

Full Length Research

Review on the status and management strategies of Fusarium head blight (*Fusarium graminearum*) of wheat

Belachew Bekele

Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, Holeta Research center. E-mail: bbekele6@gmail.com

Accepted 18 October 2017

Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) is counted among the most commonly cultivated cereal crops with over 600 million tons harvested each year. It is an important crop commodity, which could contribute a major part in achieving the country's agricultural policy objective of food grain self-sufficiency. The most important constraints affecting wheat production include drought, diseases, insects and weeds. Diseases are the major once, which decreases the yield, quality and profitability for producers. Fusarium Head Blight (FHB or scab) is common and damaging fungal disease of wheat that causes losses up to 70% and contaminates harvested grain with mycotoxins. FHB is caused by one or more Fusarium species, mostly by *F. graminearum* (Schwabe). Its infections cause problems concerning the quality of harvested wheat seeds by producing a variety of mycotoxins, of which deoxynivalenol (DON) is perhaps the most famous. If present in food or feed, DON can result in serious health problems. Moreover, the seeds infected with Fusarium not only have a lower 1000 grain weight but also the present Fusarium fungi can infect the seedling after sowing, thus causing less dense plant stand due to seedling blight. The improvement of FHB resistance has become a major breeding objective worldwide. Environmental conditions have a huge influence on disease development and if prolonged humid weather persists after initial infection, severe FHB will occur. Favorable temperatures for the production of ascospores and macroconidia vary between 16°C to 36°C. Temperature and weather condition determines the severity of disease development. Individual management options are unlikely to fully protect crops from FHB, therefore multiple strategies provide the best means of maintaining yield potential, reducing the risk of mycotoxin contamination, protecting quality, and enhancing producer returns, but it is difficult due to confounding environmental conditions.

Key words: Wheat, Fusarium, Mycotoxin, Resistant, Management practices

Cite this article as: Bekele B (2018). Review on the status and management strategies of Fusarium head blight (*Fusarium graminearum*) of wheat. Acad. Res. J. Agri. Sci. Res. 6(2): 77-88

INTRODUCTION

Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) is counted among the most commonly cultivated cereal crops with over 600 million tons harvested each year (Priyamvada *et al.*, 2011). It was cultivated over a wide range of climates with year round production about 10,000 years ago as part of the

Neolithic revolution that was distinguished as a period of transition from hunting and gathering food to one of settlement and agriculture (Gupta *et al.*, 2006). Wheat is well adapted to harsh environments, from severe dry to cold conditions, compared to other major cereal crops

(Schery, 1969). The center of origin of wheat is presumed to be near present day Turkey. Findings suggest that wheat was grown in the Nile Valley around 500 B.C. and had extended through India, China, and England during the same time (Schery, 1969).

It is ranked as the 3rd largest grain crop after corn and rice in terms of world production (653 million MT annually) (FAO, 2012a). China, India, USA, Russia, and France are the leading wheat producing countries; the US ranks third among these (FAO, 2012b). The US is the largest exporter of wheat in the world, which exports 50% of its total annual production (FAO, 2012d).

Ethiopia is the 2nd largest producer of wheat in Sub-Saharan Africa. In Ethiopia, it is one of the major cereal crops grown between 6 and 14°N latitudes; and between 35 and 42°E longitude ranging in altitude from 1500 m to 3200 m. The most suitable regions, however, fall between 1900 masl and 2700 masl. It is the fourth most important cereal crop in Ethiopia. In area of production, it ranks 4th after teff, maize and sorghum and in total grain production, it also ranks 4th after maize, teff and sorghum. In productivity, it ranks second to maize. It is an important crop commodity, which could contribute a major part in achieving the country's agricultural policy objective of food grain self-sufficiency.

The current total area of production of both durum (*Triticum turgidum* var. *durum*) and bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) is about 1,627,647.16 ha with an annual production of 34,347,061.22 quintals (CSA, 2012/2013). Its productivity (21.10 q/ha) is still below the world average (65.5 q/ha) (FAO, 2013).

Wheat is used for consumption by both humans and animals (Han *et al.*, 2005). From direct use, wheat provides more than 35% of dietary calories in the developing world and 74% in the developed countries (Shiferaw *et al.*, 2013). The most important constraints affecting wheat production include drought, diseases, insects and weeds. One of the major limiting factors in wheat production is diseases, decreasing the yield, quality and profitability for producers. Fusarium head blight (FHB or scab) is common and damaging fungal disease of cereals that causes losses in grain yield and quality and contaminates harvested grain with mycotoxins (Buerstmayr *et al.*, 2003). It can cause yield losses up to 70% under favourable conditions (Bai *et al.*, 2000). FHB, white heads and pink mold, is mainly caused by, *Fusarium graminearum* Schw., with perfect stage of *Gibberella zeae* (Schw.) Petch., Seventeen different *Fusarium* species have been associated with the disease. Among these, *Fusarium graminearum* is the most internationally predominate, which is followed by *F. culmorum* (W.G. Smith) Saccardo and *F. avenaceum* (Parry *et al.*, 1995; Ruckenbauer *et al.*, 2001).

FHB is an important disease throughout the wheat growing areas of the world. The disease is more severe

when wheat is sown in the residue from a previous host crop such as maize (*Zea mays* L.), followed by warm humid conditions during flowering. It was first reported in 1884 in England (Arthur, 1891) and was recognized as a key problem of wheat during the early twentieth century (Stack, 2003) and it is one of the most destructive diseases of wheat worldwide (Osborne and Stein, 2007).

The importance of *Fusarium* species is related not only to the diseases produced to infected plants but also to mycotoxin biosynthesis (trichothecenes) and accumulation in infected plant material. *F. graminearum* strains usually express one of three sets of trichothecenes – nivalenol and its derivatives (NIV chemotype), DON and 15-acetyl deoxynivalenol (15-ADON chemotype), and DON and 3-acetyl deoxynivalenol (3-ADON chemotype) (Ward *et al.* 2002). The disease negatively affects yield and grain quality by damaging wheat kernels and contaminating the grain with mycotoxins (Gilbert and Tekauz, 2000).

Moisture appears to be the most important environmental factor influencing the severity of infection caused by *F. graminearum* in small grain cereals, given that fusarium head blight development can occur at temperatures that range from approximately 9°C to 30° C (de Wolf *et al.*, 2000). Generally, the disease is more important in warm and humid areas (Dubin *et al.*, 1996). In the field, (FHB) is recognized by premature bleaching of infected spikelet and the production of orange, spore bearing structures called sporodochia at the base of the glumes. During wet weather, there may be whitish, occasionally pinkish, fluffy fungal growth on the infected heads in the field

To minimize the severity and incidence of FHB and DON content different management strategies, Cultural practices (tillage, rotation, nutrient management), Host plant resistance, Biological control (Trichoderma, Bacillus) (Da Luz *et al.*, 2003) Fungicides (Prothioconazole, Tebuconazole) (Baturu Ciesniewska *et al.*, 2011) are recommended.

OBJECTIVES

- ✓ Review on the impact of Fusarium head blight on wheat grain and quality.
- ✓ Review on the management strategies of fusarium head blight

DISCUSSION

Distribution

F. graminearum is cosmopolitan. It has been reported wherever wheat is grown (Goswami and Kistler, 2004),




Figure 1. Macroconidia of *F. graminearum*

Source: M S Saharan *et.al.*, 2001.

and infection has reached epidemic proportions in the United States over the last decade (O'Donnell *et al.*, 2000). *Fusarium graminearum* persists within all of central Europe and south western Russia, and infects wheat fields grown along the eastern coast of China, and further inland where irrigation is used (Hope 2005; Qu *et al.*, 2008). It is also one of the important diseases of wheat in Ethiopia (Mengistu *et al.*, 1991). The incidence and severity of Fusarium head blight (also called *Gibberella zeae*) has increased worldwide (Xu, 2003).

Causal agent

Cultural characteristics

F. graminearum in agar culture appears gray, pink, brown, or burgundy. The temperature optimum for growth in culture ranges from 23-29^o C.

Microscopic structure

F. graminearum produces asexual spores known as macroconidia. It is slender, thick-walled, curved to straight, tapered at both ends, with five to seven septa or partitions (figure 1). Globes chlamydospores (thick-walled asexual resting spores) are produced mainly in macroconidia, but may also form in mycelia. Chlamydospores are one means by which *F. graminearum* survives unfavorable conditions.

The sexual stage of *F. graminearum* (*G. zeae*) produces perithecia (sexual fruiting structures) superficially on wheat heads. Perithecia are dark purple or black and form abundantly on corn stable as well as in culture perithecia can survive for more than 16 months on corn and wheat residue under field conditions. Within the perithecia, ascospores (sexual spores) develop within sacks known as asci (singular: ascus).

Host Range

F. graminearum survives on a wide range of hosts including not only living plants such as wheat, barley, oat, rye, corn, soybean, sorghum, rice, wild grasses and common weeds but also on dead tissue of many plant species (Xu YG, Chen LF. 1993). Crop residues on the soil surface are the major reservoir of pathogens of FHB (Shaner GE. 2003). It can also cause disease in *Acacia* (Mill.), *Eucalyptus*, and carnation (*Dianthus caryophyllus* L.), (Urban, M., *et.al*, 2003).

Disease development/ cycle

F. graminearum overwinters as chlamydospores or mycelia in the soil or in host crop residues which serve as a source of primary (initial) inoculum in the spring. The fungus also can survive on wheat seed. *F. graminearum*, mycelium on crop debris produces sticky ascospores or macroconidia (Leplat *et al.*, 2012). By means of wind, rain, insects or rain splash, it reaches and infects the wheat ears (Goswami & Kistler, 2004; Shaner, 2003). Infections occur mostly during anthesis (stage at which anther rupture and shed pollen during flowering), partly because pollen and anthers serve as a food base for the germinating spores. During warm temperature and wet conditions, blight symptoms develop within two to four days after infection. Apparently healthy crop will shows symptoms suddenly. (Figure 2)

Symptoms

On immature wheat heads (spikes), one or more spikelet or the entire head appears prematurely whitened or bleached. Initial symptoms generally are visible near the middle of the head on the first florets but can occur anywhere on the head. Soon after infection, dark-brown, water-soaked spots appear on the glumes of infected




Figure.2. Disease cycle of *F. graminearum*
Source: Leplat *et al.*, 2012.

florets. Later, entire florets become blighted. The dark brown symptoms usually extend into the rachis, even down into the stem tissue as the fungus spreads within a spike. The clogging of vascular tissues in the rachis can cause the head to ripen prematurely, so that even grains not directly infected will be shriveled owing to a shortage of water and nutrients (Bai GH. 1994). The bleached heads are readily visible in a green field. Partial bleaching of wheat head is a diagnostic symptom of FHB. Infection of the stem (peduncle) immediately below the head also may occur, causing a brown or purple discoloration. If the peduncle is infected early, the entire head becomes sterile. The fungus sporulates on infected spikelet and glumes during prolonged wet weather. This results in pink to salmon-orange spore masses, also diagnostic of FHB. Bleached spikelets are sterile or contain kernels that are shriveled and/or appear chalky white or pink. These kernels are often referred to as fusarium damaged kernels (FDK), scabby kernels, or tombstones. Apparently healthy kernels also may be infected, especially if infection occurred late in kernel development.

Economic importance

Effect on yield

FHB can cause substantial economic losses. It can cause yield losses up to 70% under favorable conditions. Losses result from shriveled kernels with lighter weight (Bai *et al.*, 2000). In 1917, FHB caused losses estimated at 288,000 metric tons (10.6 million bushels) in 31 out of

40 states surveyed (Atanasof, 1920). In Paraguay the weather conditions in 1972 – 1975 favored FHB epidemics and accounted for losses up to 70% (Windels, 2000). To date, FHB continues to cause significant economic losses in the U.S. and other parts of the world. Epidemics of FHB result in devastating economic losses to the wheat industry and this suggests a need for more resistance sources (McMullen *et al.*, 1997). (Table 1)

Effect on grain quality

Grain shriveling

The extent of damage to kernels depends on disease severity on wheat heads. Higher disease severity results in a larger extent of damage to kernels. Rubella and Kistler (2004) stated that toxin effects cause problems in marketing and processing of infected wheat grain. These significantly reduces milling quality by lowering flour yield and baking quality, increasing ash content, discoloring flour, and causing odors. The loaves of bread made with fusarium damaged wheat have an open texture and reduced volume, along with an ugly gray/ green cast. Human consumption of wheat or wheat products contaminated with high levels of DON may result in flu like symptoms, including fever, headaches, and vomiting (McCormick, 2003; Gale, 2003).

Mycotoxin

In addition to lowering grain yield and quality, *F. graminearum* is one of the group of fusarium species that

Table 1.Yield loss attributed by FHB

Country	Yield loss	Reference
USA	18.5%	Windels, (2000)
South Africa	40%	Kriel & Pretorius, (2008)
Paraguay	70%	Windels, (2000)
Uruguay	80%	Cludad Obregon, (1985)
Ethiopia	60%	Cludad Obregon, (1985)

Table 2. Deoxynivalenol (DON) Advisory Levels

Maximum Allowable DON Level	Consumer
1ppm	Humans
5ppm	Swine and all animal species (except cattle and poultry). Not to exceed 20% diet for swine and 40% for other animals
10ppm	Ruminating beef and feedlot cattle older than 4 months and poultry. Not to exceed 50% of diet.

Source: FDA advisories, 1982 & 1993.

produces mycotoxins. The primary mycotoxin associated with FHB is deoxynivalenol (DON). Human consumption of wheat or wheat products contaminated with high levels of DON may result in flu like symptoms, including fever, headaches, and vomiting. Livestock may refuse to eat contaminated grain, which reduces weight gain (Tuite *et al.* 1990). Other mycotoxins associated with *F. graminearum* include, nivalenol (NIV) and T-2 toxin (McCormick, 2003; Gale, 2003). DON may frequently present at high concentrations, as high as 20 ppm in wheat. A recommended tolerance level of 1 ppm DON in grains for human use has been set by several countries, including the USA (Chu, 1997). An increase in mycotoxin content may even occur in postharvest if grain is inappropriately stored (Pirgozliev *et al.*, 2003). The toxins can also be leached out from infected plants by free water, possibly causing aquatic environmental pollution (Gautam & Dill-Macky, 2012). The United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has established some advisory levels for DON in food products for human consumption and feed grain feed to livestock (Table 2)

Germination

Use of FHB infected seeds without treatment results in lower plant densities (Gilbert *et al.*, 1997; Bechtel *et al.*, 1985) due to a loss of viability, reduced emergence and

post emergence seedling blight (Jones, 1999).

DISEASE CONTROL

Cultural practices

Tillage

Crop residues and weeds spp. (mainly quack grass, ragweed, buckwheat and mustards) left on the soil surface, enables the pathogen to over winter and these can therefore act as a source of inoculum. Hence, any tillage practices that bury, destroy or promote faster decomposition of residue from a host crop will reduce the potential inoculum for future host crop (McMullen & Stack, 1999). Where reduced tillage practices are used, maize residue is still abundant during the second spring after harvest of the maize crop, because maize residue lasts much longer than residue of small grains (Shaner, 2003).

Abundance of inoculum depends on how long the residue remains intact after harvest of the crop and how well the fungi survive in this residue (Shaner, 2003). To control FHB, early ploughing of cereal stubble and volunteer plants should be carried out wherever possible, since perithecia can only release inoculum from infested residue that is retained on the soil surface (Cook, 1981).

Table 3. *F. graminearum* colonies on per square meter of soil for different tillage systems

Treatment	FHB Incidence	DON level (ppm)
Mold Board Plough	63.5a	1 ppm
Chisel ploughing	71.8b	5 ppm
No tillage	70.8c	10 ppm

Source: Dill-Macky, 2010.

Table 4. Effect of nitrogen fertilizer on FHB of wheat

Varieties	Amount of fertilizer applied (kg/ha)	Average number of infected ears on 5m ²
Etida	150	17.3a
	100	15ab
	50	10.7c
	Control	10.3cd
Zvezdana	150	16.7a
	100	19.0a
	50	21.3a
	control	8.3b

Source: Martin *et al.*, (1991)

Table 5. Frequency of fusarium head blight as influenced by crop rotation

Factor	No. of fields	Mean number of heads with symptoms per/100,000 plants
Previous crop		
Corn	36%	15.1a
Soybean	5.2%	7.1b
Wheat	7.2%	2.3b

Source: Schaafsma *et al.*, 2001.

Jenkinson & Parry (1994) recognized the importance of weed control, especially annual broad-leaved weeds, as they suggested that a rise in FHB incidence is evident with increasing weed populations.

Plant High quality Seed

Infested seed may be an additional source of inoculum. Planting high quality seed can minimize seedling blight. *F. graminearum* in or on buried seed may survive for at least 16 months (Inch and Gilbert, 2003a). However, a dry heat treatment of 70⁰ C for 5 days was found to be an effective method of eradicating *F. graminearum* and other from wheat and barley seed (Gilbert *et al.*, 2005; Tekauz *et al.*, 2004).

Nutrient Status

Increasing fertilizer Nutrients application in the soil increases the FHB. Optimizing the use of nitrogen (N) might contribute to the control of FHB. Martin *et al.* (1991) observed that increasing N from 70 to 170 kg/ha significantly increased the incidence of Fusarium infected

grain in wheat. Also Milev *et al.*, (2008) reported FHB being promoted by addition of inorganic fertilizer (120 kg N and P ha⁻¹) compared with non-fertilized controls.

Rotation

Fusarium graminearum is not host specific and can be isolated from many species (Inch and Gilbert, 2003a; Pereyra and Dill-Macky 2008). A rotation involving maize, also a host of *F. graminearum*, should be avoided (Teich and Nelson, 1984; Krebs *et al.*, 2000; Schaafsma, 2001). Dill-Macky and Jones (2000) demonstrated a small but significant decrease in FHB severity and DON after planting wheat into soybean residues compared to residues of wheat or maize. Similarly, in a Swiss study, significantly less FHB developed on wheat sown into oilseed rape residues compared to maize residues (Krebs *et al.*, 2000). (Table 5)

Resistance

Breeding for resistance has been accepted as the most

Table 6. Types of resistance for FHB

Type	Description
I	Resistance to initial infection (incidence)
II	Resistance to the spread of the fungus within the plant (severity)
III	Resistance to kernel infection. The rates of seed infection can differ at a given level of resistance as measured by disease severity
IV	Resistance against toxin accumulation disease
V	Tolerance to FHB where tolerant wheat maintain yield

Source: Mesterházy, *et al.* 2003.

reliable strategy to minimize losses in yield and quality (Anderson *et al.*, 2001). This is mainly due to the difficulties related to the necrotrophic nature of pathogen and the particular pattern of pathogenicity. The resistance is multigenic and expression of resistance is dependent on the genetic background of the germplasm. Five resistance mechanisms to FHB in wheat were discussed by Mesterhazy (1995) with type I representing defence to first disease attack, type II representing defence to colonization, type III representing defense for accumulation of mycotoxins, type IV representing defence for kernel infection and type V representing tolerance. Availability of resistance genes for breeding FHB resistant cultivars can reduce losses to FHB disease (Shen *et al.*, 2003).

Type I resistance works against initial infection and is usually measured by the number of infected spikelet (Buerstmayr *et al.*, 2003). The most widely used defense mechanism is type II because it is easy to evaluate under monitored environments (Shi *et al.*, 2008). Other types of resistance are known to be present and protect some wheat lines despite the presence of FHB (McMullen *et al.*, 2008). According to Gilbert and Tekauz (2000) resistance types III, IV and V are difficult to manipulate and/or expensive to screen for and are not being used that often in breeding programs.

FHB resistance is a quantitative trait in wheat and is affected by environmental effects such as temperature, humidity, plant development stage and abundance of inoculum (Parry *et al.*, 1995; Ma *et al.*, 2006). The use of quantitative trait loci (QTL) analysis which identifies regions of the genome responsible for conferring resistance, has revealed that most QTLs explain a relatively small proportion of the variance associated with FHB disease traits (Buerstmayr *et al.*, 2009; Miedaner *et al.*, 2009).

Biological control

Several microbial antagonists of *F. graminearum* have been identified which combined with chemical fungicides

to reduce the amount of infection and DON contamination (Da Luz *et al.*, 2003). Microorganisms with potential to control *F. graminearum* on wheat include bacteria such as *Bacillus* spp., yeasts, *Cryptococcus* spp. and filamentous fungi, *Trichoderma* spp. (Gilbert & Tekauz, 2000; Jochum & Yuen, 2001). Other strategies for biological control include the disruption of the fungal life cycle. Biological interventions must be aimed at disruption of spikelet infection and the movement of *Fusarium* within the rachis and reducing the survival of the fungus in cereal debris with subsequent ascospore production (Da Luz *et al.*, 2003). The fungus, *Clonostachys rosea* (Link:Fr.) Schroers, Samuels, Serfert and Gams (syn. *Gliocladium roseum* Bainier) has been shown to reduce FHB severity by 58%, FDK by 49% and DON by 21%. (Table 7)

Fungicide

Fungicide application is one measure available to reduce the risk (Horsley *et al.*, 2006, Baturu Ciesniewska *et al.*, 2011). Application of fungicides at flowering stage seems to be the best time for the reduction of Fusarium infection (Müllenborn *et al.* 2007). Triazole fungicides (tebuconazole and metconazole) were shown to be effective in reducing both FHB and DON production (Jennings *et al.* 2000, Edwards *et al.* 2001). Pirgozliev *et al.*, (2002) also showed a great reduction in FHB and DON in grain treated with metconazole, which indicates that this fungicide is very effective against *F. graminearum*. (Table 8)

Integrated disease management

The best approach to managing FHB is to integrate multiple strategies (Mesterházy, 2003; Gilbert & Tekauz, 2011) genetic resistance, cultural practices including crop rotation, tillage, seed treatment, fungicide application and biological control agents are recommended. Practices for suppressing initial inoculum, especially rotation of wheat with non-host crops like rape and soya bean and

Table 7. Effect of antagonistic microorganisms on colony size, head blight severity and kernel weight for *F. graminearum* in culture and when inoculated on to wheat ears.

Bio control	% Colony reduction	% FHB Severity reduction	%Kernel weight reduction	%DON content
Fusarium + Alternaria	51.5	76.0	44.7	91.4
Fusarium+ Epiccocum	45.5	72.3	43.5	15.5
Fusarium+ Trichoderma	64.1	59.7	41.0	113.8
Fusarium+ Bacillus	52.0	80.5	44.7	69.0
Fusarium+ Folicur	100.0	39.9	19.5	93.1
Fusarium + copper	100.0	52.9	26.1	76.7
Control	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00

Source: Müllenborn, *et al.*, 2007.

Table 8. Effects of Fungicides on FHB and DON

Cultivar	Fungicide treatment	FHB		DON (mg kg ⁻¹)
		Incidence %	Severity %	
Common wheat	control	81.2c	73.7c	13.39c
	Prothioconazole	26.0a	26.2a	2.06a
	Prothioconazole + tebuconazole	23.8a	25.6a	2.29a
	Tebuconazole	48.2b	33.8ab	5.60ab
	Cyproconazole + prochloraz	43.5b	41.2b	5.92 b

Reference: Miriam Haidukowski¹, 2012.

Table 9. Effect of integrated management strategies (varietal selection, rotation, fungicide) on FHB severity, (DON) accumulation and yield of durum wheat

Integrated practices	FHB Severity%	DON ppm	Yield tonnes/ha
✂	34	3.0	3.3
❖	13	2.3	4.1
➤	6	1.9	4.2
◆	4	1.1	4.6

- ✂ Susceptible 'Monroe' durum planted in to wheat stubble
- ❖ Susceptible 'Monroe' durum planted in to Canola stubble
- Moderately resistant 'Divide' durum planted into Canola stubble
- ◆ Moderately resistant 'Divide' durum planted into Canola Stubble and treated with foliar fungicide Prosaro (prothioconazole+ tebuconazole)

Source: McMullen, 2008.

ploughing infected residues are advised for managing FHB. The most promising results have been observed under natural conditions by McMullen *et al.*, (2008) who demonstrated the incremental benefits of multiple

strategies (varietal resistance, rotation and fungicide application) in reducing FHB severity and DON accumulation (Table 9).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

Fusarium head blight is one of the economically devastating diseases of wheat in the world. Fusarium diseases of wheat cause significant losses worldwide and therefore are the most important factor in quality and economy sector. FHB is a difficult disease to manage so it is imperative to prevent the disease from becoming established in a field. Minimizing FHB can only be achieved through an integrated approach including cultivation practices, fungicide application and the use of resistant cultivars. However, more complete understanding of the pathogen and host mechanisms of resistance is certainly needed. The reduction of diseases and mycotoxin content in wheat is possible through the use of specific fungicides; however that does not guarantee complete elimination of the pathogen. Furthermore, pathogen populations may be resistant towards certain fungicides. Therefore, appropriate, efficient and environmentally friendly control measures to lessen such stresses need to be applied. Because of the economic importance of Fusarium infections and difficulty in FHB prevention, it is necessary to acquire profound understanding of the action mode of both the pathogens and the protective measures. This issue requires further study on the use of innovative methods of control. Best management practices for FHB include:

1. Use a tolerant variety
2. Under severe disease conditions even tolerant varieties will need fungicide application to Achieve acceptable control. Protect the flower from spore (conidia) infection by using a fungicide
3. Suspend irrigation prior to flowering until anthesis. This reduces spore dissemination from in crop residue.
4. Use tillage to incorporate the infected straw and destroy residue-borne inoculum.
5. If grain lots are identified with DON levels greater than 1 ppm, removal of the light weight infected kernels will often reduce DON levels.

REFERENCES

- Anderson JA, Stack RW, Liu S, Waldron BL, Fjeld AD, Coyne C, Moreno-Sevilla B, Mitchell Fetch J, Song QJ, Cregan PB, Frohberg RC (2001). DNA markers for Fusarium head blight resistance QTLs in two wheat populations. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* 102:1164-1168
- Arthur JC (1891). Wheat scab; Indian Agr.Expt.Sta. Bull. 36
- Saharan M S, Kmar J, Sharma A K and Nagarajan S (2001). Pathogenic variation among Fusarium spp. Associated with head scab of wheat in Indian J.Agril Sci.73 322-326'
- Atanasoff D (1920). Fusarium head blight (scab) of wheat and other cereals. *Journal of Agricultural Research* XX:1-32.
- Bai GH, Shaner G, Ohm H (2000). Inheritance of resistance to *Fusarium graminearum* in wheat. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* 100:1-8
- Bai GH, Shaner GE (1994). Wheat scab: perspective and control. *Plant Dis.* 78: 760–66
- Baturo Cieřniewska A, Łukanowski A, Kolenda M (2011). Effect of fungicide application on wheat head blight, occurrence of Fusarium spp. and mycotoxin production. *Plant Breeding and Seed Science*63: 29-38.
- Bechtel, D.B., Kaleikau, L.A., Gaines, R.L., and Seitz, LM (1985). The effects of Fusarium graminearum infection on wheat kernels. *Cereal Chem.* 62: 191–197.
- Buerstmayr H, Steiner B, Hartl L, Griesser M, Doldi L (2003). Molecular mapping of QTLs for *Fusarium* head blight resistance in spring wheat. II. Resistance to fungal penetration and spread. *Theor. Appl. Genet.* 107:503–8
- Buerstmayr H, Ban T, Anderson JA (2009). QTL mapping and marker-assisted selection for Fusarium head blight resistance in wheat: a review. *Plant Breeding* 128:1-26
- Buerstmayr H, Steiner B, Hartl L, Griesser M, Doldi L (2003). Molecular mapping of QTLs for Fusarium head blight resistance in spring wheat. II. Resistance to fungal penetration and spread. *Theor. Appl. Genet.*107:503–8
- Chu F S (1997). Trichothecene mycotoxin. In: *Encyclopedia of Human Biology*, second edition, vol.8, pp. 511-522 Academic press.
- Kriel, W.M. & Pretorius ZA (2008). The FHB challenge to irrigation wheat production in South Africa. *Cereal Research Communications* 36:569-571.
- Cook RJ (1981). Fusarium diseases in The People's Republic of China. Pages 53-55 in: *Fusarium: Diseases, Biology and Taxonomy*. P.E. Nelson, T.A. Toussoun & R.J. Cook, eds. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Da Luz, W.C., Stockwell, C.A. & Bergstrom GC (2003). Biological control of Fusarium graminearum. Pages 381-394 in: *Fusarium Head Blight of wheat and barley*. K.J. Leonard & W.R. Bushnell, eds. APS Press.
- De Wolf, E. D., Madden, L. V. & Lipps PE (2003). Risk assessment models for wheat Fusarium head blight epidemics based on within-season weather data, *Phytopathology*, Vol. 93, No. 4., pp. 428-435, ISSN 0031-949X.
- Dill-Macky (2010). *Fusarium head blight (scab), Compendium of Wheat Diseases and Pests*, APS Press, pp. 34-36, ISBN 978-0-89054-385-6 , St. Paul, Minnesota, USA.

- Dubin, H.J., L. Gilchrist, J. Reeves and A. McNab (1996). *Fusarium Head Scab: Global Status and Future Prospects*. CIMMYT, Mexico, D.F., pp:130.
- Edwards, S.G., Pirgozliev, S.R., Hare, M.C., & Jenkinson P (2001). Quantification of trichothecene producing *Fusarium* species in harvested grain by competitive PCR to determine efficacies of fungicides against *Fusarium* head blight of winter wheat. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*, 67, 1575–1580.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization) (2012a). Top ten commodities-2010. Source: http://faostat3.fao.org/home/index.html#VISUALIZE_TOP_20. Accessed on 10/17/2012.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization) (2012b). Countries by commodity (wheat). Top 10 countries (2010). Source: http://faostat3.fao.org/home/index.html#VISUALIZE_TOP_20. Accessed on 10/17/2012.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization) (2012d). Top exports – United States of America- 2009. Source: <http://faostat.fao.org/site/342/default.aspx>. Accessed on 8/22/2012.
- Gale L R (2003). Population biology of *Fusarium* species causing head blight of grain crops, *Fusarium Head Blight of Wheat and Barley*, APS Press, pp. 120-143, ISBN 0-89054-302-X, St. Paul, Minnesota, USA.
- FAO (2014). FAOSTAT. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy.
- CSA (Central Statistical Agency) of Ethiopia (2012/13). Agricultural Sample Survey report on area and production of major crops (Private peasant holdings, meher season). Statistical Bulletin, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Gautam P and Dill-Macky R (2012). Free Water Can Leach Mycotoxins from *Fusarium*-infected Wheat Heads. *Journal of Phytopathology* 160 (9): 484-490.
- Gilbert J and Tekauz A (2000). Review: Recent developments in research on *Fusarium* head blight in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Plant Pathology* 22:1-8.
- Gilbert J, SM. Woods, TK. Turkington, and A Tekauz (2005). Effect of heat treatment to control *Fusarium graminearum* in wheat seed. *Can. J. Plant Pathol.* 27:448–452.
- Gilbert J, Fedak G, Procnier JD, Aung T, Tekauz A (1997). Strategies for breeding for resistance to *Fusarium* head blight in Canadian spring wheat. See Ref. 44, pp. 47–51.
- Gilbert, J. & Tekauz A (2011). Strategies for management of fusarium head blight (FHB) in cereals. *Prairie Soils Crops*, 4, 97–104.
- Goswami RS and Corby Kistler H (2004). Heading for disaster: *Fusarium graminearum* on cereal crops. *Mol Plant Pathol* 5(6):515–525.
- Gupta SK, Charpe A, Prabhu K, Haque Q (2006). Identification and validation of molecular markers linked to the leaf rust resistance gene *Lr19* in wheat. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* 113:1027-1036.
- Han FP, Fedak G, Ouellet T, Dan H, Somer DJ (2005). Mapping of genes expressed in *Fusarium graminearum* infected heads of wheat cultivar Frontana. *Genome* 48:88-96.
- Hope R., Aldred D., Magan N (2005). Comparison of environmental profiles for growth and deoxynivalenol production by *Fusarium culmorum* and *F. graminearum* on wheat grain. *Letters in Applied Microbiology*, 40: 295–300.
- Horsley, R.D., J.D. Pederson, P.B. Schwarz, K. McKay, M.R. Hochhalter, and M.P. McMullen (2006). Integrated use of tebuconazole and *Fusarium* head blight-resistant barley genotypes. *Agron. J.* 98:194-197.
- Inch, S. and J Gilbert (2003a). The incidence of *Fusarium* species recovered from inflorescences of wild grasses in southern Manitoba. *Can. J. Plant Pathol.* 25:379–383.
- Jenkinson, P. & Parry DW (1994). Isolation of *Fusarium* species from common broad-leaved weeds and their pathogenicity to winter wheat. *Mycological Research* 98:776 –780.
- Jennings P, Turner JA, Nicholson P (2000). Overview of *Fusarium* head blight in the UK – effect of fungicide treatment on disease control and mycotoxin production. In: *Proceedings of The Brighton Crop Protection Conference – Pests and Diseases* (pp 707-712) British Crop Protection Council, Farham, UK.
- Jochum C.C., & Yuen GY (2001). Potential for biological control of *Fusarium* Head Blight by *Lysobacter* sp. strain C3. Page 64 in: [Proc.] 2001 National *Fusarium* Head Blight Forum, 8-10 December 2001, Erlanger, KY.
- Jones RK (1999). Seedling blight development and control in spring wheat damaged by *Fusarium graminearum* group 2. *Plant disease* 83, 1013-1018.
- Krebs H, Streit B and Forrer HR (2000). Effect of tillage and preceding crops on *Fusarium* infection and deoxynivalenol content of wheat. *Proceedings 13th International Federation of Organic Agricultural Movements*. Basel, Switzerland, August 28-31, 2000.
- Kriel, W.M. & Pretorius, Z.A. 2008. The FHB challenge to irrigation wheat production in South Africa. *Cereal Research Communications* 36:569-571. Supplement B.
- Leplat J, Friberg H, Abid M, Steinberg C (2012). Survival of *Fusarium graminearum*, the causal agent of *Fusarium* head blight. A review *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, 33, 97-111.
- Ma HX, Zhang KM, Gao L, Bai GH, Chen HG, Cai ZX, Lu WZ (2006). Quantitative trait loci for resistance to *Fusarium* head blight and deoxynivalenol accumulation in Wangshuibai wheat under field conditions. *Plant Pathology* 55:739-745.
- McMullen M, Jones R, and Gallenberg D (1997). Scab of

- wheat and barley: a re-emerging disease of devastating impact. *Plant Dis.* 81: 1340-1348.
- Martin RA, MacLeod JA, Caldwell C (1991). Influence of production inputs on incidence of infection by *Fusarium* species on cereal seed. *Plant Dis.* 75: 784–788.
- McCormick S (2003). The role of DON in pathogenicity, *Fusarium* Head Blight of Wheat and Barley, APS Press, pp. 165-183, ISBN 0-89054-302-X, St. Paul, Minnesota, USA.
- McMullen M, Zhong S, Neate S (2008). *Fusarium* head blight (Scab) of small grains. *Plant diseases management*, North Dakota State University Extension Service, pp 804
- McMullen MP & Stack RW (1999). *Fusarium* head blight (scab) of small grains. Bulletin no 804, Extension Service, North Dakota State University.
- Mengistu Huluka, Getaneh woldeab, Yeshaneh Adinew, Ribika Desta and Ayele bodebo (1991). Wheat pathology research in Ethiopia. In Hailu gebre mikaele, B.T Tonner & Mengistu huluka (edu.) wheat research in Ethiopia historical perspective. Pp. 173-217, EAR/CIMMYT, AA Ethiopia.
- Mesterhazy A, J. Bartok and C. Lamper (2003). Influence of wheat cultivars, species of *Fusarium* and isolate aggressiveness on the efficacy of fungicides for control of FHB. *Plant Disease* 87: 110- 115.
- Pirgozliev SR, Edwards SG, Hare MC, Jenkinson P (2002). Effect of dose rate of azoxystrobin and metconazole on the development of *Fusarium* head blight and the accumulation of deoxynivalenol (DON) in wheat grain. *European Journal of Plant Pathology* 108: 469-478.
- Miedaner T, Wilde F, Korzun V, Ebmeyer E, Shmolke M, Hartl L, Schön CC (2009.) Marker selection for *Fusarium* head blight resistance based on quantitative trait loci (QTL) from two European sources compared to phenotypic selection in winter wheat. *Euphytica* 166:219-227
- Miriam Haidukowski (2012). Effect of prothioconazole-based fungicides on *Fusarium* head blight, grain yield and deoxynivalenol accumulation in wheat under field conditions.
- Mullenborn C, U. Steiner and EC. Oerke (2007). Effect of fungicides on *Fusarium* head scab and saprophytic fungi on wheat. 15th International Symposium on Modern Fungicides and Antifungal Compounds, 6-10 May, Ramada Treff Hotel.
- O'Donnell K, Kistler H.C, Tacke B.K, Casper H.H, (2000). Gene genealogies reveal global phylogeographic structure and reproductive isolation among lineages of *Fusarium graminearum*, the fungus causing wheat scab. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 97: 7905-7910.
- Osborne L E and Stein JM (2007). Epidemiology of *Fusarium* head blight on small-grain cereals. *Int. J. Food microbiol.* 119:103-108.
- Parry DW, Jenkinson P & McLeod L (1995). *Fusarium* ear blight (scab) in small grain cereals a review. *Plant Pathology* 44:207-238.
- Pereyra SA. and R. Dill-Macky (2008). Colonization of the residues of diverse plant species by *Gibberella zeae* and their contribution to *Fusarium* head blight inoculum. *Plant Dis.* 92:800-807.
- Pirgozliev SR, Edwards SG, Hare MC and Jenkinson P (2003). Strategies for the control of *Fusarium* head blight in cereals. *European Journal of Plant Pathology* 109 (7): 731-742.
- Priyamvada M, Saharan S, Tiwari R (2011). Durable resistance in wheat. *International Journal of Genetics and Molecular Biology* 3:108-114
- Qu B, Li H.P, Zhang J.B, Huang T, Carter J, Liao Y.C, and Nicholson P (2008). Comparison of genetic diversity and pathogenicity of *Fusarium* head blight pathogens from China and Europe by SSCP and seedling assays on wheat. *Plant Pathol.* 57: 642-651.
- Rubella SG, Kistler CH (2004). Pathogen profile heading for disaster: *Fusarium graminearum* on cereal crops. *Molecular Plant Pathology* 5:515-525.
- Ruckenbauer P, Buerstmayr H & Lemmens M (2001). Present strategies in resistance breeding against scab (*Fusarium* spp., *Euphytica*, Vol. 119, pp. 121-127, ISSN 0014-2336.
- Dill-Micky R and Jones R K (2000). The effect of the previous crop residues and tillage on *Fusarium* head blight of wheat; *plant Dis.* 84:71-76.
- Schaafsma A (2001). Agronomic considerations for reducing deoxynivalenol in wheat grain. *Can. J. Plant Pathol.* 23:279-285.
- Schery R W (1969). Food crops: cereals, legumes, forages. Pages 349-386 in: *Plant Science, an Introduction to World Crops*. J. Janick, R. W. Shery, F. W. Woods, and V. W. Ruttan, eds. W. H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco.
- Shaner GE (2003). Epidemiology of *Fusarium* head blight of small grain cereals in North America. See Ref. 62, pp. 84–119
- Shen X, Ittu M, Ohm HW (2003). Quantitative trait loci conditioning resistance to *Fusarium* head blight in wheat line F201R. *Crop Science* 43:850-857
- Shi JR, Xu DH, Yang HY, Lu XQ, Ban T (2008). DNA marker analysis for pyramided *Fusarium* head blight (FHB) resistance QTLs from different germplasm. *Genetica* 133:77-84
- Shiferaw B, Smale M, Braun HJ, Duveiller E, Reynolds M, Muricho G (2013). Crops that feed the world 10. Past successes and future challenges to the role played by wheat in global food security. *Food Security* 5:291-317
- Teich A, and K Nelson (1984). Survey of *fusarium* head

- blight and possible effects of cultural practices in wheat fields in Lambton County in 1983. *Can. Plant Dis. Surv.* 64:11-13.
- Tekauz A, B. McCallum, N. Ames, and J. Mitchell Fetch (2004). *Fusarium* head blight of oat – current status in western Canada. *Can. J. Plant Pathol.* 26:473-479.
- Tuite J, Shaner G, and Everson RJ (1990). Wheat scab in soft red winter wheat in Indiana in 1986 and its relation to some quality measurements. *Plant Dis.* 74:959-962.
- Urban M, Daniels S, Mott E and Hammond-Kosack KE (2003). *Arabidopsis* is susceptible to the cereal ear blight fungal pathogens *Fusarium graminearum* and *Fusarium culmorum*. *Plant Journal* 32 (6): 961–973.
- Ward TJ, Bielawski JP, Kistler H.C, Sullivan E, O'Donnell K (2002). Ancestral polymorphism and adaptive evolution in the trichothecene mycotoxin gene cluster of phytopathogenic *Fusarium*. *Proceedings of National Academy of Science USA*, 99: 9278–9283.
- Windels CE (2000). Economic and social impacts of *Fusarium* head blight: Changing farms and rural communities in the Northern Great Plains. *Phytopathology* 90:17-22.
- Xu YG, Chen LF (1993). *Wheat Scab: Theory and Practice on Control*. Nanjing, China; Jiangsu Sci.-Tech. Publ. House
- XU X (2003). Effects of environmental conditions on the development of *Fusarium* ear blight. In *European Journal of Plant Pathology*, vol. 109, no. 7, p. 683–689.