Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research

Volume 11, Issue 3, Page 1-16, 2024; Article no.AJAHR.117519
ISSN: 2581-4478

In vivo Studies on the Effect of *Warburgia ugandensis* Crude Extracts Against Bacterial wilt in Tomato

Oliver Libese Lideke [a*], Eric G. Mworia [a] and Cynthia N. Mugo Mwenda [b]

[a] Department of Agriculture, Meru University of Science and Technology, Kenya.
[b] Department of Biological Sciences, Meru University of Science and Technology, Kenya.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: https://doi.org/10.9734/ajahr/2024/v11i3324

Open Peer Review History:
This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/117519

Original Research Article

Received: 05/04/2024
Accepted: 07/06/2024
Published: 10/06/2024

ABSTRACT

Tomato plants are susceptible to *Ralstonia solanacearum*, a pathogen responsible for bacterial wilt, a severe soil-borne disease with no available cure. *Warburgia ugandensis* crude extract has shown biocontrol capabilities against pathogenic fungi and bacteria in animals, but data on its effectiveness in plants is limited. The current study was done to evaluate the in vivo efficacy of *W. ugandensis* crude extracts against *R. solanacearum* in tomato plants. *W. ugandensis* leaf and stem bark crude extracts were obtained using ethanol, methanol, hexane, and dichloromethane. The obtained crude extracts were tested against *R. solanacearum* in tomato at the greenhouse in triplicate. The data collected on bacterial wilt incidence, severity, stem diameter, height, and the number of branches and fruits set were analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) at a 5% significance level. Tukey's test was employed to determine significant differences between means

**Corresponding author: Email: libeseoliver@gmail.com;*

Cite as: *Lideke, Oliver Libese, Eric G. Mworia, and Cynthia N. Mugo Mwenda. 2024. "In Vivo Studies on the Effect of Warburgia Ugandensis Crude Extracts Against Bacterial Wilt in Tomato". Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research 11 (3):1-16. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajahr/2024/v11i3324.*

at the same significance level. Tomato plants established in soil inoculated with *R. solanacearum* and treated with dichloromethane crude extract of *W. ugandensis* stem bark showed no sign of bacterial wilt disease and were comparable to the positive control. Tomato plants established in soil inoculated with *R. solanacearum* but treated with *W. ugandensis* leaf ethanol crude extract had the highest average height of 62.50 cm which was similar to positive control. Tomato plants grown in *R. solanacearum*-inoculated soils and treated with methanol crude extracts from *W. ugandensis* stem bark produced a significantly higher average number of fruits, 22.00, compared to those treated with crude extracts from other solvents. The study proposed that *W. ugandensis* crude extract has the ability to be used as antibacterial biocontrol against *R. solanacearum*. Further research is important to determine the bioactive compounds against *R. solanacearum*.

Keywords: Tomato; Ralstonia solancearum and warburgia ugandensis.

1. INTRODUCTION

Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum*) ranked fourth among the leading vegetables in the world (FAOSTAT, 2020) is native to South America [1,2]. It is a widely grown and consumed vegetable in Kenya with about 28.3 hectares under production that account for 599.458 tonnes [3]. It is an income-generating crop in high-potential and peri-urban areas. Main production counties in Kenya include Meru, Kirinyaga, Kajiado, Taita Taveta, Bungoma, and Kwale [4].

Tomatoes' fruits are used as salad, cooked as vegetables, or processed as tomato source, tomato paste, ketchup, and juice [5]. It is nutritionally important as source of vitamins and minerals. The main varieties grown in Kenya can be categorised as those grown in greenhouses and those grown in the field. Thus, tomato production is hugely affected by numerous agro ecological factors such as climatic and soil conditions. It is now well established under optimal rainfall conditions with supplemented irrigation, tomato does well under average temperatures of between 20 °C-27 °C in a wide range soil conditions such as well drained, deep, and uniform clay and silt or loam soils with an average pH of 6.0 to 7.0 [6,7].

However, the tomato crop attracts numerous pests and diseases. Among the major pests that infests tomato crop include white flies, spider mites, nematodes, thrips, aphids, and leaf miners [8] that act as disease vectors. Additionally, tomato crop is affected by various diseases such as fusarium wilt, yellow leaf curl virus, leaf spot, powdery mildew, bacterial spot, bacterial wilt, and late blight [9]. Among these, bacterial wilt has been shown as the most lethal because the affected plant has no known effective control. Bacterial wilt is a lethal vascular soil-borne disease caused by *R. solancearum* [10,11]. It is known to occur in a wide range of agro ecological zones globally including; sub-tropical, tropics, and warm temperate. The disease is also known to affect more than 450 species in 54 different families with disease incidence ranging from 63% to 100% [12,13,14,15]. Affected plants easily manifest symptoms mid production cycle such as a flaccid appearance on the young leaves especially in normal warm environmental conditions and subsequently wilt to death [16]. The vascular tissue of the stem shows a brown discoloration and when cut cross-section drops of white or yellow bacterial ooze may be visible [17].

Despite decades of global efforts in finding an effective control strategy for bacterial wilt in order to reduce losses incurred by farmers, still, no effective control mechanism has so far been reported. Currently, existing control strategies include; cultural, chemical, biological, host resistance, or a combination of all to form an integrated disease management mechanism [18,19]. Previous reports had also shown efforts toward breeding for resistance while biotechnology geared towards genetic manipulations has produced some successful candidates [20,21].

Plant biochemical derivatives have been shown to be more environmentally friendly than synthetic chemicals [22]. In vitro and in vivo investigations have reported some plants with antimicrobial potential in Salvia, Organum, and Thymus genera [23,24]. *Azadirachta indica* methanol extract has antimicrobial properties against *Escherichia coli*, Salmonella, and Streptococcus in animals and humans [25,26]. *Moringa oleifera* leaf and seed extracts have antibacterial properties against *Micrococcus kristinae*, *Aeromonas caviae*, *Salmonella enteritidis*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Bacillus subtilis*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Proteus*

vulgaris, *Enterococcus faecalis, Enterobacter cloacae*, *Vibrio cholera* and *E. coli* pathogenic bacterial in animals and human [24,27]. [28] also asserted that *M. oleifera, Lepidium sativum,* and *A. indica* leaf extracts had antimicrobial activity against *Shigella boydii*, *Salmonella Typhi*, *Streptococcus agalactiae,* and *S. aureus* pathogenic bacteria in human. Nevertheless, there is limited information about the effect of plant extracts against plant pathogens. *A. indica*, *Tithonia diversifolia,* and *Allium sativum* extracts were used in vitro treatment to manage common bean *Phaeoisariopsis griseola* [29]. *Rosemarinus officinalis* crude extract was used to manage plant diseases such as *Xanthomonas oryzae pv. Oryzae*, *Sclerotium rolfsii*, *Rhizoctonia solani*, *Alternation alternate* and *Colletotrichum graminicola,* and even *R. solanacearum* [30,31]. [32] opined that *Allium fistulosum* extract was effective against *R. solanacearum* in both in vivo and in vitro treatments.

Extracts obtained from *Warburgia ugandensis* have been used traditionally in Africa as medicine to treat ailments such as toothaches, constipation, and fever among others [33]. *W. ugandensis* has been reported to have bioactive compounds that confer antimicrobial properties against early and late blight pathogens in tomatoes [33,34]. A series of unique sesquiterpentine 1-4 dialdehydes isolated from *W. ugandensis* have been shown to have broad antibacterial and antifungal activities [35]. Polygodial, warbuganal, and muzigadial obtained from these plants show similar antibacterial spectra [36]. Nevertheless, there is limited information on the utilization of *W. ugandensis* stem bark and leaf crude extracts to control plant pathogens [37]. The study assessed the efficacy of *W. ugandensis* stem barks and leaf crude extract obtained using organic solvents such as ethanol, methanol, hexane, and dichloromethane as potential in controlling *R. solanacearum* which cause bacterial wilt in tomatoes.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Sample Collection

Leaves and stem barks of *W. ugandensis* were collected from the identified trees at Meru University of Science and Technology (MUST). Leaves and stem barks were dried under shade for three weeks and milled into a fine powder using an electrical blender and subjected to the extraction protocol.

2.2 Organic Solvents Extraction of *W. ugandensis* Leaf and Stem Bark

Fifty grams of *W. ugandensis* leaf and stem bark powder was transferred into one litre conical flask. Sequential extraction was done with 80% organic solvents viz. dichloromethane, methanol, hexane, and ethanol. Two hundred millilitre of each organic solvent was added to the conical flask and placed on a shaker and soaked for 72 hours. The samples were filtered using Whatman filter paper (No. 1). The filtrate was concentrated using a rotary evaporator at their respective organic solvent boiling points. The concentrate was sterilized by vacuum filtration. The crude extracts were transferred into sterile falcon tubes that were labeled and caped tightly. The crude extracts were stored in a refrigerator at 4 °C [37].

2.3 Isolation of *R. solanacearum*

R. solanacearum was isolated from soil in the vicinity of affected Irish tomato plants at MUST biological laboratory. Ten grams of dry soil was placed in a beaker and 100 ml of sterilized distilled water was added. The sample was agitated for 20 minutes and serial dilutions were then carried out by adding 1 ml of the sample to 9 ml of sterilized distilled water to a dilution of 10^{-9}. One hundred microlitres of the solution was spread on the Kelman's 2, 3, 5- Triphenyl tetrazolium chloride (TZC) medium that was dispensed in a Petri plate and incubated at 28 °C for 24 h to 48 h [37].

2.4 Subculturing to Obtain a Pure Culture

The single colony technique was adopted to obtain pure cultures and identified virulent *R. solanacearum* isolates grown on Kelmans 2, 3, 5-TZC medium as stated in Bergey's Manual of Systematic Bacteriology [38,39]. The microorganisms of interest were picked by sterilized inoculating wire loop from a mixed culture streaked on a Petri plate containing Kelman's 2, 3, 5-TZC medium and incubated at 28 °C. The observation was made after 12 hours to 48 hours, restreaking on fresh Petri plates containing 2, 3, 5-TZC medium was done to ensure purity. *R. solanacearum* was suspended and stored in distilled water at room temperature (15 ºC min. and 28 ºC max.) and restreaked every six months to maintain virulence [40,41].

2.5 Confirmatory Tests for *R. solanacearum*

The tests below were carried out to determine the presence of *R. solanacearum.*

2.5.1 Gram staining test for *R. solanacearum*

A loop full of the bacteria was spread on a glass slide and fixed by heating on a very low flame. Aqueous crystal violet solution (0.5%) was spread over the smear for 30 seconds and then washed with running tap water for one minute. It was then flooded with iodine for one minute, rinsed in tap water, and decolorized with 95% ethanol until colourless runoff. After washing the specimen was counter-stained with safranin for approximately 10 seconds, washed with water, dried, and observed microscopically at 10X, 40X, and 100X using oil [38,42].

2.5.2 Catalase oxidase test for *R. solanacearum*

Young agar cultures (18-24 hrs) and 3% hydrogen peroxide (H_2O_2) were used to observe the production of gas bubbles. A loop full of bacterial culture was mixed with a drop of H_2O_2 on a glass slide and observed to produce gas bubbles with the naked eye and under a dissecting magnification of 25X (38,42].

2.5.3 Potassium hydroxide test for *R. solanacearum*

Bacteria were aseptically removed from Petri plates with an inoculating wire loop, placed on a glass slide in a drop of 3% KOH solution, stirred for 10 seconds, and observed for the formation of slime threads [38,42].

2.6 Preparation of Bacterial Inoculum

Inoculum of the *R. solanacearum* was prepared by culturing it on Kelman's 2, 3, 5-TZC medium (1 g of Casamino acids, 10 g of peptone, 5 g of glucose in 1000 ml of distilled water. To control saprophytic bacteria and fungi there was addition of 100mg polymyxin ß sulfate,25mg bacitracin 5mg chloromycetin, 0.5g Penicillin and 100mg cycloheximide and 30 minutes prior to use 5 ml of 70% ethanol was dissolved) [38,40,42,43,44]. Cultures were suspended in distilled water and were adjusted to 1×10^8 CFU ml^{-1} (colony forming unit) using 0.5 Mac Farland solution.

2.7 *In vivo* efficacy of *W. ugandensis* Crude Extract Against *R. solanacearum*

The experiment was conducted in the greenhouse using Riogrande tomato variety which [45] reported that is susceptible to bacterial wilt and had a germination and purity percentages of 96% and 99.9% (KEPHIS lot NR: 18-20558) respectively. Germination was done in germination trays using Hygromix media and watered when necessary. Transplanting media (soil and sand) were sterilized by autoclaving at 121 ˚C for 15 minutes to eliminate contamination. The transplanting media and D.A.P fertilizer were thoroughly mixed and placed in 3 L pots. Holes were made in the soil in the pots and prepared in four categories: non-inoculated with *R. solanacearum,* inoculated with 1 ml of *R. solanacearum* solution (1×10^8 CFU $ml^{-1)}$ and treated with 1 ml of sodium hypochlorite (1%)(positive control) through drenching, inoculated with 1ml of *R. solanacearum* solution (1×10^8 CFU $ml^{-1)}$ and treated with 1 ml of Dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) (negative control) through drenching and inoculated with 1 ml of *R. solanacearum* solution (1×10^8 CFU $ml^{-1)}$ and treated with 1 ml of *W. ugandensis* stem bark and leaf crude extract obtained either using ethanol, methanol, dichloromethane or hexane. Randomized complete design (RCD) was used to allocate the pots for each treatment in three replicates. One tomato plant was transplanted in each pot 5 weeks after germination.

Two weeks after transplanting, a teaspoonful of urea (46% N) was applied in each pot followed by a teaspoonful of Calcium Ammonium Nitrate (CAN) in the third week and in weeks six and nine. Foliar feed Wuxal® was applied weekly at 50 ml/20 L water. The crop was kept free of weeds by hand weeding and uprooting of weeds. Irrigation was carried out once every two days. Crop support (staking) was carried out to allow free air movement and reduce moisture accumulation thus reducing disease incidences. Pruning to remove side shoots, laterals, old leaves, diseased leaves, and branches was done by hand (thumb and finger). Standard pest and disease management program was used except for the management of *R. solanacearum.*

2.8 Assessments of Bacterial wilt Incidence and Severity

Disease incidence was assessed at weekly intervals for the development of bacterial wilt

symptoms and calculated as the percentage of wilted plants within each treatment according to the formula:

$$WI = \left[\frac{NPSWS}{NPPT}\right] X\ 100$$

Where % WI = percentage wilt incidence,
NPSWS = number of plants showing wilt symptoms and
NPPT = number of plants per treatment [46,47].
Disease severity scoring of tomato plants affected by bacterial wilt was done on a six-point scale (0= No wilt symptom, 1= One leaf wilted, 2= 2 or more leaves wilted, 3 = all leaves except the tip wilted, 4= Whole plant wilted, 5= Death (collapse) of the whole plant). The six-point scale was proposed by [45].

Percentage Severity Index (PSI) as described by [47,48,49] was calculated using the formula:

$$PSI = \frac{\sum Scores\ \text{X}\ 100}{NPR\ X\ MSC}$$

Where;

PSI = Percent severity index,
NPR = Number of plants rated and
MSC = Maximum scale of the scores

2.9 Data Collection and Analysis

Data collected of bacterial wilt incidence, severity stem diameter, height, number of branches and fruits set was subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA) at a 5% level of significance. Tukey's test was used in separation means significant difference at a 5% level. The general linear model procedure of the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) program was used to analysed the data.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Colony Morphology of *R. solanacearum*

R. solanacearum was isolated from the soil in the vicinity of wilted tomato plant samples collected from Meru County during field survey. Fig. 1(A and B) showed virulent isolates grown on Kelmans 2, 3, 5-TZC medium were highly fluidal, white coloured with a light pink centre and round to irregular margin [37,38,42].

3.2 Biochemical Confirmatory Test for *R. solanacearum*

Morphological observations revealed that cells of *R. solanacearum* were straight rod-shaped, with circular ends, cells emerged singly or in pairs, red colouration, and encased when viewed under a compound microscope at 100X magnification with oil immersion. The isolated *R. solanacearum* bacteria were pink in colour in Gram staining reaction under the compound microscope at 100X magnification (Fig. 2A), confirming that they were Gram-negative [38,41]. Fig. 2 (B) *R. solanacearum* showed a positive response to the catalase oxidase test, evidenced by the generation of air bubbles upon inoculation to the medium [37,42]. Additionally, the bacterial culture of *R. solanacearum* produced a string-like viscous material on a glass slide in the KOH test which further confirmed its Gram-negative characteristics [38,42]. Based on the morphological and biochemical traits observed, the bacteria isolated was *R. solanacearum*.



Fig. 1. Colony morphology of R. solanacearum. (A) Represents colony morphology of R. solanacearum isolated cultures grown on 2, 3, 5-TZC medium at incubator for 18 hours and (B) represents colony morphology of R. solanacearum subcultures grown on 2, 3, 5-TZC medium at incubator for 18 h

3.3 The Effect of Soil Treatment with *W. ugandensis* Crude Extracts on Tomato Bacterial wilt Disease Incidence

There was no significant difference between the tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soil but treated with leaf and stem bark hexane crude extract showed 50% disease incidence (Fig. 3) and tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soil but treated with leaf dichloromethane crude extract had 50% disease incidence (Fig. 3). Astonishingly, tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soil but treated with stem bark using dichloromethane crude extract showed 0% disease incidence (Fig. 3). There was a significant difference between tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soil but treated with the leaf and stem bark using methanol crude extract both showed suppressed disease incidence of 16.67% and 33.33% respectively (Fig. 3). There was a significant difference between tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soil but treated with ethanol crude extract from both leaf and stem bark showed the lowest disease incidence suppression of 83.33% and 66.67% respectively (Fig. 3). Plant crude extracts have been used in greenhouse tomato plants to manage bacterial wilt [50,51]. Previously, *W. ugandensis* stem bark and leaf crude extracts have shown to contain mukaadial, muzigadial, polygodial, ugandensidial, ugandensolide, and warburganal metabolites that are active against *R. solanacearum* which may be the reason why bacterial wilt incidence was suppressed [52] (. Similar findings have also been reported by [32,37,47] with *A. fistulosum* crude extract showing reduced tomato plant bacterial wilt incidence and severity. As expected, DMSO (-VE) did not show any disease suppression (Fig. 3&4) while tomato plants established in non-inoculated soil and soil treated with sodium hypochlorite(+VE) did not show any disease incidence at all (Figs. 3 & 4).

3.4 The Effect of Soil Treatment with *W. ugandensis* Crude Extracts on Tomato Disease Severity

There was no significant difference between the tomato plants established in soil inoculated with *R. solanacearum* treated but with *W. ugandensis* leaf and stem bark hexane crude extract obtained showed 41.67% disease severity (Fig. 5) and tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soils but treated with *W. ugandensis* leaf dichloromethane crude extract had 41.67% disease severity (Fig. 5). Tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soil but treated with *W. ugandensis* stem bark dichloromethane crude extract had a significant disease severity of not showing any disease manifestation (Fig. 5). There was a significant difference between the tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soils but treated with *W. ugandensis* leaf and stem bark methanol crude extracts showed suppressed disease severity of 13.89% and 27.78% respectively (Fig. 5). There was a significant difference between the tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soils but treated with *W. ugandensis* leaf and stem bark crude ethanol extracts showed the highest disease severity of 69.44% and 55.56 respectively (Fig. 5). Tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soils but treated with DMSO did not express any disease (Fig. 5). These results concur with [53,54] reported that DMSO had no impact on *R. solanacearum*. Similar to plants established in non-inoculated soil and *R. solanacearum* inoculated soil but treated with sodium hypochlorite. This study concurs with [55,56] that bacterial wilt disease severity was variably and significantly reduced by some aqueous plant crude extracts applied through soil drenching. Previous findings deduced that plant crude extract biochemical compounds that contain antimicrobial properties may be in different forms including phenolic and aldehyde [36]. Secondary compounds combined naturally in plant crude extract have a higher antimicrobial activity that might be due to synergism than individual constituents that are purified [57,58]. The disparity in restraining disease progress by use of *W. ugandensis* crude extracts obtained using different organic solvents could be due to target pathogen membrane permeability, difference in active biochemical compositions of the crude extracts, efficacy difference and extracts durability in the soil [56]. Tomato plants established under negative control and in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soil but treated with *W. ugandensis* organic solvents crude extracts had different disease severity percentage may be due to agronomic practices regulations, genetic interventions, physical measures, and host immunity enhancement, can be employed alone or in tandem to mitigate pathogens, boost host resistance, or alter the conditions under which host-pathogen interactions take place affected the disease

development. These results agree with [59,60] that bacterial wilt severity is influenced by factors such as crop type, pathogen characteristics, location, technological resources, and regulatory policies.

3.5 The Effect of Soil Treatment with *W. ugandensis* Crude Extracts on Tomato Plants Mean Height, Number of Branches and Diameter

Tomato plants' average height was significantly different in some treatments (Table 1). Tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soils but treated with DMSO showed the lowest average height of 49.00 cm which was significant from other treatments. These results agree with [61,62] reported that *R. solanacearum* retarded tomato plant height. Tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soil but treated with *W. ugandensis* leaf and stem bark ethanol crude extracts showed no significant difference in average height. Similarly, tomato plants established in soils treated with *W. ugandensis* stem bark and leaf methanol and hexane crude extracts also had no significant difference in the average height. Tomato plants established in non-inoculated soil and plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soil but treated with *W. ugandensis* leaf ethanol crude extract had the highest average height of 62.50 cm. Tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soils but treated with sodium hypochlorite had an average height of 55.17 cm which was significantly different from tomato plants established in non-inoculated soil and tomato plants established *R. solanacearum* inoculated in soil but treated with *W. ugandensis* leaf ethanol crude extract. *W. ugandensis* crude extract obtained from the stem bark and leaf using different organic solvents may have had a synergistic effect by stimulating tomato plants' growth through decreased retarding effect of *R. solanacearum*. These results concur with those of [63,64] Gao *et al*., (2021[1]) and [1] Marey & Elmasry, (2024) that treatment of tomato plants with *A. fistulosum* crude extract increased the height of tomato plants.

Tomato plants established in soils treated with DMSO had the lowest average number of 17.67 branches which was significant difference from other treatments (Table 1). Tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soils but treated with *W. ugandensis* crude extract obtained from the stem bark and leaf using ethanol, methanol, dichloromethane, and hexane showed no significant difference in the average number of branches. Similarly, tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soil but treated with sodium hypochlorite showed an average number of 22.50 branches that was not significantly different from tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soil but treated with *W. ugandensis* crude extract obtained from the stem bark and leaf using ethanol, methanol, dichloromethane, and hexane. Tomato plants established in non-inoculated soil showed the highest average number of 24 branches. This study concurs with previous findings of [65] that reported application of seaweed crude extracts against *Sclerotium rolfsii* increased tomato plant's growth parameters.



Fig. 2. Gram staining and Catalase Oxidase tests. (A) shows Gram staining of *R. solanacearum*. Pink colour indicates rod shaped cells of *R. solanacearum* at 100X magnification, and (B) show production of air bubbles when a loop full of *R. solanacearum* bacterial culture was mixed with a drop of H_2O_2



Fig. 3. Disease wilt incidence percentage at the terminal stage of development. Rs represents *R. solanacearum* while Wu represents *W. ugandensis*. N (sterilized soil media with no Rs inoculation), +VE (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with sodium hypochlorite), -VE (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with DMSO), BE (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu stem bark ethanol crude extract), LE (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu ethanol leaf crude extract), BM (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu stem bark methanol crude extract), LM (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu methanol leaf crude extract), BD (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu dichloromethane stem bark crude extract), LD (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu dichloromethane leaf crude extract), BH (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu hexane stem bark crude extract and LH (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu hexane leaf crude extract). Different letters show significant difference. The statistical significance p≤0.05

Tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soils but treated with DMSO had the smallest plant diameter of 10.33 mm which was significantly different from the other treatments (Table 1). Tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soils but treated with *W. ugandensis* crude extract obtained from the stem bark and leaf using ethanol, methanol, dichloromethane and hexane showed no significant difference in the average plant diameter. Similarly, tomato plants established in non-inoculated soils and *R. solanacearum* inoculated soil but treated with sodium hypochlorite showed no significant difference in average plant diameter with tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soil but treated with *W. ugandensis* crude extract obtained from the stem bark and leaf using ethanol, methanol, dichloromethane, and hexane. Tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soil but treated with *W. ugandensis* stem bark ethanol crude extract showed the largest average plant diameter of 13.00 mm. Generally, tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soils treated with *W. ugandensis* crude extract obtained from both the stem bark and leaf using different organic solvents increased growth of tomato plant height, branches, and stem diameter. The results of the current study agree with those of [32,66] reported that tomato plant growth parameters increased when treated with different plant crude extracts.



Fig. 4. *W. ugandensis* leaf stem bark and leaf crude extract suppressive effect on *R. solanacearum* of tomato plants. Rs represents *R. solanacearum* while Wu represents *W. ugandensis*. N (sterilized soil media with no Rs inoculation), +VE (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with sodium hypochlorite), -VE (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with DMSO), BE (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu stem bark ethanol crude extract), LE (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu ethanol leaf crude extract), BM (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu stem bark methanol crude extract), LM (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu methanol leaf crude extract), BD (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu dichloromethane stem bark crude extract), LD (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu dichloromethane leaf crude extract), BH (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu hexane stem bark crude extract and LH (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu hexane leaf crude extract)

Table 1. Means and standard error (SE) of tomato plants height, number of branches and plant diameter from eleven different organic extract treatments

Treatment	Plant height (cm)		Number of branches		Plant diameter(mm)	
N	62.50	±1.75a	24.17	±0.65a	12.77	±0.53ab
+VE	55.17	±3.09bcd	22.50	±0.60abc	12.07	±0.37ab
-VE	49.00	±0.50d	17.67	±0.42f	10.33	±0.20c
BE	60.50	±0.13ab	22.00	±1.08bcd	13.00	±0.26a
LE	62.50	±2.96a	23.67	±0.55ab	11.67	±0.26b
BM	56.75	±3.61ab	21.67	±0.33cde	11.83	±0.05b
LM	61.80	±1.90ab	21.33	±0.88cde	11.93	±0.30ab
BD	58.33	±3.02ab	20.67	±0.67de	12.17	±0.40ab
LD	50.00	±1.42cd	20.83	±0.21cde	11.87	±5.04ab
BH	56.11	±1.15abc	20.00	±0.95cde	12.50	±0.76ab
LH	56.67	±3.33abc	20.50	±0.42de	12.33	±0.21ab
LSD	6.72		1.68		1.17	
P	<0.0052		<0.0052		<.0052	
CV	10.14		6.78		8.32	

Rs represents R. solanacearum while Wu represents W. ugandensis. N (sterilized soil media with no Rs inoculation), +VE (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with sodium hypochlorite), -VE (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with DMSO), BE (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu stem bark ethanol crude extract), LE (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu ethanol leaf crude extract), BM (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu stem bark methanol crude extract), LM (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu methanol leaf crude extract), BD (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu dichloromethane stem bark crude extract), LD (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu dichloromethane leaf crude extract), BH (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu hexane stem bark crude extract and LH (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu hexane leaf crude extract). Mean values in the same column followed by the same letter are not significant at p≤0.05



Fig. 5. Disease severity percentage at terminal stage of development. Rs represents *R. solanacearum* while Wu represents *W. ugandensis*. N (sterilized soil media with no Rs inoculation), +VE (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with sodium hypochlorite), -VE (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with DMSO), BE (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu stem bark ethanol crude extract), LE (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu ethanol leaf crude extract), BM (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu stem bark methanol crude extract), LM (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu methanol leaf crude extract), BD (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu dichloromethane stem bark crude extract), LD (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu dichloromethane leaf crude extract), BH (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu hexane stem bark crude extract and LH (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu hexane leaf crude extract). Different letters show significant difference. The statistical significance p≤0.05.

3.6 The Effect of Soil Treatment with *W. ugandensis* Crude Extracts on Tomato Plants Number of Fruits Set

Tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soil but treated with *W. ugandensis* stem bark and leaf using hexane crude extracts showed a significant difference in average number of fruits set of 10.67 and 16.50 respectively (Fig. 6). There was no significant difference between the tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soil but treated with *W. ugandensis* leaf dichloromethane crude extract showed the average number of fruits set of 21.60 (Fig. 6) and tomato plants established in non-inoculated soils had a 21.33 average fruit set (Fig. 6). Tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soils but treated with *W. ugandensis* leaf and stem bark using methanol crude extracts showed a significant difference in average number fruits set of 13.50 and 22.00 respectively (Fig. 6). There was no significant difference between the tomato plants in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soil but treated with *W. ugandensis* ethanol crude extract from stem bark had average number of fruits set of 22.00 (Fig. 6) and tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soil treated with sodium hypochlorite showed the highest average number of fruits set of 22.33 (Fig. 6). Tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soil treated with DMSO showed average number of fruits set of 16.00 (Fig. 6). Tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soils but treated with *W. ugandensis* leaf dichloromethane and stem bark ethanol crude extracts had a significant increase in the average number of fruits set compared to *W. ugandensis* other organic solvents extracts and negative control. This could be because of the applied *W. ugandensis* crude extracts that increased chlorophyll content hence promoting number of tomato fruits set. Similarly [67] study shown that the seaweed extracts promoted the following tomato growth parameters: foliage dry weight, root lengths and roots and numbers of flowers



Fig. 6. Mean number of tomato plants fruits set at terminal stage of development. Rs represents *R. solanacearum* while Wu represents *W. ugandensis*. N (sterilized soil media with no Rs inoculation), +VE (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with sodium hypochlorite), -VE (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with DMSO), BE (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu stem bark ethanol crude extract), LE (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu ethanol leaf crude extract), BM (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu stem bark methanol crude extract), LM (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu methanol leaf crude extract), BD (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu dichloromethane stem bark crude extract), LD (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu dichloromethane leaf crude extract), BH (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu hexane stem bark crude extract and LH (soil media inoculated with Rs and then treated with Wu hexane leaf crude extract). The error bars show the standard errors (SE) of the means. Different letters show significant difference. The statistical significance p≤0.05

and flower clusters. Further demonstrations conducted by [68,69] shown that application of seaweed extracts remarkably increased tomato leaves chlorophyll content at the stage of flowering when evaluated by SPAD testing, trial used to determine nitrogen content status in a plant.Tomato plants established in *R. solanacearum* inoculated soils but treated with *W. ugandensis* stem bark dichloromethane extracts had the lowest disease severity index percentage but the number of tomato fruit sets were not significantly different to the negative control. These could be due to water and nutrient that play pivotal roles in influencing both the productivity and quality of crops. These study results are contrary with those of [70] reported that tomato plants treated *Euphorbia hirta* crude extract obtained using showed average resistance against *R. solanacearum* hence tomato yield increased.

4. CONCLUSION

This study shows that *W. ugandensis* stem bark and leaf crude extracts can reduce bacterial wilt disease incidence and severity and enhance the growth parameters of tomato plants. Tomato plants established in soil treated with of *W. ugandensis* stem bark dichloromethane crude extract showed bacterial wilt disease incidence

and severity of 0% suggesting that crude extracts may contain *R. solanacearum* sterilizing biochemical. Consequently, tomato farmers should examine treating the soil with *W. ugandensis* stem bark dichloromethane crude extract as an integrated strategy in managing bacterial wilt infected greenhouses to promote growth and yields of tomato.

5. RECOMMENDATION

W. ugandensis stem bark dichloromethane extracts have active compounds that may be isolated to be used in the place of synthetic pesticides against *R. solanacearum*.

DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Author(s) hereby declares that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc.) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research and publication have not been funded by any financial supporting bodies.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Jenkins JA. The origin of the cultivated tomato. Economic Botany. 1948;2:379–392.
2. Razifard H, Ramos A, Della Valle AL, Bodary C, Goetz E, Manser EJ, Li X, Zhang L, Visa S, Tieman D, van der Knaap E, Caicedo AL. Genomic evidence for complex domestication history of the cultivated tomato in Latin America. Molecular Biology and Evolution. 2020;37(4):1118–1132. Available:https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msz297.
3. Faostat F. URL. Food and agriculture organization of the United Nations (FAO). Accessed On. 2020;25. Available:http://www. Fao. Org/faostat/en/-data/QC
4. Avedi EK, Adediji AO, Kilalo DC, Olubayo FM, Macharia I. Incidence, severity, and distribution of yellow leaf curl disease of tomato in Kenya. African Crop Science Journal. 2022;30(1):1–11.
5. Agus MAV, Romeo Jr D, Arcigal RJ. Development and acceptance of tomato paste processing machine. European Journal of Science, Innovation and Technology. 2023;3(2):1–12.
6. Kumar P, Kumar P, Singh MK, Kumar R. Treasure of vegetable crops. Sankalp Publication; 2020.
7. Ochieng J, Kirimi L, Mathenge M. Effects of climate variability and change on agricultural production: The case of small-scale farmers in Kenya. NJAS: Wageningen Journal of Life Sciences. 2016;77(1):71–78. Available:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.njas.2016.03.005
8. Mani M. Pest management in horticultural crops under protected cultivation. Trends in Horticultural Entomology. 2022;387–417.
9. Solankey SS, Ray PK, Kumari M, Singh HK, Shamim M, Verma DK, Jha VB. Tomato diseases, their impact, and management. Biotic Stress Management in Tomato. Biotechnological Approaches. CRC Press, UK. 2021;1.
10. Dickstein ER, Bocsanczy AM, Champoiseau P, Jones J, Norman D, Paret M, Sharma A, Momol TM, Allen C, Huang Q, Miller S, Shadman-Adolpho S, Evans-Goldner L, Liu Z, Bulluck R, Cardwell KF, Fajardo JE. Recovery Plan for *Ralstonia solanacearum* Race 3 Biovar 2 (Phylotype IIB, sequevars 1 and 2) Causing Brown Rot of Potato, Bacterial Wilt of Tomato, and Southern Wilt of Geranium. Plant Health Progress; 2023. Available:https://doi.org/10.1094/PHP-03-23-0027-RP.
11. Yabuchi E, Wang L, Yamayoshi T, Arakawa M, Yano I. Bactericidal effect of chlorine on strains of Legionella species. Kansenshogaku Zasshi. The Journal of the Japanese Association for Infectious Diseases. 1995;69(2):151–157.
12. Elphinstone JG. The current bacterial wilt situation: A global overview. Bacterial Wilt Disease and the Ralstonia Solanacearum Species Complex. 2005;9–28.
13. Kurabachew H, Ayana G. Bacterial Wilt caused by *Ralstonia solanacearum* in Ethiopia: Statusa and management approaches: A review. International Journal of Phytopathology. 2017;5(3):107–119.

14. Lebeau A, Daunay M-C, Frary A, Palloix A, Wang J-F, Dintinger J, Chiroleu F, Wicker E, Prior P. Bacterial wilt resistance in tomato, pepper, and eggplant: Genetic resources respond to diverse strains in the *Ralstonia solanacearum* species complex. Phytopathology. 2011;101(1):154–165.
15. Manda RR, Addanki VA, Srivastava S. Bacterial wilt of solanaceous crops. Int. J. Chem. Stud. 2020;8(6):1048–1057.
16. Jiang G, Wei Z, Xu J, Chen H, Zhang Y, She X, Macho AP, Ding W, Liao B. Bacterial wilt in China: History, current status, and future perspectives. Frontiers in Plant Science. 2017;8:1549.
17. Heikrujam SC, Singh RI, Laiphrakpam PC, Laishram S. Isolation and characterization of *Ralstonia solanacearum* from infected tomato plants of Bishnupur district of Manipur. The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2020;9(2):138–141.
18. Benti EA. Control of bacterial wilt (*Ralstonia solanacearum*) and reduction of ginger yield loss through integrated management methods in Southwestern Ethiopia. The Open Agriculture Journal. 2023;17(1).
19. Schaad NW, Frederick RD, Shaw J, Schneider WL, Hickson R, Petrillo MD, Luster DG. Advances in molecular-based diagnostics in meeting crop biosecurity and phytosanitary issues. Annual Review of Phytopathology. 2003;41(1):305–324.
20. Patil VU, Gopal J, Singh BP. Improvement for bacterial wilt resistance in potato by conventional and biotechnological approaches. Agricultural Research. 2012;1:299–316.
21. Vailleau F, Genin S. *Ralstonia solanacearum*: An arsenal of virulence strategies and prospects for resistance. Annual Review of Phytopathology. 2023;61(1):25–47. Available:https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-phyto-021622-104551.
22. Hernández-Díaz JA, Garza-García JJ, Zamudio-Ojeda A, León-Morales JM, López-Velázquez JC, García-Morales S. Plant-mediated synthesis of nanoparticles and their antimicrobial activity against phytopathogens. Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture. 2021;101(4):1270–1287.
23. Hachlafi NE, Aanniz T, Menyiy NE, Baaboua AE, Omari NE, Balahbib A, Shariati MA, Zengin, G, Fikri-Benbrahim K, Bouyahya A. *In vitro* and *In vivo* biological investigations of camphene and its mechanism insights: A review. Food Reviews International. 2023;39(4):1799–1826.
24. Jabeen R, Shahid M, Jamil A, Ashraf M. Microscopic evaluation of the antimicrobial activity of seed extracts of Moringa oleifera. Pak J Bot. 2008;40(4):1349–1358.
25. Hemdan BA, Mostafa A, Elbatanony MM, El-Feky AM, Paunova-Krasteva T, Stoitsova S, El-Liethy MA, El-Taweel GE, Mraheil MA. Bioactive *Azadirachta indica* and *Melia azedarach* leaves extracts with anti-SARS-CoV-2 and antibacterial activities. PLOS ONE. 2023;18(3): e0282729. Available:https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0282729
26. Maragathavalli S, Brindha S, Kaviyarasi N, Annadurai B, Gangwar S. Antimicrobial activity in leaf extract of neem (*Azadirachta indica* Linn.). International Journal of Science and Nature. 2012;3(1):110–113.
27. Jikah AN, Edo GI. *Moringa oleifera*: A valuable insight into recent advances in medicinal uses and pharmacological activities. Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture. 2023;103(15): 7343–7361. Available:https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.12892
28. Ibrahim N, Kebede A. *In vitro* antibacterial activities of methanol and aqueous leave extracts of selected medicinal plants against human pathogenic bacteria. Saudi Journal of Biological Sciences. 2020;27(9):2261–2268.
29. Chauhan P, Tapwal A. Green synthesis of nanoparticles using botanicals and their application in management of fungal phytopathogens: A review. Archives of Microbiology. 2023;205(3): 94.
30. Abdallah Y, Ogunyemi SO, Abdelazez A, Zhang M, Hong X, Ibrahim E, Hossain A, Fouad H, Li B, Chen J. The green synthesis of MgO nano-flowers using *Rosmarinus officinalis* L. (Rosemary) and the antibacterial activities against *Xanthomonas oryzae* pv. Oryzae. BioMed Research International; 2019.
31. El-Wahed A, Hassan M, Bereika MF, Abo-Elyousr KA, Almasoudi NM. Integration of *Pseudomonas fluorescens* and *Rosemarinus officinalis* for controlling of potato bacterial wilt. Egyptian Journal of Biological Pest Control. 2023;33(1):1–9.
32. Deberdt P, Perrin B, Coranson-Beaudu R, Duyck P-F, Wicker E. Effect of *Allium*

fistulosum extract on *Ralstonia solanacearum* populations and tomato bacterial wilt. Plant Disease. 2012;96(5):687–692.
33. Okello D, Kang Y. Ethnopharmacological potentials of *Warburgia ugandensis* on antimicrobial activities. Chinese Journal of Integrative Medicine. 2021;27(8):633–640.
34. Prieto JA, Patiño OJ, Plazas EA, Pabón LC, Ávila MC, Guzmán JD, Delgado WA, Cuca LE. Natural products from plants as potential source agents for controlling Fusarium. Fungicides-Showcases of Integrated Plant Disease Management from Around the World. Croacia: Intech. 2013;233–278.
35. Ikeagwuonu CM, Adjeroh LA. Preliminary phytochemical screening, anti-bacterial and anti-fungal effects of leave extracts of Indigofera suffruticosa Mill., 1768. World Scientific News. 2024;188:146–159.
36. Nkqenkqa V, Mundembe R. *Warburgia Salutaris* metabolites of medicinal value–A review. Malaysian Journal of Science and Advanced Technology. 2023;244–254.
37. Lideke OL, Mworia EG, Mwenda CM. Inhibition of Ralstonia solanacearum by *Warburgia ugandensis* stem bark and leaf crude extracts obtained using organic solvents. African Journal of Science, Technology and Social Sciences. 2023;2(2):59-69.
38. Aslam MN, Mukhtar T. Distributional spectrum of bacterial wilt of chili incited by *Ralstonia solanacearum* in Pakistan. Bragantia. 2023;82:e20220196. Available:https://doi.org/10.1590/1678-4499-2022-0196.
39. Sneath PH, Mair NS, Sharpe ME, Holt JG. Bergey's manual of systematic bacteriology. Volume 2. Williams & Wilkins; 1986.
40. García RO, Kerns JP, Thiessen L. *Ralstonia solanacearum* species complex: A quick diagnostic guide. Plant Health Progress. 2019;20(1):7–13.
41. Shahbaz MU, Mukhtar T, Begum N. Biochemical and serological characterization of *Ralstonia solanacearum* associated with chilli seeds from Pakistan. International Journal of Agriculture & Biology. 2015;17(1).
42. Khasabulli BD, Musyimi DM, Miruka DM, Opande GT, Jeruto P. Isolation and characterisation of *Ralstonia solanacearum* strains of tomato wilt disease from Maseno, Kenya. Journal of Asian Scientific Research. 2017;7(9):404–420.
43. Champoiseau PG, Jones JB, Allen C. *Ralstonia solanacearum* race 3 biovar 2 causes tropical losses and temperate anxieties. Plant Health Progress. 2009;10(1):35.
44. Kelman A. The relationship of pathogenicity of *Pseudomonas solanacearum* to colony appearance in a tetrazolium medium. Phytopathology. 1954;44(12). Available:https://www.cabdirect.org/cabdirect/abstract/19551101405
45. Chengo DG, Mutitu EW, Muiru WM. Evaluation of tomato cultivars for resistance to bacterial wilt caused by *Ralstonia Solanacearum*. East African Agricultural and Forestry Journal. 2022;86(1–2):8–8.
46. Ayana G, Fininsa C, Ahmed S, Wydra K. Effects of soil amendment on bacterial wilt caused by *Ralstonia solanacerum* and tomato yields in Ethiopia. Journal of Plant Protection Research. 2011;51(1).
47. Shikoli EM. Influence of bunching onion (*Allium Fistulosum*) crude extract and irrigation levels on bacterial wilt incidence and tomato (*Solanum Lycopersicum* L.) growth, yield and quality [Thesis, Egerton University]; 2022. Available:http://41.89.96.81:8080/xmlui/handle/123456789/4503
48. Cooke BM. Disease assessment and yield loss. In The epidemiology of plant diseases (pp. 43–80). Springer; 2006.
49. Khairy AM, Tohamy MR, Zayed MA, Ali MA. Detecting pathogenic bacterial wilt disease of potato using biochemical markers and evaluate resistant in some cultivars. Saudi Journal of Biological Sciences. 2021;28(9):5193–5203.
50. Lee Y-H, Choi C-W, Kim S-H, Yun J-G, Chang S-W, Kim Y-S, Hong J-K. Chemical pesticides and plant essential oils for disease control of tomato bacterial wilt. The Plant Pathology Journal. 2012;28(1):32–39.
51. Wamani AO, Muthomi JW, Mutitu E, Waceke WJ. Efficacy of microbial antagonists in the management of bacterial wilt of field-grown tomato. Journal of Natural Pesticide Research. 2023;6:100051. Available:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.napere.2023.100051.

52. Vu TT, Choi GJ, Kim J-C. Plant-derived antibacterial metabolites suppressing tomato bacterial wilt caused by *Ralstonia solanacearum*. Research in Plant Disease. 2017;23(2):89–98.
53. Ahmad K, Khan RAA, Ahmad M, Khan R, Naz I, Ullah S, Khan W, Waleed M, Khan S, Zaman A. Evaluating powder preparation of *Dodonaea viscosa* as a new potential control measure against bacterial wilt of tomato. Journal of Plant Pathology. 2023;1–12.
54. Li S, Yu Y, Chen J, Guo B, Yang L, Ding W. Evaluation of the antibacterial effects and mechanism of action of protocatechualdehyde against *Ralstonia solanacearum*. Molecules. 2016;21(6):Article 6. Available:https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules21060754
55. Mithöfer A, Maffei ME. General mechanisms of plant defense and plant toxins. In Plant toxins (pp. 1–22). Springer; 2016.
56. Musyimi DM, Khasabulli BD, Opande GT. Effect of methanolic extracts of *Senna didymobotrya* and *Moringa oleifera* on Growth of *Ralstonia solanacearum*; 2022.
57. Liu G, Nie R, Liu Y, Mehmood A. Combined antimicrobial effect of bacteriocins with other hurdles of physicochemic and microbiome to prolong shelf life of food: A review. Science of The Total Environment. 2022;825:154058. Available:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.154058
58. Ningombam A, Ahluwalia V, Srivastava C, Walia S. Antifeedant activity and phytochemical investigation of *Millettia pachycarpa* extracts against tobacco leaf eating caterpillar, *Spodoptera litura* (Fabricius) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). Journal of Asia-Pacific Entomology. 2017;20(2):381–385.
59. Dossoumou ME, Sikirou R, Zannou A, Paret M, Baba-Moussa L. Bacterial wilt and dissemination factors in tomato production areas of Benin, West Africa. Archives of Phytopathology and Plant Protection. 2023;56(18):1427–1449. Available:https://doi.org/10.1080/03235408.2023.2291842
60. Siddique MI, Silverman E, Louws F, Panthee DR. Quantitative trait loci mapping for bacterial wilt resistance and plant height in tomatoes. Plants. 2024;13(6):876.
61. Hacisalihoglu G, Ji P, Longo LM, Olson S, Momol TM. Bacterial wilt induced changes in nutrient distribution and biomass and the effect of acibenzolar-S-methyl on bacterial wilt in tomato. Crop Protection. 2007;26(7):978–982.
62. Wang R, Li C, Jia Z, Su Y, Ai Y, Li Q, Guo X, Tao Z, Lin F, Liang Y. Reversible phosphorylation of a lectin-receptor-like kinase controls xylem immunity. Cell Host & Microbe. 2023;31(12):2051-2066.e7. Available:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chom.2023.10.017
63. Gao S, Liu X, Liu Y, Cao B, Chen Z, Xu K. The spectral irradiance, growth, photosynthetic characteristics, antioxidant system, and nutritional status of green onion (*Allium fistulosum* L.) grown under different photo-selective nets. Frontiers in Plant Science. 2021;12:650471.
64. Marey RA, Elmasry HM. Vegetative growth, yield, and quality of onion as influenced by nitrogen rates and natural stimulators. Egyptian Journal of Soil Science. 2024;64(1):49–62. Available:https://doi.org/10.21608/ejss.2023.229168.1638
65. Abbas M, Shakeel S, Ji P, Zafar-ul-Hye M. Induction of resistance in tomato against *Sclerotium rolfsii* by application of seaweed extract and chemical compounds. International Journal of Pest Management. 2022;1–12.
66. Fadia A, Ibtissam L, Anass W, Laila R, Moustapha A, Imane W. Comparison of the effect of two categories of *Arthrospira platensis* polysaccharides (exo and endopolysaccharides) on tomato growth: Effect on morphological, histological, and biochemical plant growth traits. Journal of Applied Phycology. 2023;35(3):1183–1192. Available:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10811-023-02948-7
67. Hussain HI, Kasinadhuni N, Arioli T. The effect of seaweed extract on tomato plant growth, productivity, and soil. Journal of Applied Phycology. 2021;33(2):1305–1314. Available:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10811-021-02387-2.
68. Gholizadeh A, Saberioon M, Borůvka L, Wayayok A, Mohd Soom MA. Leaf chlorophyll and nitrogen dynamics and their relationship to lowland rice yield for site-specific paddy management.

Information Processing in Agriculture. 2017;4(4):259–268.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inpa.2017.08.002

69. Yuan Z, Ata-Ul-Karim ST, Cao Q, Lu Z, Cao W, Zhu Y, Liu X. Indicators for diagnosing nitrogen status of rice based on chlorophyll meter readings. Field Crops Research. 2016;185:12–20.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2015.10.003

70. Kusampudi V, Kusampudi S, Lakshmi BS. Effect of foliar-applied *Euphorbia hirta* towards controlling bacterial diseases in tomato crops and enhancing fruit yield and shelf life. Plant Production Science. 2023;26(1):1–16.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/117519