Table 1 The inhibition effects of three plant extracts on dodder's growth and development and on host's damage

Plant extracts	Concentration (g/mL)	Dodder			Soybean		
		Symptom	Damage degree (%)	Fresh weight (g/plant)	Symptom	Damage degree (%)	Fresh weight (g/plant)
Eucalyptus leaves	0.00	Normal growth and development	0.0	0.145±0.01a	Normal growth and development	0.0	2.6±0.19b
	0.01	No wilting, slow growing	16.0	0.134±0.03a	Leaves yellowing	8.0	2.1±010ab
	0.05	Part wilting, loose twining	44.0	0.104±0.01a	Dead spots partly appearing in leaves	22.0	1.8±0.12a
	0.25	Wilting, dead	70.0	0.115±0.03a	Dead spots fully appearing in leaves	64.0	1.9±0.29a
Sapium sebiferum leaves	0.00	Normal growth and development	0.0	0.l27±0.02a	Normal growth and development	0.0	2.7±0.12a
	0.01	No obvious damage	6.0	0.12±0.02a	Chlorotic leaves appearing	7.0	2.9±0.33a
	0.05	Wilting, few twines	44.0	0.108±0.02a	Leaves partly Appearing dead	24.0	2.6±0.37a
	0.25	Same as above	48.0	0.103±0.03a	Lots of leaves dead	54.0	2.9±0.19a
Melia azedarachn leaves	0.00	Normal growth and development	0.0	0.153±0.01a	Normal growth and development	0.0	2.6±0.19a
	0.01	No wilting, slow growing	18.0	0.154±0.05a	not obvious hurt	4.0	2.7±0.34a
	0.05	Slowly grow, few twine	30.0	0.105±003a	Leaves yellowing	10.0	2.2±0.25a
	0.25	Wilting, Half of leaves death	60.0	0.065±0.01a	Large area dead spots appearing in leaves	58.0	2.0±0.16a
Melia azedarach bark	0.00	Normal growth and development	0.0	0.121±0.02a	Normal growth and development	0.0	2.6±0.19a
	0.01	Slow growing, few twine	28.0	0.081±0.01a	No obvious hurt	4.0	3.1±0.51a
	0.05	Wilting, no twine	54.0	0.101±0.01a	No obvious hurt	5.0	2.5±0.32a
	0.25	Mostly dead	78.0	0.08±0.01a	Leaves yellowing slightly	7.0	2.5±0.27a

Note: Data of the experiment in the table was the value of the average ± standard error repeated five times; Multiple comparisons were done with Duncan new multiple range method, and there is no significant difference (p<0.05) among the same letters after the same column by Duncan test