistant varieties/hybrids. Leaf injury rating, larval development period, larval weight and stem tunnel length are some of the parameters used for measuring antibiosis, while ovipositional preference, number of egg masses/eggs per plant are the parameters for antixenosis. Leaf injury rating after artificial infestation of plants by laboratory reared pest has been in use for screening the germplasm world over. Recently, several studies have been conducted in which a large number of germplasms are screened for resistance using their antibiotic and antixenotic traits and a robust susceptibility index is developed utilizing their results.

Keywords: Antibiosis · Antixenosis · Germplasm · Resistance · Screening methods

✉ Pradyumn Kumar: pradyumn.kumar@gmail.com

¹302/43, EMAAR Palm Hills, Sector 77, Gurugram-122004, Haryana, India

²Research Associate, 2944-JP, Sector 23, Gurgaon-122017, Haryana, India

³ICAR–Indian Institute of Maize Research, Pusa Campus, New Delhi-110012, India

⁴Division of Entomology, ICAR–Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi-110012, India

⁵School of Agricultural Sciences, GD Goenka University, Gurugram-122103, India

⁶Department of Plant Breeding and Genetics, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana-141004, Punjab, India

Introduction

Maize (*Zea mays* L.) is widely grown throughout the world and has the highest production of all the cereals with 1.162 billion tons produced in 2020. It serves as a staple food for millions of people in different parts of the tropical world. The average yield of temperate maize is 7.0 tons/ha, whereas global average is 4.2 tons/ha. The earlier literature cites over 160 insect and mite species which attack maize crop in India Fletcher (1914, 1917), Ayyar (1940), Bhutani (1961), Pant and Kalode (1964) and Mathur (1987) observed over 250 species of pests associated with maize in field and storage conditions. The pyralid *Chilo partellus* and the noctuid *Sesamia inferens* and muscids, *Atherigona* spp. are important pests of maize ecosystem. A robust germplasm screening technique is prerequisite for developing resistant hybrids against these pests. Parameters of antibiosis of germplasm were extensively used by studying leaf injury level, tunnel length caused by stem borers, larval development period, larval weight, etc. Attempts are now being made to make the screening more efficient by incorporating antixenotic trait, the oviposition preference.

Germplasm screening techniques for resistance against stem borers

Screening of maize germplasm against resistance is an integral component of breeding program for developing resistant varieties/hybrids. Germplasm with broad genetic background; efficient technique of mass rear healthy insects for artificial infestation of plants; an efficient technique to infest plants uniformly and an accurate technique to evaluate insect damage in the field are some

of the important aspects of maize germplasm screening for resistance. CIMMYT and its research partners around the world have worked towards developing screening techniques and breeding protocols which have enabled the development and release of resistant maize germplasm Mihm (1984). Techniques have been standardized to mass rear the stem borers on artificial diet and infest maize plants efficiently and rapidly. Recording leaf injury rating on artificial infested plants was developed by Sarup (1983) which is now used conventionally to screen maize germplasm.

Method used to study role of antibiosis in imparting resistance

Maize germplasms to be tested in fields are sown in rows separated by non-experimental maize. Twelve days after germination, the plants were infested by black-headed stage of eggs or neonate larvae from laboratory culture of stem borer. Kaur *et al.* (2014) found that 12 days after germination plants are most suitable for the establishment of stem borer larvae on them. The symptoms of feeding were visible by number of leaves bearing holes. After 25 days of infestation, the plants were observed for leaf injury rating on 1–9 scale. In another set of infested rows, the plants were dissected after 7, 14 and 21 days of infestation to observe the tunnel length and recovery of larvae/pupae. The larvae recovered were reared on baby corn till pupation in the laboratory. The larval/pupal weight and larval development period were recorded.

Method used to study the role of antixenosis in imparting resistance

Oviposition is the first interaction of stem borer females with maize plants. To study the oviposition preference, the experiment was conducted in multi-choice test and no choiced test. In multi-choice test, the germplasm to be tested were planted in pots and kept in a walk-in cage. The adult pairs were released at the rate of one pair per four plants. The females prefer to lay more eggs on the plants of their choice germplasm. After five days of release, the plants were examined for the number of egg masses per plant, number of eggs per egg mass, the number of eggs per plant and number of plants oviposited. These observations were recorded. In no-choice test for each germplasm, four plants were kept in a versatile

collapsible cage developed by Kumar *et al.* (2019) and a single pair of adults was released in the cage. The gravid female had no other germplasm to choose for oviposition. After five days of release, the parameters observed in case of multi-choice test were observed and recorded in no-choice test as well.

Review of antibiosis and antixenosis in imparting resistance

In antibiosis type of resistance, the biology of the insect is affected leading to reduced longevity and reproduction, and increased insect mortality. Antibiosis decreases larval development as well as the number of larvae per plant, thereby decreasing the stem damage levels (Pimentel, 2002). The leaf injury rating scale to evaluate the damage caused by stem borer which is used for screening maize germplasm was first developed by Sarup (1983). Durbey and Sarup (1984) showed the adverse effect of rearing *Chilo partellus* on different maize germplasm. Maximum antibiosis resulted from rearing on resistant Antigua Gr. I, Mex-17 and tolerant Ganga 5. The expression of antibiosis due to tolerant Ganga-5 revealed its intermediate behavior towards *Chilo partellus*. The average larval and pupal weights were significantly lower on resistant varieties (Antigua Gp. I and Mex-17) as against susceptible varieties (Basi Local and Vijay composite). Chamarthi (2008) opined that resistance factors which can be quantified or monitored in plant can be used as marker traits for screening germplasm against stem borers. Leaf feeding damage, which is the first larval feeding symptom, is an important marker trait which has been used by various workers in order to distinguish resistant from susceptible genotypes (Kumar, 1994). Singh *et al.* (2011) observed that the direct effect of stem tunneling on loss in maize grain yield was greater than the effect of leaf feeding. To achieve an overall improvement in the level of genotypic resistance that protects all stages of plant growth, resistance to more than one damage variable is required. Cholla *et al.* (2018) found a significant correlation between leaf injury ratings and stem tunnel length. Based on the selection index developed using these two parameters, he identified WNZPBT2 and PFSR 51016/1 as the resistance sources of *Chilo partellus*.

Morphological traits such as leaf toughness, stem penetrometer resistance, trichome density; biochemical traits such as stem sugar content and leaf injury, number

of exit holes and stem tunnel length were used to develop selection index. Based on this index, 120 maize inbred were categorized into resistant, moderately resistant, moderately susceptible and susceptible germplasm (Shelmith *et al.*, 2013). Secondary metabolism, which involves specialized, often complex and species-specific biosynthetic pathways, is thought to provide compounds which are accumulated and stored, so that when attacked, the plant is already equipped with the means to deter or kill herbivores. Plants may possess constitutive defenses that can act as a physical barrier, as in lignification or resin production, or can act as a biochemical signal perceived by the herbivore, as deterrents of feeding or oviposition, or can act as a toxin. Toxic compounds e.g., alkaloids, terpenoids, phenolics, forcing specialists to invest resources in detoxification mechanisms that in turn incur growth and development costs. Plant parts that are of high fitness value or that are under a high risk of attack may be best protected by constitutive defenses, whereas others may be better defended by induced responses (Wittstock and Gershenson, 2002). All the three components of resistance have been identified in stem borer resistant maize.

Gundappa *et al.* (2013) studied effects of two phenolic acids on *Chilo partellus* in maize inbred lines. Both the phenolic acids were negatively correlated with leaf injury rating and tunnel length at all the plant ages. The *p*-coumaric acid is predominant phenolic acid in maize inbred lines compared to ferulic acid. These phenolic acids were quantified in 17 Indian maize inbred lines. The *p*-coumaric acid and ferulic acid in leaves range from 1.3 to 3.9 mg/g and 1.5 to 4.7 mg/g, respectively. Higher quantities of these acids were found in inbred lines HKI 577, HKI 323, HKI 1105. The higher quantities of these acids were recorded in plants at 10 and 25 days after germination. Bioassay of neonate larvae of *C. partellus* done by diet incorporating with phenolic acids resulted in increased mortality by *p*-coumaric acid (41.5 per cent) than ferulic acid (17.7 per cent) over control (Gundappa, 2012). Antixenotic mechanism of resistance, which is employed by the host plants, deters the insects from oviposition (Painter, 1951; Valencia, 1984; Afzal *et al.*, 2009), feeding and seeking shelter (Dabrowski and Kidiavai, 1983; Woodhead and Taneja, 1987; Sharma and Nwanze, 1997; Dhaliwal and Arora, 2003). This mechanism renders the plants undesirable or, in other words, to be bad hosts for an easy invasion of insects (Shoonhoven *et al.*, 1998). Oviposition of many

lepidopterans is a critical step in their life cycle because of the limited mobility of first instars larvae (Feeny *et al.*, 1983; Showler and Moran, 2003). Plant volatiles, especially herbivore-induced volatile components, such as green leaf volatiles, terpenes, alkenes, 14 carboxylic acids and alcohols (Holopainen, 2004) play important role in mediating behavior such as host plant searching and acceptance in phytophagous insects; in attracting parasitoids or predators of pest insects; in directing insect oviposition as well as in influencing insect-plant interactions (Durbey and Sarup, 1982; Anderson and Alborn, 1999; Wink, 2003; Lonstantopoulou *et al.*, 2004; Steinbauer *et al.*, 2004; Rassmann *et al.*, 2005; Ruther and Kleier, 2005; Carroll *et al.*, 2006; Raguso, 2008). It is hypothesized that ovipositing females have evolved to lay eggs on hosts that elicit the best performance of the offspring (Thompson and Pellmyr, 1991). Scheirs and De Bruyn (2002) reported that egg-laying females choose oviposition sites that enhance their own long-term fitness at the expense of their offspring. Females when confronted with an array of potential hosts, exhibit a hierarchy in their preferences (Courtney *et al.*, 1989). When a number of potential hosts are available, female will lay most eggs on her most preferred plant, fewer on the next preferred and so on. Durbey and Sarup (1982) studied different plant parameters viz. percentage of plants oviposited, plant height, percentage of leaves oviposited and number of egg masses per plant for ovipositional responses of *Chilo partellus* amongst resistant (Antigua Gr. I, Mex-17, Ganga-5) and susceptible (Basi local and Vijay composite) maize germplasm under caged conditions. They found that the moths ensured greater survival of the freshly hatched larvae to continue the progeny on susceptible germplasm than to get eliminated on resistant ones.

Conclusion

Oviposition preference was studied in multi-choice test and confirmed by no-choice test method in 20 germplasm. Germplasm, significantly varied on oviposition preference. The adult preference for oviposition and larval performance was studied on *Sesamia inferens*. The correlation between parameters of preference and performance of *Sesamia* was poor (0.19). Thus, it is important to develop approaches that eventually improve the efficiency of selecting borer-resistant genotypes

keeping both antibiotic and antixenotic parameters in view in a high yielding background. The selection criteria should consider measuring the combined effect of different components of host plant resistance, an approach that requires the use of appropriate indices that result in selection for resistance as well as grain yield performance.

Acknowledgement

The corresponding author is grateful to the Indian Council of Agricultural Research for granting the project on ‘Development of improved screening techniques of maize germplasm for insect resistance and crop loss assessment’ under which this work could be accomplished.

References

- Afzal, M., Nazir, Z., Bashir, M. H. & Khan, B. S. (2009). Analysis of host plant resistance in some genotypes of maize against *Chilo partellus* (Swinhoe) (Pyralidae: Lepidoptera). *Pakistan Journal of Botany*, **41**: 421–428.
- Anderson, P. & Alborn H. (1999). Effects on oviposition behavior and larval development of *Spodoptera littoralis* by herbivore-induced changes in cotton plants. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata*, **92**: 45–51.
- Cholla, A., Chander, S., Kaur, J., Suby, S. B. & Kumar P. (2018). Improved method of screening maize germplasm for resistance against *Chilo partellus* (Swinhoe). *Indian Journal of Genetics*, **78**: 454–459.
- Ayyar, T. V. R. (1940). Handbook of Economic Entomology for South India. Narendra Publishing House, 1992, pp. 171–190.
- Bhutani, D. K. (1961). Insect pests of maize and their control. *Indian Farming*, **11**: 7–11.
- Carroll, M. J., Schmelz, E. A. & Meagher, R. L. (2006). Attraction of *Spodoptera frugiperda* larvae to volatiles from herbivore-damaged maize seedlings. *Journal of Chemical Ecology*, **32**: 1911–1924.
- Chamarthi, S. K. (2008). Biochemical mechanisms of resistance to shoot fly, *Atherigona soccata* (Rondani) in sorghum, *Sorghum bicolor* (L) Moench. Ph.D. Dissertation, Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh, India.
- Courtney, S. P. Chen, G. K. & Gardner A. (1989). A general model for individual host selection. *Oikos*, **55**: 55–65.
- Dabrowski, Z. T. & Kidiavai, E. L. (1983). Resistance of some sorghum lines to the spotted stalk borer, *Chilo partellus*, under western Kenyan conditions. *International Journal of Tropical Insect Science*, **4**: 119–126.
- Dhaliwal, G. S. & Arora, R. (2003). Principles of Insect Pest Management. 2nd Edn Kalyani Publishers, Ludhiana, India, pp. 90–94.
- Durbey, S. L. & Sarup, P. (1982). Preferential plant sites for oviposition of *Chilo partellus* (Swinhoe) moths in different maize germplasms. *Journal of Entomological Research*, **6**: 116.
- Durbey, S. L. & Sarup, P. (1984). Biological parameters related to antibiosis mechanisms of resistance in maize varieties to *Chilo partellus* (Swinhoe). *Journal Entomological Research* **8**: 140–147.
- Feeny, P., Rosenberry, L. & Carter M. (1983). Herbivorous insects: host-seeking behavior and mechanisms (Eds. S. Ahmad). Academic New York, pp. 27–76.
- Fletcher, T. B. (1914). Some south Indian insects and other animals of importance considered especially from economic point of views. Government Printing Press Madras, pp. 565.
- Fletcher, T. B. (1917). Maize Pests. *Proceedings of 2nd Entomological Meeting*. Pusa, pp. 188–193.
- Gundappa, Kumar P. & Suby, S. B. (2013). Antibiotic effect of phenolic acids (ferulic acid and *p*-coumaric acid) on maize spotted stem borer, *Chilo partellus* (Swinhoe) (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae). *Indian Journal of Entomology*, **75**: 247–250.
- Gundappa. (2012). Role of phenolic acids (ferulic acid and *p*-coumaric acid in imparting resistance against *Chilo partellus* (Swinhoe) in maize. Ph.D. thesis submitted to the faculty of PG School, Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, pp. 73.
- Holopainen, J. K. (2004). Multiple functions of inducible plant volatiles. *Trends in Plant Science*, **9**: 529–533.
- Kaur, J., Kumar, P., Singh, J. & Suby, S. B. (2014). Plant-age preference for oviposition by *Sesamia inferens* (Walker) on maize *Zea mays* L. *Indian Journal of Entomology*, **76**: 245.
- Kumar, H. (1994). Components of resistance in maize (*Zea mays* L) to first and second generation *Chilo partellus* (Swinhoe). *Maydica*, **39**: 165–170.
- Mihm, J. A. (1984). Techniques for efficient mass rearing and infestation in screening for host plant resistance to corn earworm, *Heliothis zea*. CIMMYT, pp. 16.
- Painter, R. H. (1951). Insect resistance in crop plants. The University Press of Kansas Lawrence KS, pp. 520.
- Pant, N. C. & Kalode, M. B. (1964). Entomology in India. *Entomological Society of India*, New Delhi, pp. 279–292.
- Pimentel, D. (2002). Encyclopedia of pest management. New York NY: Marcel Dekker, Inc, pp. 481–487.
- Kumar, P., Suby, S. B., Sekhar, J. C. & Kumar, R. S. (2019). A collapsible insect rearing cage. *Indian Patent No. 311890/29/04/2019*.
- Raguso, R. A. (2008). The “invisible hand” of floral chemistry. *Science*, **321**: 1163–1164.
- Rassmann, S., Kollner, T. G., Hiltbold, I., Toepfero, J. & Kuhlmann U. (2005). Recruitment of entomopathogenic nematodes by insect-damaged maize roots. *Nature*, **434**: 732–737.
- Ruther, J. & Kleier, S. (2005). Plant-plant signaling: Ethylene synergizes volatile emission in *Zea mays* induced by exposure to (Z)-3-hexen-1-ol. *Journal Chemical Ecology*, **31**: 2217–2222.
- Sarup, P. (1983). Techniques of scoring for resistance to the major insect pests of maize. *All India Co-ordinated Maize Improvement Project*, Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, pp. 64–72.
- Scheirs, J. & De Bruyn, L. (2002). Integrating optimal foraging and optimal oviposition theory in plant-insect research. *Oikos*, **96**: 187–191.

- Sharma, H. C. & Nwanze, K. F. (1997). Mechanisms of resistance to insects in sorghum and their usefulness in crop improvement. International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics, Patancheru, Andhra Pradesh, India, pp. 56.
- Shelmith, M., Mugo, S. N., Otim, M. H., Mwolol, J. K. & Okori P. (2013). Mechanism and sources of resistance in tropical maize inbred lines to *Chilo partellus* stem borers. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, **55**: 51–60.
- Showler, A. T. & Moran P. J. (2003). Effects of drought stressed cotton, *Gossypium hirsutum* L. on beet armyworm, *Spodotera exigua* (Hubner), oviposition and larval feeding preferences and growth. *Journal of Chemical Ecology*, **29**: 1997–2011.
- Singh, B. U., Sharma, H. C. & Rao K. V. (2011). Mechanisms and genetic diversity for host plant resistance to spotted stem borer, *Chilo partellus* in sorghum, *Sorghum bicolor*. *Journal of Applied Entomology*, **135**: 333–392.
- Steinbauer, M. J., Schiest, F. P. & Davies, N. W. (2004). Monoterpenes and epicuticular wax help female autumn gum moth differentiate between waxy and glossy *Eucalyptus* and leaf of different ages. *Journal of Chemical Ecology*, **30**: 1117–1141.
- Thompson, J. N. & Pellmyr, O. (1991). Evolution of oviposition behavior and host preference in Lepidoptera. *Annual Review of Entomology*, **36**: 65–89.
- Valencia, L. (1984). Mechanism of resistance to potato moth oviposition. *Report of the 12th planning Conference on IPM*. International Potato Research Center Lima, pp. 161–187.
- Wink, M. (2003). Evolution of secondary metabolites from an ecological and molecular phylogenetic perspective. *Phytochemistry*, **64**: 3–19.
- Wittstock, U. & Gershenzon, J. (2002). Constitutive plant toxins and their role in defense against herbivores and pathogens. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology*, **5**: 300–307.
- Woodhead, S. & Taneja S. L. (1987). The importance of the behavior of young larvae in sorghum resistance to *Chilo partellus*. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata*, **45**: 47–54.