

PERTANYAAN KARYA ILMIAH NO.3

3. Komentor untuk karya penelitian : 'Judul Artikel: Curative activity of watery fermented compost extract as a bark treatment against tapping panel dyness., Penulis: Dr. Ir. A. Muslim, M.Agr., Nama Jurnal: The Open Agriculture Journal, Volume Jurnal: 12, Nomor Jurnal: -, Tahun Terbit Jurnal: 25 April 2018, Halaman: 74-83, ISSN: 1874-3315, Penerbit: BENTHAM Open': Lampirkan bukti-bukti proses review ke jurnalnya/bukti korespondensinya karena penerbitnya (BENTHAM Open) tergolong yang diragukan.

JAWABAN KARYA ILMIAH NO. 3

Berikut kami lampirkan bukti-bukti korespondensi proses review author dan penerbit Journal The Open Agriculture Journal yang terdiri dari :

1. Surat pemberitahuan submission
2. Revised paper oleh Author
3. Accepted letter

1. SURAT PEMBERITAHUAN SUBMISSION



Suwandi S <suwandi@fp.unsri.ac.id>

TOASJ Manuscript Revision Required | BMS-TOASJ-2018-5

3 messages

The Open Agriculture Journal <toasj@benthamopen.org>
Reply-To: The Open Agriculture Journal <toasj@benthamopen.org>
To: suwandi@fp.unsri.ac.id
Cc: wajeehaahmed@benthamopen.com

Thu, Mar 15, 2018 at 5:56 PM

Reference#: BMS-TOASJ-2018-5

Submission Title: Curative Activity of Watery Fermented Compost Extract as a Bark Treatment against Tapping Panel Dryness

Dear Dr. Suwandi Suwandi,

Thanks for submitting the manuscript to "The Open Agriculture Journal". Your manuscript has been reviewed by the experts in the field, and the consensus is that it needs a revision with rewriting and checking. I am attaching the comments below and encouraging you to address the comments, revise the manuscript indicating the exact changes you made and to resubmit it at your earliest convenience.

Reviewer's Comment:

In general, the Ms was well written. I have made some minor revisions on the Ms which is hereby uploaded.

Minor revision =Minimum keywords should be 6.

Sincerely,

Ms. Noushaba Azher
Editorial Manager
E-mail: noushaba@benthamopen.com
<https://www.linkedin.com/company/benthamopen>

Note: For complaints contact: complaint@benthamscience.net

Attachments:

[Suwandi S Text \(revised\).docx](#) |

Suwandi fp <suwandi@fp.unsri.ac.id>
To: The Open Agriculture Journal <toasj@benthamopen.org>

Sat, Mar 17, 2018 at 10:33 AM

Reference#: BMS-TOASJ-2018-5

Dear Ms. Noushaba Azher,

Enclosed you will find a first revised version of the manuscript ID BMS-TOASJ-2018-5 entitled "Curative Activity of Watery Fermented Compost Extract as a Bark Treatment against Tapping Panel Dryness" by Suwandi Suwandi, Armi Junita, Suparman Suparman, Abu Umayah, Harman Hamidson, A Muslim and Chandra Irsan, which we would like to re-submit for publication in the The Open Agriculture Journal.

Reviewers recommended some revisions that we have made corrections accordingly. Keywords have been added to be 7 (Biostimulant, Compost tea, Watery fermented compost extract, Amino acid, Bark

treatment, Rubber tree, Tapping panel dryness). We would like to thank for all reviewers' thorough reading, suggestions and corrections.

We feel that these changes have adequately addressed the comments and suggestions of the reviewers, and we look forward to publication in The Open Agriculture Journal. Please feel free to contact me at suwandi@fp.unsri.ac.id if you need any additional information or clarification.

Thank you for your consideration of this manuscript.

Sincerely,

S. Suwandi

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Suwandi, Ph.D.

Phytopathology Laboratory, Department of Plant Protection

Faculty of Agriculture, Sriwijaya University

Jl. Palembang-Prabumulih Km.32 Indralaya 30662 Indonesia

Tel./Fax. +62-711-580663 E-mail: suwandi@fp.unsri.ac.id



Suwandi S Text (revised by Authors).docx

75K

The Open Agriculture Journal <toasj@benthamopen.org>

Mon, Mar 19, 2018 at 1:46 PM

To: Suwandi fp <suwandi@fp.unsri.ac.id>

Cc: Bentham Open-Noushaba <noushaba@benthamopen.com>, Bentham Open - Qasit <qasit@benthamopen.com>

Dear Dr. Suwandi,

Many thanks for your email. We have safely received your revised manuscript entitled "Curative Activity of Watery Fermented Compost Extract as a Bark Treatment against Tapping Panel Dryness" and sent for re-reviewing. You will be informed on the final editorial decision.

For any assistance you are always welcome.

Regards,

Wajeeha Ahmed

Assistant Manager(Publication)

-

<https://www.linkedin.com/company/benthamopen>

https://twitter.com/bentham_open

1 **Curative Activity of Watery Fermented Compost Extract** 2 **as a Bark Treatment against Tapping Panel Dryness**

3 **Suwandi Suwandi***, Armi Junita, Suparman Suparman, Abu Umayah, Harman Hamidson,
4 **A Muslim and Chandra Irsan**

5 *Department of Plant Protection, Faculty of Agriculture, Sriwijaya University, Palembang, Indonesia*

6 **Abstract:**

7 **Background:**

8 Tapping panel dryness (TPD) is a stress-related disorder that afflicts rubber trees, contributing to yield losses
9 in nearly every rubber-growing region.

10 **Aims / Method:**

11 We demonstrated the curative effects of biostimulants containing a fermented watery extract of shrimp waste-
12 enriched compost (SWCE) on TPD in field trials. Undiluted SWCE was applied to lightly scraped bark in the
13 first, third, and fourth trials, and applied directly without bark scraping in the second trial.

14 **Result:**

15 Bark treatment significantly ($p < 0.05$) reduced tapping cut dryness and increased latex yield, suggesting
16 recovery from the disorder. When SWCE was applied to pre-scraped bark, 80% and 30% of trees with partial
17 and complete TPD, respectively, recovered from tapping dryness within 2 months. The latex dry weight of
18 treated trees with partial and complete TPD was 77.5% and 21.1% that of healthy trees, respectively. We
19 observed slight recovery from TPD in trees treated without bark scraping and in trees with a history of ethephon
20 stimulation. No curative effect of SWCE was demonstrated in treated trees without a tapping rest period. These
21 findings suggest that compost extract could be a useful treatment for partial TPD.

22 **Keywords:** Biostimulant, Compost tea, Rubber tree, Tapping panel dryness

23

24 **1. INTRODUCTION**

25 Tapping panel dryness (TPD) is a physiological disorder afflicting rubber trees, it resulting from stresses
26 related to excessive recurrent tapping and overstimulation by ethylene [1 - 4]. The disorder causes severe yield
27 and crop losses in natural rubber-producing countries [5]. TPD is detected early by bark dryness upon tapping,
28 which can manifest as partial dry zones (no latex flow) [6]. Ultimately, the disease causes complete stoppage
29 of latex flow on the tapping cut [7]. The early onset of the syndrome is tapping cut dryness, which lacks any
30 visible sign of bark necrosis and is related to overproduction of reactive oxygen species (ROS) in laticifers [3].
31 This type of TPD is reversible after a resting period for the trees [8]. In the advanced stage, an irreversible type
32 of total dryness, called bark necrosis [9] or brown bast TPD (BB-TPD), can occur [3]. The latter, which is
33 related to a cyanogenesis process [7, 10], involves histological deformation of the bark including browning,
34 thickening, or even flaking due to thylosoid formation, lignified gum, and abnormal division of parenchyma
35 cells [3, 9].

36 A great deal of research has been done to reveal the nature and molecular mechanisms of TPD. However,
37 data are lacking on the bioactive compounds for recovery from the disorder. In reversible TPD, affected trees
38 can sometimes be cured by bark scraping and application of chemicals. Tapping can be reconsidered after a
39 resting period for bark regeneration. However, this process is costly, and a year of latex production can be lost
40 [3]. TPD is a stress-related disorder, and the bioactive compounds and/or microorganisms that can enhance
41 stress tolerance are being developed as agents for curative treatment of the disorder. Plant growth stimulation
42 and enhanced tolerance to biotic and abiotic stresses have been reported following the application of a variety
43 of bioactive compounds, including humic and amino acids, peptides, saponins, alginates, mannitol, and fatty
44 acids [11].

45 The application of compost water extract (CWE), popularly known as compost tea, is a simple and
46 inexpensive method to extract plant beneficial bioactive compounds from compost into the solution [12].
47 Improved plant growth, yield, and nutritive quality as well as disease suppression in response to CWE foliar

* Address correspondence to this author at the Department of Plant Protection, Faculty of Agriculture, Sriwijaya University, Jl. Palembang-Prabumulih Km.32 Indralaya, Palembang 30662, Indonesia; Tel: +628127880446; Fax: +62711580059; E-mails: suwandi@fp.unsri.ac.id, suwandi.saleh@gmail.com

48 spray or soil drench have been reported elsewhere [13 - 19]. This study examined the suppression of stress-
49 related disease through bark treatment with a CWE from shrimp shell-enriched compost.

50 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

51 2.1. Watery Fermented Compost Extract

52 Shrimp waste-enriched compost extract (SWCE) was produced from shrimp waste-enriched compost
53 through two-step fermentation. The enriched compost was fermented by suspension in water, and then left
54 undisturbed at ambient temperature for 4 days to extract the bioactive substances. The supernatant was filter-
55 harvested and mixed with 5% (w/v) sucrose and 10% (v/v) compost activator. The entire brewer contents were
56 vigorously stirred by hand and then left to ferment at ambient temperature for 21 days. SWCE can be stored
57 (without significant changes in nutrient contents) in a closed plastic container for 5 years [20]. Its plant nutrients
58 are composed of mainly nitrate (350 ppm), calcium (450 ppm), as well as amino acids including glycine (365
59 ppm), aspartic acid (232 ppm), lysine (184 ppm), leucine (186 ppm), glutamic acid (170 ppm), and valine (132
60 ppm).

62 2.2. Trials with Tapping Rest and No Ethephon Stimulation

63 Trials involved bark treatment firstly with bark scraping (first trial) and secondly, without bark scraping
64 (second trial). Both trials were performed at the Faculty of Agriculture, Sriwijaya University Experiment
65 Station, Gelumbang, South Sumatra. The plantation was established in 1999, planted with a GT1 clone, and
66 tapped using a system of 1/2S d/2 (a half spiral cut alternating daily). Ethephon stimulation was not applied at
67 this plantation.

68 We applied 30 ml undiluted SWCE using a brush on recently scraped bark (panel BO-1 or BO-2) in the
69 first trial and directly without prior bark scraping in the second trial. Bark scraping consisted of the removal of
70 the outer layers of cork to 30 cm below and above the tapping cut. In total, 60 trees were treated in the first trial,
71 and another 80 trees were used in the second trial. Half of the treated trees had no latex flow on the tapping cut
72 (total TPD), and in the remainder, the cut length was 45-65% dry (partial TPD). All TPD trees were without
73 brown color or necrosis on the bark. Trees were treated once (single application), treated twice at a 1-month
74 interval (double application), or brushed with water (control) in the first trial. The second trial included four
75 treatments (SWCE, SWCE + 5% KCl, SWCE + 5% NaCl, and water as control). Each treatment was applied
76 twice (with a 1-month interval), and each treatment had 10 replicates. Treated trees were not tapped during the
77 trials.

79 2.3. Trials with Ethephon Stimulation and Tapping Rest

80 The third trial was conducted on 10-year-old rubber tree clones (PB260) at a commercial rubber plantation
81 in Ogan Ilir, South Sumatra. Trees in the third trial were tapped using a system of 1/2S d/3 and stimulated
82 monthly with 2.5% ethephon. The trial included bark treatment with SWCE on scraped bark in total- or partial-
83 TPD trees. Treatment was applied three times at a 2-month interval. Water was applied to the control trees.
84 There were 15 replicates. Treated trees were not tapped during the experiment.

86 2.4. Trials with Ethephon Stimulation and without Tapping Rest

87 The fourth trial was conducted on 13-year-old rubber tree clones (PB260) at a small-holding rubber
88 plantation in Gelumbang, South Sumatra. The trees in this trial were overexploited by daily tapping (1/2S d/1)
89 and stimulated monthly with 2.5% ethephon. SWCE was applied three times at a 1-month interval on the
90 scraped bark of partial-TPD trees. The treated trees were tapped daily without a rest during the experimental
91 period.

93 2.5. TPD recovery

94 The trees were tapped three times at a cutting interval of 2 days (1/2S d/3) at the following times after first
95 application: first trial: 2 months; second trial: 1 and 2 months; third trial: 5, 7, and 10 months; fourth trial: 2, 3,
96 and 4 months. Tapping cut dryness was measured as a percentage of dry cut length relative to the total length
97 of the tapping cut, and was observed immediately after tapping. The latex yield was measured as the latex

98 volume and dry weight [21]. To study the effect of SWCE on the plugging index, the latex flow rate for the first
99 5-minute tapping was measured and divided by the total volume [22].

100 The results were examined using analysis variance and the Waller-Duncan K-ratio t-test ($p = 0.05$) using
101 the *agricolae* and *Rcmdr* packages in the R statistical software (version 3.3.1; R Foundation for Statistical
102 Computing, Vienna).

103 3. RESULTS

104 3.1. Trial with Tapping Rest and without Ethephon Application

105 We consistently observed a reduction in tapping cut dryness and an increase in latex yield in trees with
106 both total and partial TPD in response to bark treatment, indicating recovery from the disorder. Higher latex
107 stimulation was observed in TPD trees with bark scraping and double SWCE application (Fig. 1).

108 In trials with bark scraping, 8 of the 10 treated partial-TPD trees and 3 of the 10 total-TPD trees recovered
109 from tapping cut dryness. On partial- and total-TPD trees treated with SWCE, the percentage of dry cut length
110 was significantly ($p < 0.05$) lower than that in the control (Fig. 2). The treatment resulted in reduction of the
111 dry cut by 69.1% and 91.4% relative to control following single and double applications of SWCE to partial-
112 TPD trees, respectively. When SWCE was applied to total-TPD trees, dry cut was reduced by 69.6% and 82.7%
113 relative to control following single and double applications.

114 The latex yield (i.e., latex volume and dry weight) of treated partial-TPD trees was significantly increased
115 ($p < 0.05$) after SWCE treatment, and this increase was larger following double application (Fig. 2). The latex
116 dry weight of treated partial TPD increased 11.8 fold relative to control, the equivalent of 77.5% of healthy
117 trees (average: 43.7 g tapping⁻¹). The tapping cuts of treated total TPD started to produce latex with dry weights
118 that were 21.1% those of healthy trees.

119 The plugging index was significantly ($p < 0.05$) reduced with an increase in recovered latex yield in partial-
120 TPD trees. However, no reduction in plugging index was observed in treated total-TPD trees (Fig. 2). The
121 tapping cuts of treated total-TPD trees started to secrete latex, but this latex immediately coagulated in laticifers
122 within 5-10 minutes. Bark scraping alone could induce latex secretion, as observed in water-treated total-TPD
123 trees that started to produce small amounts of latex (Fig. 2), whereas no latex was secreted in trees without bark
124 scraping (Fig. 3).

125 When SWCE was directly applied without bark scraping (second trial), the percentage of dry cut length
126 of the treated tapping panel in both partial- and total-TPD trees was significantly lower ($p < 0.05$) than that of
127 the control. The latex yield of treated TPD trees was significantly higher ($p < 0.05$) than that of the control (Fig.
128 3). However, when compared to trees treated with bark scraping, treatments without bark scraping resulted in a
129 smaller reduction in tapping cut dryness and reduced stimulation of latex yield. The dry cut of the treated partial-
130 and total-TPD trees decreased by 61.1 and 19.5% relative to control, respectively. The latex dry weight of
131 treated partial-TPD trees increased 2.8 fold relative to control, or 56.8% of healthy trees (average: 43.7 g
132 tapping⁻¹). In treated total-TPD trees, tapping cuts produced small amounts of latex, equal to 5.8% of the latex
133 dry weight of healthy trees.

134 A more substantial recovery effect due to bark treatment with SWCE was observed 1 month after
135 application. Treatment without bark scraping on partial-TPD trees resulted in a 46.5% decrease in tapping cut
136 dryness after 1 month, and a 61.1% reduction was obtained after 2 months. Latex dry weight increased 3.2 fold
137 relative to control after a 1-month application. The addition of 5% (v/v) KCl or NaCl salt to the SWCE
138 significantly reduced ($p < 0.05$) the biostimulant activity of the mixture. Even though partial TPD trees treated
139 with the salted SWCE produced higher latex yields relative to the controls, the yields were lower than those of
140 non-salted SWCE (Fig. 3).

142 3.2. Trials in Trees with Ethephon Stimulation and Tapping Rest

143 No bark-treated trees exhibited total recovery from TPD in this trial, but their tapping cut dryness
144 decreased and latex volume increased in response to the treatment. The percentage of the dry cut length of
145 treated partial-TPD trees was significantly ($p < 0.05$) lower than control and 36-41% less relative to control
146 at the 7th and 10th months. Similar results were observed for total-TPD stress. The percentage of dry cut length
147 was significantly lower in treated trees compared to control and was 23-43% less relative to control than values

148 between the 5th and 10th months. The dry cut length of control TPD trees tended to increase between the 5th
149 and 10th months (Fig. 4).

150 Stimulation of latex yield was observed in treated partial- and total-TPD trees in this trial. The beginning
151 of latex production was observed in 8 of the 15 treated trees (16%), compared to a reduction in latex production
152 in water-treated control trees between 5 and 10 months after application. The latex volume of treated partial-
153 TPD trees was significantly higher ($p < 0.05$) than that of control, and increased 77-96% relative to control from
154 the 5th to the 10th month. Under total-TPD stress, bark treatment resulted in a 59-95% increase in latex volume
155 relative to control, although a significant difference was observed only at the 7th month (Fig. 4). However,
156 compared to healthy, treated TPD trees, these produced small amounts of latex until 10 months after the first
157 bark treatment. The latex volume in treated partial and total TPD was 17.1% and 6.6% that of the healthy trees
158 (average: 168.1 mL latex tapping⁻¹).

159 3.3. Trials with Ethephon Stimulation and without Tapping Rest

160 The treated trees were tapped daily without a resting period. No recovery effect was observed after bark
161 treatment with SWCE on these over-exploited rubber trees. The percentage of dry cut length was shown to
162 increase over time on both the treated and control trees. Latex dry weight tended to be higher on treated
163 compared control trees; however, the latex yield was found to decrease with an increase in dry cut length (Fig.
164 5).

165 4. DISCUSSION

166 Bark treatment with SWCE consistently reduced dry cut length and increased latex yield in TPD affected
167 trees. The increase in latex yield was much higher in partial- compared to total-TPD trees, suggesting that bark
168 treatment is more effective during the early stages of the syndrome. Conversely, there was no evidence of self-
169 recovery in water-treated TPD trees during this study. The dry cut length of control trees increased even after a
170 10-month rest from tapping. Therefore, curative treatment is necessary to suppress syndrome development.

171 In all trials, bark treatments on total-TPD trees resulted in poor disease recovery compared to those on
172 partial-TPD trees, indicating that the treatment was less effective when applied during advanced stages of TPD
173 During the advanced stages, when histological deformation of the bark occurred due to thylosoid formation,
174 lignified gum, and abnormal division of parenchyma cells, ultimately causing irreversible total latex dryness
175 [9]. The tapping cut of some treated trees started to secrete latex, but the latex was immediately coagulated
176 (high plugging index), leading to low yield due to the short duration of flow during tapping. This effect was
177 probably due to higher cyanogenesis on the laticifers that resulted in unstable latex [10].

178 When ethephon was applied frequently, bark treatments with SWCE resulted in a decrease in curative
179 effects compared to those in trees without a history of ethephon stimulation. There was no curative effect from
180 the treatment in over-exploited trees that were tapped daily without a rest during the experimental period.
181 Resting from tapping is necessary for effective curative treatment with SWCE. A high tapping frequency and
182 ethephon stimulation have been known to produce over-accumulation of ROS and to cause oxidative stress that
183 ultimately leads to laticifer dysfunction [3, 23]. The addition of 5% (w/v) KCl or NaCl significantly inhibited
184 the curative action of SWCE. Inhibition of salts under biostimulation activity could be explained by the
185 induction of ROS and ethylene production when a plant is exposed to salt stress [24]. It is likely that the curative
186 effect of SWCE is greatly affected by physiological stress in the individual tree; this potential but the
187 underlining mechanism needs to be further investigated.

188 Disease suppression, improved plant growth and yield following soil and foliar application of 0.2-2.0%
189 SWCE have been demonstrated in our pot and field trials. The application of compost extract increased yield
190 of ratooned rice crops [25] and suppressed blast disease (*S. Suwandi*, unpublished data) in a tidal swamp area
191 in South Sumatra. Increased growth of rice seedlings treated with SWCE has been observed under salinity stress
192 [26]. Fast leaf greening (usually within 3 days) and delays in leaf senescence are among common plant
193 responses following application of the extract; these effects are, an observation similar to well-known cytokinin
194 effects [27]. Krishnakumar *et al.* [28] reported that cytokinin and trans-zeatin riboside levels were lower in the
195 bark tissue of TPD trees than in healthy trees. Further work is required to understand these physiological
196 changes during recovery from TPD.

197 Beneficial effects in response to application of SWCE exceeded the direct effect of its nutrient content.
198 SWCE had lower N, P, K, micronutrients, and amino acids contents, suggesting that the compost extract could
199 be classed as a biostimulant. Biostimulants enhance endogenous plant processes, beyond the direct effects of

200 their constituents such as nutrients and anti-fungal, anti-microbial, or phytohormonal compounds [29]. There is
201 growing evidence demonstrating the potential of various organic substances, including amino acids mixtures,
202 to increase crop productivity and ameliorate crop tolerance to abiotic stresses [30]. Colla *et al.* [31]
203 demonstrated the biostimulant actions of a protein hydrolysate containing amino acids and small peptides,
204 which elicited gibberellin- and auxin-like activities, enhancing nitrogen uptake and crop performance of lettuce
205 plants (*Lactuca sativa*). Perennial Rye-grass (*Lolium perenne* L.) treated with hydrolyzed amino acids and
206 subjected to high temperatures (36 °C) had improved photosynthetic efficiency [32]. Application of Megafol, a
207 biostimulant containing amino acids and protein to tomato plants under drought stress enhanced induction of a
208 number of drought responsive genes [33]. Our previous trial using watery fish-enriched compost, which may
209 have contained amino acids, also demonstrated, to a lesser extent, the recovery of partial TPD (data not shown).
210 Amino acids and their metabolites are known to play essential roles during signaling processes as well as in
211 plant stress responses [30, 34, 35]. Exogenous low-dose amino acids such as glutamate, cysteine, phenylalanine,
212 and glycine enhanced the activity of the antioxidant enzymes on soybean [36]. Treatment of rice roots with
213 glutamate induced systemic disease resistance against rice blast by regulating salicylic acid signaling pathway
214 in rice leaves [37].

215
216

CONCLUSION

217 The results from this study suggest that curative treatment is necessary to suppress TPD syndrome
218 development. Bark treatment with SWCE consistently reduced dry cut length and increased latex yield in TPD
219 affected trees. Bark treatment is more effective during the early stages of the syndrome. These findings suggest
220 that SWCE containing amino acids has the potential to be used as an early curative treatment for TPD.

221
222

ETHICS APPROVAL AND CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE

223 Not applicable.

224
225

HUMAN AND ANIMAL RIGHTS

226 No Animals/Humans were used for studies that are base of this research.

227
228

CONSENT FOR PUBLICATION

229 Not applicable.

230
231

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

232 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

233
234

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

235 The authors received funding under the Sriwijaya University Priority Applied Research Project
236 023/SP2H/LT/DPRM/II/2016 and 102/SP2H/LT/DPRM/IV/2017.

REFERENCES

- 238 [1] Faridah Y, Arijia M, Ghandimathi H. Changes in some physiological latex paramers in relation to over
239 exploitation and onset of induced tapping panel dryness. *J. Nat. Rubber Res.* 1996; 10(3): 182-98.
- 240 [2] Obouayeba S, Soumahin EF, Okoma KM, Kouadio Boko AMC, Dick E, Lacote R. Relationship
241 between tapping intensity and tapping panel dryness susceptibility of some clones of *Hevea*
242 *brasiliensis* in Southwestern Côte. *Agric. Biol. J. North Am.* 2011; 2(8): 1151-59.
- 243 [3] Putranto R-A, Herlinawati E, Rio M, Leclercq J, Piyatrakul P, Gohet E, Sanier C, Oktavia F, Pirrello
244 J, Kuswanhadi, Montoro P. Involvement of ethylene in the latex metabolism and tapping panel dryness
245 of *Hevea brasiliensis*. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* 2015; 16(8): 17885-908.
246 [<http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijms160817885>]
- 247 [4] Li D, Wang X, Deng Z, Liu H, Yang H, He G. Transcriptome analyses reveal molecular mechanism

- 248 underlying tapping panel dryness of rubber tree (*Hevea brasiliensis*). Sci. Rep. 2016; 6: 23540.
249 [http://dx.doi.org/10.0.4.14/srep23540]
- 250 [5] Chen S, Peng S, Huang G, Wu K, Fu X, Chen Z. Association of decreased expression of a Myb
251 transcription factor with the TPD (tapping panel dryness) syndrome in *Hevea brasiliensis*. Plant Mol.
252 Biol. 2003; 51(1): 51-8.
253 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1020719420867]
- 254 [6] Sookmark U, Pujade-Renaud V, Chrestin H, Lacote R, Naiyanetr C, Seguin M, Romruensukharom P,
255 Narangajavana J. Characterization of polypeptides accumulated in the latex cytosol of rubber trees
256 affected by the tapping panel dryness syndrome. Plant Cell Physiol. 2002; 43(11): 1323-33.
- 257 [7] de Faÿ E, Moraes LAC, Moraes VHDF. Cyanogenesis and the onset of tapping panel dryness in rubber
258 tree. Pesqui. Agropecuária Bras. 2010; 45(1): 1372-80.
- 259 [8] Senevirathna AMWK, Wilbert S, Perera SAPS, Wijesinghe AKHS. Can tapping panel dryness of
260 rubber (*Hevea brasiliensis*) be minimised at field level with better management ? J. Rubber Res. Inst.
261 Sri Lanka 2007; 88: 77-87.
- 262 [9] de Faÿ E. Histo- and cytopathology of trunk phloem necrosis, a form of rubber tree (*Hevea brasiliensis*
263 Müll. Arg.) tapping panel dryness. Aust. J. Bot. 2011; 59(6): 563-74.
264 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/BT11070]
- 265 [10] Moraes LAC, Moreira A, Moraes VHDF, Tsai SM, Cordeiro ER. Relationship between cyanogenesis
266 and latex stability on tapping panel dryness in rubber trunk girth. J. Plant Interact. 2014; 9(1): 418-24.
267 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17429145.2013.846420]
- 268 [11] Sharma HSS, Selby C, Carmichael E, McRoberts C, Rao JR, Ambrosino P, Chiurazzi M, Pucci M,
269 Martin T. Physicochemical analyses of plant biostimulant formulations and characterisation of
270 commercial products by instrumental techniques. Chem. Biol. Technol. Agric. 2016; 3(1): 13.
271 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s40538-016-0064-6]
- 272 [12] Scheuerell S, Mahaffee W. Compost tea: principles and prospects for plant disease control. Compost
273 Sci. Util. 2002; 10(4): 313-38.
274 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1065657X.2002.10702095]
- 275 [13] Zhang W, Han DY, Dick WA, Davis KR, Hoitink HAJ. Compost and compost water extract-induced
276 systemic acquired resistance in cucumber and Arabidopsis. Phytopathology 1998; 88(5): 450-5.
277 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO.1998.88.5.450]
- 278 [14] Dionne A, Tweddell RJ, Antoun H, Avis TJ. Effect of non-aerated compost teas on damping-off
279 pathogens of tomato. Can. J. Plant Pathol. 2012; 34: 37-41.
280 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07060661.2012.660195]
- 281 [15] Naidu Y, Meon S, Siddiqui Y. In vitro and in vivo evaluation of microbial-enriched compost tea on
282 the development of powdery mildew on melon. BioControl 2012; 57(6): 827-36.
283 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10526-012-9454-2]
- 284 [16] Shrestha K, Walsh KB, Midmore DJ. Microbially enhanced compost extract: does it increase
285 solubilisation of minerals and mineralisation of organic matter and thus improve plant nutrition? J.
286 Bioremediation Biodegrad. 2012; 3(5).
287 [http://dx.doi.org/10.4172/2155-6199.1000149]
- 288 [17] Curlango-Rivera G, Pew T, VanEtten HD, Zhongguo X, Yu N, Hawes MC. Measuring root disease
289 suppression in response to a compost water extract. Phytopathology 2013; 103(3): 255-60.
290 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO-06-12-0145-R]

- 291 [18] Seddigh S, Kiani L, Tafaghodinia B, Hashemi B. Using aerated compost tea in comparison with a
292 chemical pesticide for controlling rose powdery mildew. Arch. Phytopathol. Plant Prot. 2014; 47(6):
293 658-64.
294 [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03235408.2013.817075>]
- 295 [19] Suwandi S, Hamidson H, Muslim A. Suppression of panicle blast by rice straw compost extract. J.
296 Fitopatol. Indones. 2016; 12(3): 104-8.
297 [<http://dx.doi.org/10.14692/jfi.12.3.104>]
- 298 [20] Suwandi S, inventor; Shrimp waste-enriched compost extract, method for production thereof, and use
299 thereof for control plant diseases and improving plant growth. Indonesia Patent ID P000035097. 2013
300 Dec.
- 301 [21] Kumara PHS. Methods of estimation of dry rubber content in natural rubber latex. Bull. Rubber Res.
302 Inst. Sri Lanka 2006; 47: 65-9.
- 303 [22] Milford GFJ, Paardekooper EC, Ho CY. Latex vessel plugging, its importance to yield and clonal
304 behaviour. J. Rubb. Res. Inst. Malaya 1969; 21(3): 274-82.
- 305 [23] Zhang Y, Leclercq J, Montoro P. Reactive oxygen species in *Hevea brasiliensis* latex and relevance to
306 tapping panel dryness. Tree Physiol. 2016; 37: 261-9.
307 [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/treephys/tpw106>]
- 308 [24] Poór P, Kovács J, Borbély P, Takács Z, Szepesi Á, Tari I. Salt stress-induced production of reactive
309 oxygen- and nitrogen species and cell death in the ethylene receptor mutant never ripe and wild type
310 tomato roots. Plant Physiol. Biochem. 2015; 97: 313-22.
311 [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.plaphy.2015.10.021>]
- 312 [25] Suwandi S, Amar M, Irsan C. Application of compost extract increased yield and suppressed the
313 diseases of ratoon rice crop in tidal swamp of banyuasin regency. J. Lahan Suboptimal 2012; 1(2):
314 116-22.
- 315 [26] Suwandi S, Hamidson H, Muslim A. Biopriming treatment with enriched compost extract increased
316 growth of rice seedling under salinity stress. Proc. 2nd (Palembang) National Seminar on Suboptimal
317 Lands. In: Inclusive agricultural technology for suboptimal lands. Research Center for Suboptimal
318 Lands Sriwijaya University, Palembang 2014.
- 319 [27] Zwack PJ, Rashotte AM. Cytokinin inhibition of leaf senescence. Plant Signal. Behav. 2013; 8(7):
320 e24737.
321 [<http://dx.doi.org/0.4161/psb.24737>]
- 322 [28] Krishnakkumar R. Influence of TPD on cytokinin level in Hevea bark. Ind. J. Nat Rubber Res. 1997;
323 10: 107-9.
- 324 [29] du Jardin P. Plant biostimulants: definition, concept, main categories and regulation. Sci. Hortic.
325 (Amsterdam). 2015; 196: 3-14.
326 [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/J.SCIENTA.2015.09.021>]
- 327 [30] Van Oosten MJ, Pepe O, De Pascale S, Silletti S, Maggio A. The role of biostimulants and bioeffectors
328 as alleviators of abiotic stress in crop plants. Chem. Biol. Technol. Agric. 2017; 4(1): 5.
329 [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s40538-017-0089-5>]
- 330 [31] Colla G, Roupae Y, Canaguier R, Svecova E, Cardarelli M. Biostimulant action of a plant derived
331 protein hydrolysate produced through enzymatic hydrolysis. Front. Plant Sci. 2014; 5.
332 [<http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2014.00448>]
- 333 [32] Botta A. Enhancing plant tolerance to temperature stress with amino acids: an approach to their mode

- 334 of action. *Acta Hort.* 2013; 1009: 29-35.
335 [<http://dx.doi.org/10.17660/ActaHortic.2013.1009.1>]
- 336 [33] Petrozza A, Santaniello A, Summerer S, Di Tommaso G, Di Tommaso D, Paparelli E, Piaggese A,
337 Perata P, Cellini F. Physiological responses to Megafol® treatments in tomato plants under drought
338 stress: a phenomic and molecular approach. *Sci. Hort.* (Amsterdam). 2014; 174: 185-92.
339 [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/J.SCIENTA.2014.05.023>]
- 340 [34] Zeier J. New insights into the regulation of plant immunity by amino acid metabolic pathways. *Plant.*
341 *Cell Environ.* 2013; 36(12): 2085-103.
342 [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/pce.12122>]
- 343 [35] Hildebrandt TM, Nunes Nesi A, Araújo WL, Braun H-P. Amino acid catabolism in plants. *Mol. Plant*
344 2015; 8(11): 1563-15.
345 [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/J.MOLP.2015.09.005>]
- 346 [36] Teixeira WF, Fagan EB, Soares LH, Umburanas RC, Reichardt K, Neto DD. Foliar and seed
347 application of amino acids affects the antioxidant metabolism of the soybean crop. *Front. Plant Sci.*
348 2017; 8: 327.
349 [<http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2017.00327>]
- 350 [37] Kadotani N, Akagi A, Takatsuji H, Miwa T, Igarashi D. Exogenous proteinogenic amino acids induce
351 systemic resistance in rice. *BMC Plant Biol.* 2016; 16: 60.
352 [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12870-016-0748-x>]
- 353
354

355

356

357 **Fig. (1).** Latex flow immediately after tapping, 2 months after the first treatment with fermented watery extract
358 of shrimp waste-enriched compost (SWCE) on scraped bark in partial tapping panel dryness (TPD) rubber
359 trees. SWCE was applied once (C) or twice at a 1-month interval (D). Water was applied to trees as the control
360 treatment (A).

361

362

363 **Fig. (2).** Effects of bark treatment with SWCE on tapping cut dryness, latex yield, and plugging index 2 months
364 after application. SWCE was applied once (single) or twice (double) at a 1-month interval on the lightly scraped
365 bark of **(a)** partial-TPD- and **(b)** total-TPD-affected rubber trees. Bars are means \pm SEM of 10 replicate trees;
366 bars without a letter in common are significantly different ($p < 0.05$) according to the Waller–Duncan K-ratio
367 t-test.

368

369

370 **Fig. (3).** Effects of bark treatment with SWCE on tapping cut dryness and latex yield. SWCE was applied twice
371 with a 1-month interval without bark scraping in **(a)** partial-TPD- and **(b)** total-TPD-affected rubber trees. Bars
372 are means \pm SEM of 10 replicate trees; bars without a letter in common are significantly different ($p < 0.05$)
373 according to the Waller–Duncan K-ratio t-test.

374

375

376 **Fig. (4).** Effects of bark treatment with SWCE on tapping cut dryness and latex volume of trees with a history
377 of ethephon stimulation. SWCE was applied at months 0, 2, and 4 on the lightly scraped bark of **(a)** partial-
378 TPD- and **(b)** total-TPD-affected rubber trees. Treated trees were not tapped during the experiment. Bars are
379 means \pm SEM of 15 replicate trees; data points with asterisks denote significant differences ($p < 0.05$), and
380 “ns” indicates no significant difference ($p \geq 0.05$) between control and SWCE-treated trees according to a 2-
381 sample t-test for unequal variance.

382

383

384

385 **Fig. (5).** Effects of bark treatment with SWCE on **(a)** tapping cut dryness and **(b)** latex dry weight of partial-
386 TPD trees with a history of ethephon stimulation. SWCE was applied three times at a 1-month interval on the
387 lightly scraped bark of partial-TPD-affected rubber trees. Treated trees were tapped daily without rest during
388 the experimental period. Bars are means \pm SEM of 10 replicate trees; data points with asterisks denote
389 significant differences ($p < 0.05$), and “ns” indicates no significant difference ($p \geq 0.05$) between control and
390 SWCE-treated trees according to a two-sample t-test for unequal variance.

391

