

9

The Future Prospects for Fungicides and Fungal Disease Control

Key Points

- The incessant rise in food demand means that all reliable methods of crop protection must be deployed at full efficiency.
- Global warming and biosecurity failures are likely to further impact crop protection.
- Many existing fungicides are likely to be phased out due to regulatory challenges.
- Fungicide resistance demands that resistance management strategies are used – this increases the need for new actives with new MOAs.
- The pipeline for new actives is working but at ever-increasing cost. Genomics and molecular modelling are likely to have an increasing impact.
- IDM will become standard practice. Better methods to select genetically resistant crops will bear fruit.
- Transgenic (GM) methods to deliver disease resistance have not developed due to public reluctance to accept transgenic crops.
- Developing genetically modified (GM) traits to replace or more likely supplement fungicides will require a major research effort.

Food Demand and Disease Threats

The world's population is growing at a faster pace than ever before and looks set to increase until at least 2050. The population needs to be fed and needs somewhere to live. Hence more food needs to be grown on less land with less water. To reduce the levels of food insecurity that already exist in parts of the world and to prevent food deficits occurring in more productive regions, efficient and effective methods of crop production must be introduced and maintained.

There are many reasons to believe that the disease pressure on the crops will increase. Global warming will have varied and rather unpredictable effects on crop diseases (Carlton *et al.*, 2012; West *et al.*, 2012) but generally will decrease food security. Global warming and ever-increasing international travel and trade will reduce or even eliminate the power of national quarantine agencies to keep exotic pathogens out of their countries. History teaches that plant pathogenic fungi will always challenge our ability to produce food in quantity and of an acceptable quality. In adopting the highly efficient practice of crop monoculture, the risk of crop failure from plant diseases has increased from something of occasional and marginal importance that could be sustained in an unsophisticated society, to a serious and continual problem often resulting in devastating yield losses and widespread social disruption.

Although the introduction of monocultures provided crop pathogens with an ideal environment in which to multiply, the situation in some crops was exacerbated by techniques that were subsequently adopted to manage other problems. In cereals, the drive to increase yield through the use of improved varieties and higher fertilizer inputs highlighted the value of good weed control. The ensuing spiral towards higher yields through the increasing use of fertilizers and herbicides eventually hit the yield-limiting factor of plant disease. Fungicides allowed yet more fertilizer to be used, to achieve even greater yields.

The effects of crop disease cannot be trivialized because they are never far away. Current estimates suggest that without fungicides we would lose up to one-third of yield, depending on the crop. In some circumstances, total loss is possible. Even in Europe, famine and food shortage were only a few harvests ago and the threat of their return has not disappeared. This reality necessitates the use of crop protection management systems that contain fungicides as an integral component.

The development and use of fungicides in crop protection is a success story. It is a story that has developed from their earliest and crude application in agriculture and horticulture, through a series of technological evolutionary steps, to a point where products are able to exert safe, broad-spectrum control for extended periods, or to work precisely to protect against attack by specific pathogens, or even to influence the host itself to combat infection. However, the process of improvement in crop disease management continues and the next 20 years are likely to witness even greater changes in fungicide technology and use.

Loss of Existing Fungicides

We have already seen (Chapter 8) that regulations initiated in Europe have led to the withdrawal of many active compounds. The ever-tightening regulatory demands, at least in Europe, will increase the pressure on the remaining compounds. The DMI group is already under serious threat and its loss could have a massive impact on the quantity and quality of food production worldwide.

Fungicide resistance preceded the withdrawal of the MBC class of fungicides by some years. Other fungicides afflicted significantly by resistance (see Chapter 6), including the DMI, QoI, PA, CAA and SDHI groups, remain in use. Indeed, predictions that QoIs would become useless through resistance have proved very wide of the mark. Instead fungicide resistance management strategies have ensured their continued use. The strategies involved mixtures and alternations of fungicides. Hence there is a strong demand for new fungicides to fulfil roles in resistance management.

The Discovery Process

The pace of fungicide discovery shows no sign of slowing up (Chapter 4). Instead, new actives and new MOAs are being as released as fast as ever. This may be because the consolidation of fungicide discoveries into ever fewer but larger companies (Syngenta, BASF and Bayer) has increased the efficiency of the discovery processes.

Nonetheless, the low-hanging fruit have been picked. The unique biomolecules in fungi, particularly the ergosterol biosynthesis pathway, have been thoroughly

examined for fungicide targets. It seems inevitable that newer fungicides will require a more expensive discovery pathway than existing ones.

Genomics has not yet had a profound impact on the processes of fungicide discovery. However we now have the situation in which the genome sequences of all relevant organisms, both the target fungi and the non-targets, are obtained or could be with only trivial effort. It is therefore possible to imagine a genomics-led discovery process in which molecules will be designed only to bind and inhibit key enzymes in the fungi and have no effect on non-target organisms. This is theoretically more straightforward than designing a pharmaceutical for a non-infectious human disease. Such a development would require a major effort in genomics and automated protein structure prediction.

Genetic Disease Control

Crop diseases are exceptional events, as all plants have natural defence systems to repel most fungal challenges. Molecular plant breeding allows breeders to combine in one cultivar all the best alleles of disease resistance genes as well as other desirable traits, as long as markers for the genes of interest have been discovered. Despite the fact that genome sequences for many major crops are now available, this process has not progressed as fast as was predicted and, to date, only major resistance gene markers are in general use. The quantitative and minor genes typical of so many resistance phenotypes have been harder to pin down. Developing the understanding of pathogenicity mechanisms in more fungi and better genomic resources for more crops will accelerate this process.

Transgenic (GM) Disease Control

Mechanisms that permit the transfer of alien genes into plants have been available for over 25 years (Binns, 2002). Several characteristics have been researched in breeding programmes, such as nitrogen fixation, drought tolerance and the modification of protein components and their storage. The GM technologies were new and deemed to be commercially risky, so the chemical companies pursued only the biggest markets with the greatest profit potential. Hence the great majority of GM crops released to date involve genes for herbicide resistance and for insect tolerance. Resistance to viruses has also been successfully deployed.

As long ago as 1991, it was shown that the expression of alien genes controlling hydrolytic enzyme activity in transgenic tobacco and oilseed rape resulted in increased resistance to infection by *R. solani* (Broglie *et al.*, 1991). Many other traits have been examined and tested in laboratory-scale experiments but, to date, no commercial crops with transgenic disease resistance have been released (Logemann *et al.*, 1992; Toubart *et al.*, 1992; Gurr and Rushton, 2005).

The reasons for this glaring failure are partly scientific but also partly political. Developing a GM disease resistance trait is beset with many of the same difficulties as developing a new fungicide; the GM trait should generate good levels of disease resistance against a wide spectrum of pathogens and should be safe. Research was carried out on a wide scale in both university and chemical company laboratories.

Indeed, many chemical companies bought seed companies so as to have a route to market the new disease resistance traits.

The first major disease resistance genes (R-genes) were cloned and analysed around 1994 (Jones *et al.*, 1994; Hammond-Kosack and Jones, 1997). The first thought was to express these genes in other plants to see whether they conferred resistance. However, it soon became apparent that R-genes were very specific and only worked in the species or at best the family from which they were derived (Gurr and Rushton, 2005). Hence this route has limited spectrum and has not attracted sufficient commercial interest.

Activation of resistance genes during infections leads to the production of a defence response which somehow kills the fungus (Anderson *et al.*, 2005). So-called PR (pathogenesis related) genes producing chitinases and glucanases were among the induced genes. The release of active oxygen was also involved. Hence many people pursued the idea that enhanced expression of these genes would lead to resistance. This strategy has been undermined to some extent by the growth reductions seen in plants expressing PR proteins that outweigh the potential benefit of disease resistance.

Another line of thought was to deploy antifungal proteins in transgenic plants (Jach *et al.*, 1995). These are diverse proteins with potent activity against several fungi. However such traits have failed the very stringent animal toxicology tests.

The latest research involves the use of RNA interference to inhibit the expression of fungal genes essential for infection (Nowara *et al.*, 2010; Duan *et al.*, 2012; Panwar *et al.*, 2013). The mRNA is targeted by a short RNA molecule that is complementary in sequence. This creates a short stretch of double-stranded RNA (dsRNA). dsRNA is efficiently detected in plants by a set of enzymes that cleave the RNA and inactivate it before it is translated into proteins. This is a very promising technology that can be delivered either by direct delivery of RNA molecules instead of a chemical fungicide or via expression of the RNA in the infected plant tissue. The proponents of this technology predict its widespread use in the next 5–15 years. It seems likely that a combination of chemical, conventional genetic and GM traits using antifungal genes, signalling molecules and RNA interference will become the norm in the next decades.

Developments in GM disease resistance have so far failed to progress to market. The scientific questions are tough but surely would have been solved had the level of investment present through the 1980s and 1990s been maintained. However the backlash against GM products that emerged in Europe in 1996 following the ‘mad-cow disease’ outbreaks caused both public- and private-sector organizations to cut back investments in this area. GM herbicide- and insect-resistant crops have been grown on a huge area and no deleterious effects have been reported. Nonetheless, no relaxation of the regulations has been forthcoming albeit there are signs of reduced anxiety at the moment. We will see whether investment now increases to exploit the potential of the GM disease resistance market.

Market Development

The last decades have seen a major consolidation in the fungicide market. Currently only three major companies are engaged in the full range from discovery to marketing.

A further merger within these companies seems unlikely. It is also hard to imagine how a new company could enter the market for conventional fungicides. Generic manufacturers are increasing in number and global importance, especially as China, India and many other tropical and semi-tropical countries become both fungicide users and manufacturers. There is the potential for new companies to enter the arena through the provision of GM traits, but the extremely demanding regulatory burden makes this unlikely. Clearly, the future for fungicide discovery is firmly fixed within a few very large companies.

References

- Anderson, J.P., Thatcher, L.F. and Singh, K.B. (2005) Plant defence responses: conservation between models and crops. *Functional Plant Biology* 32(1), 21–34.
- Binns, A.N. (2002) t-DNA of *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*: 25 years and counting. *Trends in Plant Science* 7(5), 231–233.
- Brogliè, K., Chet, I., Holliday, M., Cressman, R., Biddle, P., *et al.* (1991) Transgenic plants with enhanced resistance to the fungal pathogen *Rhizoctonia solani*. *Science* 254(5035), 1194–1197.
- Carlton, R.R., West, J.S., Smith, P. and Fitt, B.D.L. (2012) A comparison of GHG emissions from UK field crop production under selected arable systems with reference to disease control. *European Journal of Plant Pathology* 133(1), 333–351.
- Duan, C.G., Wang, C.H. and Guo, H.S. (2012) Application of RNA silencing to plant disease resistance. *Silence* 3(1), 5.
- Gurr, S.J. and Rushton, P.J. (2005) Engineering plants with increased disease resistance: what are we going to express? *Trends in Biotechnology* 23(6), 275–282.
- Hammond-Kosack, K.E. and Jones, J.D.G. (1997) Plant disease resistance genes. *Annual Review of Plant Physiology and Plant Molecular Biology* 48(1), 575–607.
- Jach, G., Görnhardt, B., Mundy, J., Logemann, J., Pinsdorf, E., *et al.* (1995) Enhanced quantitative resistance against fungal disease by combinatorial expression of different barley antifungal proteins in transgenic tobacco. *The Plant Journal* 8(1), 97–109.
- Jones, D., Thomas, C., Hammond-Kosack, K., Balintkurti, P. and Jones, J. (1994) Isolation of the tomato cf-9 gene for resistance to *Cladosporium fulvum* by transposon tagging. *Science* 266(5186), 789–793.
- Logemann, J., Jach, G., Tommerup, H., Mundy, J. and Schell, J. (1992) Expression of a barley ribosome-inactivating protein leads to increased fungal protection in transgenic tobacco plants. *Bio/Technology* 10, 305–308.
- Nowara, D., Schweizer, P., Gay, A., Lacomme, C., Shaw, J., *et al.* (2010). HIGS: host-induced gene silencing in the obligate biotrophic fungal pathogen *Blumeria graminis*. *Plant Cell* 22(9), 3130–3141.
- Panwar, V., McCallum, B. and Bakkeren, G. (2013) Host-induced gene silencing of wheat leaf rust fungus *Puccinia triticina* pathogenicity genes mediated by the barley stripe mosaic virus. *Plant Molecular Biology* 81(6), 595–608.
- Toubart, P., Desiderio, A., Salvi, G., Cervone, E., Daroda, L., *et al.* (1992) Cloning and characterisation of the gene encoding the endopolygalacturonase-inhibiting protein (PGIP) of *Phaseolus vulgaris* 1. *The Plant Journal* 2(3), 367–373.
- West, J.S., Townsend, J.A., Stevens, M. and Fitt, B.D.L. (2012) Comparative biology of different plant pathogens to estimate effects of climate change on crop diseases in Europe. *European Journal of Plant Pathology* 133(1), 315–331.

This page intentionally left blank

Index

- acceptable daily intake (ADI) 169
acylalanines 142
adjuvants 66
Alternaria sp. 93
 mali 35
amidinium 60–62
amino acid synthesis 94
anilinopyrimidines 94
apple scab (VENTIN) 6, 16, 35, 42, 49, 64,
 93, 94, 102, 111, 113
Ascomycota 1, 13–16
Asia 42
ASM (acibenzolar-*S*-methyl) 107–108
Aspergillus
 nidulans 50
 niger 50
Australia 2, 42
azanaphthalenes 95
azoxystrobin 92
- barley powdery mildew (ERYSGH) 30, 41,
 60–61, 64, 92, 93, 94, 104, 127
 fungicide resistance 123–124, 139
BASF 10, 36
Basidiomycota 1, 16
Bayer CropScience 6, 10, 36
bean anthracnose (*Colletotrichum*
 lindemuthianum) 16
benomyl 85
 resistance 136–137
benzamides 87
benodanil 88–89
benzimidazole 85–87, 123
Bion 107–108
biotrophs 17
bird toxicity 166
bixafen 90
black sigatoka (MYCFIJ) 49, 64, 102, 110–111
 fungicide resistance 132
Bordeaux mixture 6, 34, 173
boscalid 89–90
BOTCIN (*Botrytis cinerea*) 34, 40, 42, 49,
 93, 94, 95, 102, 104, 111, 113
 fungicide resistance 132, 140
Botrytis cinerea 34, 40, 42, 49, 93, 94, 95,
 102, 104, 111, 113
 fungicide resistance 132, 140
breakdown 165
brown rust (PUCCRT) 8, 64, 89, 90
bunt (*Tilletia tritici*) 5, 6–7
bupirimate 83
- C14-demethylation inhibitors 59
captan 112–113
carbendazim 85, 87
carbocation mimicry 60–62
carboxin 88
carboxylic acid amides (CAA) 104–105
 resistance 129, 142, 178
cell wall biosynthesis 104–105
Cercospora sp. 43
 beticola 123, 136–137
cereal
 barley powdery mildew (ERYSGH) 30, 41,
 60–61, 64, 92, 93, 94, 104, 127
 fungicide resistance 123–124, 139
 bunt 5, 6–7
 ergot (*Claviceps purpurea*) 5, 172
 eyespot 41, 101
 fungicide market 29, 30–31
 Fusarium graminearum 39
 Gaeumannomyces graminis 21, 44–46,
 116
 leaf stripe 135
 net blotch 41, 139
 Pseudocercospora herpotrichoides 62
 Rhynchosporium secalis 41, 42
 rust 8, 41, 64, 89, 90
 septoria nodorum blotch (LEPTNO) 8, 39,
 41, 113
 septoria tritici blotch (SEPTRI) 8, 30–31,
 39, 41, 49, 64, 90, 102, 113
 fungicide resistance 139, 140, 141
 wheat powdery mildew (ERYSGT) 30, 41,
 64, 92, 93, 94, 104, 108, 109, 116
 fungicide resistance 139

- chemical nomenclature 53, 54–58
- chlorophenyls 113
- chlorothalonil 40, 135
- chlozolinate 97
- Claviceps purpurea* 5, 172
- clubroot (*Plasmodiophora brassicae*) 17, 93
- Colletotrichum* sp. 93
- lindemuthianum* 16
- copper 110–111, 173
- Crp51* gene 130, 140–142
- CrtB* gene 139
- curative activity 73
- cymoxanil 109
- cyproconazole 59, 100–101
- cyprodinil 94
- demethylation inhibitor (DMI) 4, 171
- global sales 25–27
- market 30–31
- medical uses 171
- mode of action (MOA) 82, 98–102
- resistance 98, 100, 140–142, 146, 171, 178
- Denmark 170–171
- development costs 22
- diagnosis 151–153
- immunology 153–154
- nucleic acid-based diagnostics 154–155
- dicarboximides 97
- dichlozoline 97
- diethofencarb 87
- dimethomorph 66, 83
- discovery 178–179
- formulation 65–69
- application 68–69
- dust 67
- emulsifiers 67–68
- suspension concentrates 67
- wetable powders 66, 67
- screening 43
- design 43
- fungicide leads 50–63
- high-throughput tests 48–49
- in planta* screens 46–47
- in vivo* screens 47–48
- mode-of-action screens 49
- primary target organisms 49–50
- target selection 38–39
- exploratory targets 42, 43–46
- fungicide resistance 40
- market deconvolution 40–43
- market size 39
- new diseases 39–40
- new modes of action 40
- re-emergent diseases 39–40
- discriminatory dose (DD) 126
- disease management 150
- dose 155
- fertilizer interactions 158–159
- foliar applications 151
- fungicide selection 151
- diagnosis 151–155
- seed treatments 150–151
- soil treatments 151
- timing 155–156
- application frequency 157–158
- disease-threat models 157
- disease threshold 156–157
- growth stage 156
- dithiocarbamates 111
- dose rate 144–146, 155
- Dow 36
- downy mildew 16
- Plasmopora viticola* (PLASVIT) 6, 34, 43, 64, 92, 105, 109, 110–111, 114
- fungicide resistance 132, 142
- DuPont 36
- economic benefits 3–4
- effective concentration (EC₅₀) 126–127
- effectors 17–19
- necrotrophic effectors (NEs) 18–19
- PAMPs (pathogen-associated molecular patterns) 18
- efflux pumps 130, 140
- emulsifiers 67–68
- endocrine disruption 170
- environment 164–167
- epoxiconazole 101
- eradicator activity 73
- ergot (*Claviceps purpurea*) 5, 172
- ERYSGH (*Blumeria graminis* f. sp. *hordei*) 30, 41, 60–61, 64, 92, 93, 94, 104, 127
- fungicide resistance 123–124, 139
- ERYSGT (*Blumeria graminis* f. sp. *tritici*) 30, 41, 64, 92, 93, 94, 104, 108, 109, 116
- fungicide resistance 139
- ethaboxam 87
- ethirimol 7–8, 83
- European Union regulation 169–171

- Eutypa armeniaca* 9
 eyespot 41, 101
- fenarimol 101, 102
 fenfuram 88–89
 fenhexamid 104
 fenpiclonil 96
 fenpropidin 103–104
 fenpropimorph 60–62, 103–104, 114
 ferbam 111
 fertilizer 3, 158–159
 field resistance 127–128
 monitoring 134
 fitness penalty 130
 fluazinam 93–94
 fludioxonil 96
 fluquinconazole 66
 flutriafol 59
 foliar treatments 68–69, 151
 folpet 112–113
 food production 1–2, 177–178
 food safety 168
 formulation 65–69
 application 68–69
 dust 67
 emulsifiers 67–68
 suspension concentrates 67
 wetable powders 66, 67
 fosetyl 110, 116
 fuberidazole 86
 fumigation 45
 fungi 12–16
 Ascomycota 1, 13–16
 Basidiomycota 1, 16
 fungicide resistance action committee (FRAC)
 73, 123, 143
 fungicides 1, 159–160
 development costs 22
 discovery 178–179
 formulation 65–69
 screening 43, 46–63
 target selection 38–46
 disease management 150
 dose 155
 fertilizer interactions
 158–159
 foliar applications 151
 fungicide selection 151–155
 seed treatments 150–151
 soil treatments 151
 timing 155–158
 future prospects 177
 discovery process 178–179
 disease threats 177–178
 food demand 177–178
 fungicides loss 178
 market development 180–181
 plant resistance 179–180
 growth 9–10
 history 4–9
 impact 3–4
 market 21–24, 180–181
 crop sectors 28–35
 deconvolution 40–43
 development costs 22
 financial thresholds 22–24
 global 24–27
 manufacturers 36
 UK 41–42
 performance 71
 mode of action (MOA) 71, 73–113
 redistribution in crops 113–117
 systemicity 72–73
 protectant 7
 redistribution in crops 113–114
 phloem mobility 115–117
 vapour-phase activity 114–115
 regulation 162
 consumer values 174
 environment 164–167, 174
 European Union regulation 169–171
 long-term risks 169
 operator safety 168
 registration 163–164
 residues 168
 toxicology 164
 resistance 31, 35, 40, 85, 87, 93, 98,
 100, 123–127, 178
 acylalanines 142
 carboxylic acid amides (CAA) 129,
 142, 178
 cross-resistance 129–130
 demethylation inhibitor (DMI) 98,
 100, 140–142, 146, 171, 178
 field resistance 127–128, 134
 fitness penalty 130
 fungicide resistance action committee
 (FRAC) 73, 123, 143
 inhibition of complex III 90–93
 management 143–146
 medical fungi 171
 methyl benzimidazole carbamate
 (MBC) 129, 136–137, 178

- fungicides (*continued*)
- mode of resistance (MOR) 130, 134–135, 136, 140
 - multiple resistance 130
 - multi-site fungicides 135–136
 - quinone outside inhibitor (QoI) 31, 40, 93, 129, 135, 139, 146, 178
 - resistance factor (RF) 127, 128, 129–130, 139, 140, 141, 145
 - respiration 88
 - risk 131–134
 - sensitivity 126–127
 - succinate dehydrogenase inhibitor (SDHI) 130, 140, 178
 - succinate dehydrogenase inhibitors 88–90
 - uncouplers 93–94
 - safety 8
 - systemic 7
 - use of *see* disease management
- Fusarium*
- graminearum* 39, 142
 - mycotoxins 173
 - wilt 16
- Gaeumannomyces graminis* 21, 44–46, 116
- global market 24–25
- mode of action (MOA) 25–27
- grapevine
- black rot (*Guignardia bidwellii*) 6
 - downy mildew (PLASVIT) 6, 34, 43, 64, 92, 105, 109, 110–111, 114
 - fungicide resistance 132, 142
- Eutypa armeniacae* 9
- fungicide market 31–35
 - grey mould (BOTCIN) 34, 40, 42, 49, 93, 94, 95, 102, 104, 111, 113
 - fungicide resistance 132, 140
 - powdery mildew (UNCNEC) 6, 34, 92, 102, 116
 - fungicide resistance 139
- greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions 2
- guanidinium 60–62
- Guignardia bidwellii* 6
- head blight (*Fusarium graminearum*) 39, 142
- hemibiotrophs 17
- host plant defence induction 107–109
- hydroxyl-(2-amino-)pyrimidines 83–85
- ICI 6
- in planta* screens 46–47
- in vivo* screens 47–48
- inhibition of complex III 4, 8–9, 49, 90–93
- global sales 25–27
 - market 30
 - mode of action (MOA) 82
 - performance 71
 - resistance 31, 40, 93
- inhibition of melanin
- biosynthesis 105–107
- inhibition of RNA synthesis
- hydroxyl-(2-amino-)pyrimidines 83–85
 - phenylamides 82–83
- intellectual property 23–24
- invasive aspergillosis (IA) 171
- iprodione 97
- isomerase and reductase inhibitors 102–104
- isopyrazam 90
- isotianil 109
- 3-ketoreductase 104
- kresoxim-methyl 92
- LD₅₀ 164
- leaching 165–166
- leaf stripe (*Pyrenophora graminea*) 135
- legislation 162
- consumer values 174
 - environment 164–167, 174
 - European Union regulation 169–171
 - long-term risks 169
 - operator safety 168
 - registration 163–164
 - residues 168
 - toxicology 164
- LEPTNO (*Parastagonospora nodorum*) 8, 39, 41, 113
- log *P* 63
- long-term risks 169
- Lysimeter methodology 165–166
- Magnaporthe oryzae* (PYRIOR) 16, 29–30, 42, 53, 64, 102, 106–107, 109
- MAI 36
- management of resistance 143
- alternation 146
 - dose rate 144–146
 - good hygiene 143–144

- integrated disease management 144
- mixtures 146
- mancozeb 34
- market 21–24, 180–181
 - crop sectors 28
 - cereals 29–31
 - grapevine 31–35
 - pome (top) fruit 35
 - deconvolution 40–43
 - development costs 22
 - financial thresholds 22–24
 - global 24–25
 - mode of action (MOA) 25–27
 - manufacturers 36
 - UK 41–42
- mepanipyrim 94
- mepronil 89
- mercury 135
- metalaxyl 82, 114, 142
- methyl benzimidazole carbamate (MBC)
 - 4, 85–87
 - resistance 129, 136–137, 178
- mitosis and cell division
 - benzamides 87
 - phenylcarbamates 87
 - β -tubulin assembly 85–87
- mode of action (MOA) 7
 - amino acid synthesis
 - anilinopyrimidines 94
 - cell wall biosynthesis 104–105
 - global market 25–27
 - host plant defence induction 107–109
 - inhibition of melanin biosynthesis 105–107
 - inhibition of RNA synthesis
 - hydroxyl-(2-amino)-pyrimidines 83–85
 - phenylamides (PA) 82–83
 - mitosis and cell division
 - benzamides 87
 - phenylcarbamates 87
 - β -tubulin assembly 85–87
- multi-site
 - chlorophenyls 113
 - copper 110–111
 - dithiocarbamates 111
 - phthalimides 112–113
 - sulfur 111
- performance 71, 73–82
 - amino acid synthesis 94
 - cell wall biosynthesis 104–105
 - host plant defence induction 107–109
 - inhibition of melanin
 - biosynthesis 105–107
 - inhibition of RNA synthesis 82–85
 - mitosis and cell division 85–87
 - multi-site 109–113
 - respiration 88–94
 - signal transduction 95–97
 - sterol biosynthesis 97–104
 - unknown 109–110
- resistance *see* resistance
- respiration 88
 - inhibition of complex III 90–93
 - succinate dehydrogenase
 - inhibitors 88–90
 - uncouplers 93–94
- screening 49
- signal transduction
 - azaphthalenes 95
 - dicarboximides 97
 - phenylpyrroles 96
- sterol biosynthesis inhibitors
 - (SBIs) 97–98
 - C14-demethylation inhibitors
 - (DMIs) 98–102
 - isomerase and reductase
 - inhibitors 102–104
 - 3-ketoreductase 104
 - unknown
 - cymoxanil 109
 - fosetyl 110
- mode of resistance (MOR) 130, 136, 140
 - determining 134–135
- Monsanto 36
- multi-site modes of action
 - chlorophenyls 113
 - copper 110–111
 - dithiocarbamates 111
 - phthalimides 112–113
 - sulfur 111
- MYCFIJ (*Mycosphaerella fijiensis*) 49, 64, 102, 110–111
 - fungicide resistance 132
- Mycosphaerella fijiensis* (MYCFIJ) 49, 64, 102, 110–111
 - fungicide resistance 132
- mycotoxins 172–173
- necrotrophic effectors (NEs) 18–19
- necrotrophs 17
- net blotch 41, 139
- nomenclature 19
- nuarimol 102
- Nufarm 36

- obligate pathogens 49
- Oomycota* 1, 11–12, 16–17
- operator safety 168
- organic farming 171–174
- PAMPs (pathogen-associated molecular patterns) 18
- Parastagonospora nodorum* (LEPTNO) 8, 39, 41, 113
- patents 23–24
- penflufen 90
- performance 71
 - mode of action (MOA) 71, 73–82
 - amino acid synthesis 94
 - cell wall biosynthesis 104–105
 - host plant defence induction 107–109
 - inhibition of melanin biosynthesis 105–107
 - inhibition of RNA synthesis 82–85
 - mitosis and cell division 85–87
 - multi-site 109–113
 - respiration 88–94
 - signal transduction 95–97
 - sterol biosynthesis 97–104
 - unknown 109–110
 - redistribution in crops 113–114
 - phloem mobility 115–117
 - vapour-phase activity 114–115
 - systemicity 72–73
- Peronospora* 16
- Phakopsora pachyrhizi* 39–40
- phenylamides (PA) 82–83, 178
- phenylcarbamates 87
- phenylpyrroles 96
- phloem mobility 115–117
- phthalimides 112–113
- PHYTIN (*Phytophthora infestans*) 5, 40, 64, 93, 105, 109, 110–111, 113
 - fungicide resistance 123, 132, 142
- Phytophthora* 1, 110
 - cinnamomi* 109–110
 - infestans* (PHYTIN) 5, 40, 64, 93, 105, 109, 110–111, 113
 - fungicide resistance 123, 132, 142
- plant disease 11–16
- plant resistance 179–180
- Plasmiodiophora* 1, 11–12, 17
 - brassicae* 17, 93
- Plasmopara viticola* (PLASVIT) 6, 34, 43, 64, 92, 105, 109, 110–111, 114
 - fungicide resistance 132, 142
- PLASVIT (*Plasmopara viticola*) 6, 34, 43, 64, 92, 105, 109, 110–111, 114
 - fungicide resistance 132, 142
- Podosphaera leucotricha* 35, 42, 102
- pome (top) fruit
 - Alternaria mali* 35
 - apple scab (VENTIN) 6, 16, 35, 42, 49, 64, 93, 94, 102, 111, 113
 - fungicide market 35
 - powdery mildew (*Podosphaera leucotricha*) 35, 42, 102
- population growth 1–2
- potato
 - blight (PHYTIN) 5, 40, 64, 93, 105, 109, 110–111, 113
 - fungicide resistance 123, 132, 142
 - Synchytrium endobioticum* 13
- powdery mildew 110–111
 - ERYSGH (*Blumeria graminis* f.sp. *hordei*) 30, 41, 60–61, 64, 92, 93, 94, 104, 127
 - fungicide resistance 123–124, 139
 - ERYSGT (*Blumeria graminis* f.sp. *tritici*) 30, 41, 64, 92, 93, 94, 104, 108, 109, 116
 - fungicide resistance 139
 - fungicide resistance 123–124, 139, 131, 132, 139
 - Podosphaera leucotricha* 35, 42, 102
 - Sphaerotheca fuliginea* 6
 - UNCNEC (*Uncinula necator*) 6, 34, 92, 102, 116
 - fungicide resistance 139
- probenazole 107
- prochloraz 66, 101–102
- procymidone 97
- propiconazole 101
- propimorph 114
- proquinazid 95
- protectant activity 7, 72–73
- prothioconazole 40, 59, 101
- Pseudocercospora herpotrichoides* 62
- Puccinia*
 - hordei* 41
 - recondita* (PUCCRT) 8, 64, 89, 90
 - striiformis* 41
- PUCCRT (*Puccinia recondita*) 8, 64, 89, 90
- pyraclostrobin 92
- Pyrenophora*
 - graminea* 135
 - teres* 41, 139
 - tritici-repentis* 139

- pyrimethanil 94
- PYRIOR (*Magnaporthe oryzae*) 16, 29–30, 42, 53, 64, 102, 106–107, 109
- Pythium* 1, 16, 105
- quinone outside inhibitor (QoI) 4, 8–9, 49, 90–93
 global sales 25–27
 market 30
 mode of action (MOA) 82
 performance 71
 resistance 31, 40, 93, 129, 135, 139, 146, 178
- quinoxifen 49, 95, 116, 167, 168
- random screening 51–52
- redistribution 61–62
- regulation 162
 consumer values 174
 environment 164–167, 174
 European Union regulation 169–171
 long-term risks 169
 operator safety 168
 registration 163–164
 residues 168
 toxicology 164
- residues 168
- resistance 31, 35, 40, 85, 87, 93, 98, 100, 123–127, 178
 acylalanines 142
 carboxylic acid amides (CAA) 129, 142, 178
 cross-resistance 129–130
 demethylation inhibitor (DMI) 98, 100, 140–142, 146, 171, 178
 field resistance 127–128
 monitoring 134
 fitness penalty 130
 fungicide resistance action committee (FRAC) 73, 123, 143
 inhibition of complex III 90–93
 management 143
 alternation 146
 dose rate 144–146
 good hygiene 143–144
 integrated disease management 144
 mixtures 146
 medical fungi 171
 methyl benzimidazole carbamate (MBC) 129, 136–137, 178
 mode of resistance (MOR) 130, 136, 140
 determining 134–135
- multiple resistance 130
- multi-site fungicides 135–136
- quinone outside inhibitor (QoI) 31, 40, 93, 129, 135, 139, 146, 178
- resistance factor (RF) 127, 128, 129–130, 139, 140, 141, 145
- respiration 88
- risk 131
 fungicide risk factors 133–134
 pathogen risk factors 131–133
- sensitivity 126–127
- succinate dehydrogenase inhibitor (SDHI) 88–90, 130, 140, 178
- uncouplers 93–94
- Rhizoctonia* sp. 42
solani 62, 89
- Rhynchospodium secalis* 41, 42
- rice
 blast (PYRIOR) 16, 29–30, 42, 53, 64, 102, 106–107, 109
 fungicide market 29–30
- rust 6
 fungicide resistance 133
Phakopsora pachyrhizi 39–40
Puccinia
hordei 41
recondita (PUCCRT) 8, 64, 89, 90
striiformis 41
- Saccharomyces cerevisiae* 50
- salicylic acid 107
- Sclerotinia* sp. 43, 93, 97
- screening 43
 design 43
 fungicide leads 50–51
 analogue synthesis 52–53
 biorational design 59–62
 chemorational design 62–63
 combinatorial chemistry 52
 random screening 51–52
 high-throughput tests 48–49
in planta screens 46–47
in vivo screens 47–48
 methodology 63–65
 mode-of-action screens 49
 primary target organisms 49–50
- sedaxane 90
- seed treatments 6–7, 30, 45, 68, 88–90, 150–151
- sensitivity 126–127

- septoria nodorum blotch (LEPTNO) 8, 39, 41, 113
 septoria tritici blotch (SEPTRI) 8, 30–31, 39, 41, 49, 64, 90, 102, 113
 fungicide resistance 139, 140, 141
 SEPTRI (*Zymoseptoria tritici*) 8, 30–31, 39, 41, 49, 64, 90, 102, 113
 fungicide resistance 139, 140, 141
 sequence variation 138
 signal transduction
 azanaphthalenes 95
 dicarboximides 97
 phenylpyrroles 96
 soil fungicides 45, 151
 soybean rust (*Phakopsora pachyrhizi*) 39–40
Sphaerotheca fuliginea 6
 spiroxamine 103
 spreaders 67–68
 sterol biosynthesis inhibitors (SBIs) 97–98
 C14-demethylation inhibitors (DMIs) 98–102
 isomerase and reductase inhibitors 102–104
 3-ketoreductase 104
 strobilurins 52, 90–93
 succinate dehydrogenase inhibitor (SDHI) 9
 global sales 27
 market 30
 mode of action (MOA) 82, 88–90
 performance 71
 resistance 88–90, 130, 140, 178
 sulfur 34, 111, 114, 173
 suspension concentrates 67
Synchytrium endobioticum 13
 Syngenta 10, 36
 systemic acquired resistance (SAR) 107–109
 systemic activity 7, 72–73

 take-all (*Gaeumannomyces graminis*) 21, 44–46, 116
 target selection 38–39
 exploratory targets 42, 43–46
 fungicide resistance 40
 market deconvolution 40–43
 market size 39
 new diseases 39–40
 new modes of action 40
 re-emergent diseases 39–40
 tebuconazole 101, 127
 thiabendazole 86
 thiophanate-methyl 85

 thiram 111
 tiadinil 109
Tilletia tritici 5, 6–7
 timing 155–156
 application frequency 157–158
 disease-threat models 157
 disease threshold 156–157
 growth stage 156
 top fruit *see* pome fruit
 toxicology 164
 transgenic (GM) disease control 179–180
 triazole 8, 40, 53, 101
 market 30
 tricyclazole 29, 53, 106–107
 tridemorph 7–8, 103–104
 trifloxystrobin 92
 β -tubulin assembly 85–87
 fungicide resistance 130, 137
Typhula incarnata 89

 UK 171
 market 41–42
Uncinula necator (UNCNEC) 6, 34, 92, 102, 116
 fungicide resistance 139
 UNCNEC (*Uncinula necator*) 6, 34, 92, 102, 116
 fungicide resistance 139
 uncouplers 93–94
 unknown mode of action
 cymoxanil 109
 fosetyl 110
Ustilago maydis 140

 vapour-phase activity 114–115
 VENTIN (*Venturia inaequalis*) 6, 16, 35, 42, 49, 64, 93, 94, 102, 111, 113
Venturia inaequalis (VENTIN) 6, 16, 35, 42, 49, 64, 93, 94, 102, 111, 113
 vinclozolin 97

 wettable powders 66, 67

 zineb 111
 ziram 111
 zoxamide 87
Zymoseptoria tritici (SEPTRI) 8, 30–31, 39, 41, 49, 64, 90, 102, 113
 fungicide resistance 139, 140, 141