

SUSCEPTIBILITY OF TEA CLONES TO COLLAR AND BRANCH CANKER DISEASE (*PHOMOPSIS THEAE*)

N. Shanmuganathan & R. L. de Silva

Differential susceptibility of tea clones to Collar and Branch Canker Disease of tea (*Phomopsis theae* Petch) has been already established (Shanmuganathan & Rodrigo 1967). A number of clones have been under test in inoculation experiments (Kerr 1966; Shanmuganathan 1967; de Silva 1968), but these tests are still not complete. However, in order to prevent estates planting out clones known to be susceptible, the list of clones given in Table 1 should be carefully scrutinized. *It is emphasized that this list is tentative and will be amended from time to time, as more information becomes available.* The criteria used for the grouping of clones into the three categories are inoculation experiments, as well as field observations on several estates.

TABLE 1—*Tentative classification of clones on the basis of susceptibility to Collar and Branch Canker Disease*

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
(Good Resistance)	(Some Resistance)	(Poor Resistance)
TRI 777	TRI 2021	TRI 23
2023	2022	2016
2025	2027	2024
2026	2031	2151
Drayton 1	2039	Balangoda MT/BG
Gordon 7/4	2046	Craighead 13
Liddesdale 512	Diyanilakele 1	Gonamotawa 9
St Leonards 2/1	Drayton 95	Hellebodde H6A1
	Eskdale 9/5	Kandapola 9
	Kirkoswald 145	Kenilworth 16/3
	Liddesdale 470	Kirkoswald 150
	Liddesdale 990	Liddesdale 502
	Nayabedde 3	Neluwa 3/1
	St Leonards 3/2	Poronuwa 26
	16/183	St Johns 76
		Somerset E/727
		Tangakelle 2
		Queenstown 3/3

*We suggest that the clones listed in Groups 2 and 3 should not be planted in the Uva Province. Clones in Group 2 can be planted in the Dimbula and Dickoya Districts because the risk of damage is not as great as it is in Uva. No up-country estate should plant the clones listed in Group 3 with the exception of clone TRI 2024. This clone is a good all-rounder from many points of view and we do not wish to disqualify it from planting up-country on account of its susceptibility to *P. theae*. In areas where *P. theae* does not do much damage, it may be difficult to find many clones better than TRI 2024. Its use in Uva, however, is not recommended.*

Acknowledgment

The authors thank the Statistics Division for their assistance.

References

- DE SILVA, R. L. (1967). Asphyxiation of tea roots in clayey soils. *Tea Q.* **38**, 340-343.
- DE SILVA, R. L. (1968). Report of the Plant Pathology & Nematology Division *Rep. Tea Res. Inst. Ceylon for 1967* **2**, 67-87.
- DE SILVA, R. L. & SEEVARATNAM, L. A. (1968). The importance of soil air for tea root growth. *Tea Q.* **39**, 42-49.
- KERR, A. (1966). Report of the Plant Pathology Division. *Rep. Tea Res. Inst. Ceylon for 1965* **2**, 44-51.
- MULDER, D. (1962). Collar Canker in clonal plants caused by *Leptothyrium theae* Petch. *Tea Q.* **33**, 152-155
- PETCH, T. (1925). Descriptions of new Ceylon Fungi. III. *Ann. roy. bot. Gdns Peradeniya* **9**, 324.
- RODRIGO, W. R. F. (1968). Unpublished results.
- SHANMUGANATHAN, N. (1965). Collar and Branch Canker in young tea caused by *Phomopsis theae* Petch. *Tea Q.* **36**, 14-21..
- SHANMUGANATHAN, N. (1967). Report of the Plant Pathology & Nematology Division. *Rep. Tea Res. Inst. Ceylon for 1966* **2**, 48-79.
- SHANMUGANATHAN, N. & RODRIGO, W. R. F. (1966). Studies on Collar and Branch Canker of young tea (*Phomopsis theae* Petch). 1. Recent observations on disease incidence. *Tea Q.* **37**, 221-228.
- SHANMUGANATHAN, N. & RODRIGO, W. R. F. (1967a). Studies on Collar and Branch Canker of young tea (*Phomopsis theae* Petch). II. Influence of soil moisture *Tea Q.* **38**, 311-319.
- SHANMUGANATHAN, N. & RODRIGO, W. R. F. (1967b). Clonal resistance and variation in pathogenicity between isolates of *Phomopsis theae* to canker development in young tea. *Proc. Ceylon Ass. Advnc. Sci.* **23**, 25. (Abstr.)
- SHANMUGANATHAN, N. & DE SILVA, R. L. (1968). Susceptibility of tea clones to collar and Branch Canker Disease. *Tea Q.* **39**, 92-93.
- WEBSTER, B. N. (1957). Unpublished results.

(Accepted for Publication — 20th August 1968)

References

- DE SILVA, R. L. (1968). Report of the Plant Pathology and Nematology Division for 1967. *Rep. Tea Res. Inst. Ceylon* 1967 2, 67-87.
- KERR, A. (1966). Report of the Plant Pathology Division for 1965. *Rep. Tea Res. Inst. Ceylon* 1965 2, 44-51.
- SHANMUGANATHAN, N. (1967). Report of the Plant Pathology and Nematology Division for 1965. *Rep. Tea Res. Inst. Ceylon* 1966 2, 48-79.
- SHANMUGANATHAN, N. & RODRIGO, W. R. F. (1967). Clonal Resistance and variation in pathogenicity between isolates of *Phomopsis theae* to canker development in young tea. *Abstr. Proc. Ceylon Ass. Advnc. Sci.* 23, 25.

(Accepted for Publication — 31st October 1968)