

**Effects of phosphite on disease development  
and histological responses  
in *Eucalyptus marginata*  
infected with *Phytophthora cinnamomi***

**by**

**Ros Pilbeam B. Sc. (Hons)**

This thesis is presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
of Murdoch University 2003

## **Declaration**

I declare that this thesis is my own account of my research and contains as its main content, work which has not previously been submitted for a degree at any tertiary education institution.

Ros Pilbeam

2003

## Abstract

Phosphite is currently used for the management of *Phytophthora cinnamomi* in native plant communities. A greater understanding of how phosphite affects the host-pathogen interaction is required in order to determine the most effective treatment. This thesis aimed to investigate the effects of applied phosphite concentration on phytotoxicity, *in planta* concentration of phosphite, disease development and anatomical responses of *Eucalyptus marginata*.

Spraying the foliage to run-off with 7.5 and 10 g phosphite/L led to the development of severe leaf necrosis within 7 days, with greater than 60% of the leaf area damaged. Moderate phytotoxicity was observed after treatment with 5 g phosphite/L. *In planta* concentration of phosphite in stems, lignotubers and roots did not differ significantly between applied concentrations of phosphite. Stem tissue contained the largest concentration of phosphite at one week after spraying, with approximately 210 and 420 µg phosphite/g dry weight detected after treatment with 5 and 10 g phosphite/L, respectively.

In a subsequent field trial, the applied concentration of phosphite was found to affect the duration of effectiveness of phosphite in protecting *E. marginata* seedlings from stem colonisation by *P. cinnamomi*. Plants were wound-inoculated with *P. cinnamomi* at 6-monthly intervals after spraying with phosphite. The 2.5 and 5 g phosphite/L treatments were effective against colonisation by *P. cinnamomi* when inoculated 0 and 6 months after spraying, but only the 5 g phosphite/L treatment inhibited *P. cinnamomi* within 12 months of spraying. Phosphite had no effect on colonisation by *P. cinnamomi* when plants were inoculated at 17 months after spraying. The *in planta* concentration of phosphite detected in the leaves, stems and roots of plants treated with 5 g phosphite/L did not differ significantly between the time of harvest or tissue type at 0.2 and 6 months after spraying. *P. cinnamomi* remained viable in plants treated with phosphite.

Treatment with 2.5 and 5 g phosphite/L when *P. cinnamomi* was well-established in the stems was ineffective at preventing the death of *E. marginata*. Between 45 and 89% of plants were girdled on the day of spraying. Spraying plants with 2.5 and 5 g phosphite/L when conditions were less favourable for the pathogen reduced the mortality of *E. marginata* for up to 10 months.

*E. marginata* seedlings responded to damage by *P. cinnamomi* with the production of kino veins and woundwood. Bark lesions were in the process of being sloughed off by 7 months after inoculation in plants that remained alive.

In plants of a resistant (RR) clonal line and susceptible (SS) clonal line, phosphite treatment inhibited lesion extension in stems, but lesions did not indicate the amount of stem colonised by *P. cinnamomi*. The pathogen was isolated from up to 17 cm beyond the lesion front in the RR clonal line. Treatments that reduced the mortality of *E. marginata* were 5 g phosphite/L in the RR clonal line (RR/5) and 10 g phosphite/L in the SS clonal line (SS/10).

Uninoculated plants were wounded with liquid nitrogen to determine the microscopic responses to injury in the absence of the pathogen. Wound closure was achieved within 21 days of wounding, with callus formation and vascular cambium regeneration. A wound periderm separated wounded tissue from healthy tissue, adjacent to a lignified boundary zone. Two types of phellem were observed – thin-walled phellem (TnP) and thick-walled phellem (TkP). The first-formed TnP layers contained variable-shaped cells, while subsequent layers were more cubical in shape. Multiple TnP layers developed up to 42 days after wounding, with TkP cells sandwiched between the TnP layers. Genotype and phosphite treatment did not affect the wound responses.

Inoculated plants with a restricted lesion extension also formed a wound periderm to separate damaged tissue from healthy tissue. Phosphite treatment stimulated the responses to *P. cinnamomi* in both clonal lines. Early development of the wound periderm was visible by 6 days after phosphite treatment. It was

preceded by the formation of a ligno-suberised boundary zone in the cambial zone and in phloem parenchyma cells existing prior to injury. Suberin was not detected in the SS/0 treatment. TnP layers completely surrounded lesioned tissue in plants still alive by 24 days after phosphite treatment. Extensive callus production was evident in the SS/10, RR/5 and RR/10 treatments.

Temperature affected the post-inoculation efficacy of phosphite and anatomical responses of *E. marginata*. At 20°C, lesion extension was restricted in both clonal lines of *E. marginata*, irrespective of phosphite treatment. Greater than 70% of inoculated plants in all treatments produced a ligno-suberised boundary zone at 20°C and between 30 and 70% formed a wound periderm. At 28°C, lesion extension was reduced in phosphite-treated plants at 7 days after treatment. However, lesions continued to extend up to 5 mm per day in the SS clonal line and very few SS plants formed a wound periderm at the lesion front. This contrasted with the strong responses to abiotic wounding observed in uninoculated SS plants at 28°C. The most extensive responses to *P. cinnamomi* were detected in the RR/5 treatment at 28°C, with a ligno-suberised boundary zone and differentiated TnP of a wound periderm observed in greater than 70% of plants. This treatment resulted in significantly less girdled plants than all other treatments at 28°C, including the RR/0 treatment. At 23 and 24°C, there was no significant difference in acropetal lesion extension or circumferential lesion spread between clonal lines. The inoculation technique and environmental conditions may have resulted in too high a disease pressure for a full expression of resistance in the RR clonal line.

This thesis demonstrates that phosphite has the potential to enhance the resistance of young *E. marginata* and enable them to survive infection by *P. cinnamomi*. However, its effectiveness is dependent upon a number of factors, including host resistance, environmental conditions, the applied phosphite concentration and the timing of application.

## Table of contents

Declaration.....	i
Abstract.....	ii
Table of contents .....	v
Acknowledgments.....	x
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction and literature review .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 General introduction .....	1
1.2 What is plant resistance? .....	2
1.3 Plant resistance mechanisms.....	3
1.3.1 Anatomical responses to bark injury.....	3
1.3.2 Anatomical responses to vascular cambium and xylem injury.....	6
1.3.2.1 Wound closure .....	6
1.3.2.2 Compartmentalisation .....	7
1.4 Interspecific variation in resistance to <i>P. cinnamomi</i> .....	7
1.5 Intraspecific variation in resistance to <i>P. cinnamomi</i> .....	8
1.6 Effect of environment on host-pathogen interactions.....	10
1.7 Phosphite.....	11
1.7.1 What is phosphite?.....	11
1.7.2 Direct antifungal activity of phosphite.....	12
1.7.3 Indirect activity of phosphite.....	13
1.7.4 Mode of action.....	14
1.7.5 Detection and distribution of phosphite in plants.....	14
1.8 Summary and thesis objectives .....	16
<b>Chapter 2: Phosphite phytotoxicity and <i>in planta</i> phosphite concentration in</b>	
<b><i>Eucalyptus marginata</i> seedlings .....</b>	<b>18</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	18
2.2 Materials and methods .....	19
2.2.1 Experimental design.....	19
2.2.2 Plant material .....	19
2.2.3 Spray application of phosphite .....	19
2.2.4 Phytotoxicity symptoms .....	20
2.2.5 Harvesting plants.....	20
2.2.6 Phosphite analysis .....	20
2.2.7 Statistical analysis .....	21

2.3 Results .....	21
2.3.1 Phytotoxicity.....	21
2.3.2 <i>In planta</i> phosphite concentrations .....	22
2.4 Discussion .....	24
<b>Chapter 3:</b> The extension of <i>Phytophthora cinnamomi</i> in <i>Eucalyptus marginata</i> stems inoculated at different times after treatment with phosphite .....	27
3.1 Introduction.....	27
3.2 Materials and methods .....	28
3.2.1 Experimental design .....	28
3.2.2 Plant material and growth .....	29
3.2.3 Spray application of phosphite.....	29
3.2.4 Phytotoxicity symptoms .....	30
3.2.5 Inoculum material and inoculation procedure .....	30
3.2.6 Harvesting plants .....	30
3.2.7 Phosphite analysis.....	31
3.2.8 Environmental conditions and water relations .....	31
3.2.9 Statistical analysis.....	32
3.3 Results .....	33
3.3.1 Environmental conditions and water relations .....	33
3.3.2 Plant growth.....	36
3.3.3 Phytotoxicity symptoms .....	36
3.3.4 Lesion lengths in stems of <i>E. marginata</i> .....	36
3.3.5 Colonisation of <i>E. marginata</i> stems by <i>P. cinnamomi</i> .....	36
3.3.5.1 6 days after phosphite treatment.....	38
3.3.5.2 6 months after phosphite treatment.....	38
3.3.5.3 12 months after phosphite treatment.....	39
3.3.5.4 17 months after phosphite treatment.....	39
3.3.6 <i>In planta</i> phosphite concentrations .....	39
3.4 Discussion .....	42
<b>Chapter 4:</b> Post-inoculation efficacy of phosphite againsts <i>Phytophthora cinnamomi</i> in stems of <i>Eucalyptus marginata</i> seedlings under field conditions.....	46
4.1 Introduction.....	46
4.2 Materials and methods .....	47
4.2.1 Experimental design .....	47
4.2.2 Plant material .....	47

4.2.3	Inoculum material and inoculation procedure .....	47
4.2.4	Spray application .....	48
4.2.5	Monitoring .....	48
4.2.6	Environmental conditions and water relations .....	48
4.2.7	Harvesting for <i>P. cinnamomi</i> extension/viability and macroscopic examination of stems .....	49
4.2.8	Statistical analysis.....	50
4.3	Results .....	51
4.3.1	Environmental conditions and water relations .....	51
4.3.2	Lesions and plant survival.....	51
4.3.3	Viability of <i>Phytophthora cinnamomi</i> .....	52
4.3.4	Macroscopic observations .....	52
4.4	Discussion .....	58

**Chapter 5:** Effect of phosphite on disease development and histological responses of *Eucalyptus marginata* to abiotic wounding and colonisation by *Phytophthora cinnamomi* under glasshouse conditions .....

5.1	Introduction.....	61
5.2	Materials and methods .....	62
5.2.1	Experimental design .....	62
	Experiment 1: Colonisation by <i>P. cinnamomi</i> preliminary trial.....	62
	Experiment 2: Colonisation by <i>P. cinnamomi</i> trial .....	63
	Experiment 3: Wound responses trial .....	63
5.2.2	Plant material .....	64
5.2.3	Experimental conditions.....	65
5.2.4	Inoculum material, inoculation procedure and wounding procedure.....	65
5.2.5	Spray application .....	65
5.2.6	Monitoring .....	66
5.2.7	Harvesting.....	66
	Experiment 1: Colonisation by <i>P. cinnamomi</i> preliminary trial.....	66
	Experiment 2: Colonisation by <i>P. cinnamomi</i> trial .....	67
	Experiment 3: Wound responses trial .....	68
5.2.8	Preparation and examination of histological samples.....	69
5.2.9	Statistical analysis.....	70
	Experiment 1: Colonisation by <i>P. cinnamomi</i> preliminary trial.....	70
	Experiment 2: Colonisation by <i>P. cinnamomi</i> trial .....	71
	Experiment 3: Wound responses trial .....	72



5.3 Results .....	72
5.3.1 Experimental conditions.....	72
5.3.2 Disease development and symptoms in <i>E. marginata</i> .....	73
5.3.2.1 Experiment 1: Colonisation by <i>P. cinnamomi</i> preliminary trial.....	73
5.3.2.2 Experiment 2: Colonisation by <i>P. cinnamomi</i> trial .....	74
Lesion extension .....	74
Colonisation by <i>P. cinnamomi</i> beyond the lesion .....	74
Plant mortality .....	75
Phytotoxicity.....	75
5.3.3 Anatomical responses in <i>E. marginata</i> .....	82
5.3.3.1 Experiment 3: Wound responses trial.....	82
Histology of healthy stems .....	82
Histology of wounded stems .....	82
5.3.3.2 Experiment 2: Colonisation by <i>P. cinnamomi</i> trial .....	91
Tissue damage .....	91
Bark responses to <i>P. cinnamomi</i> up to 6 days after phosphite treatment.....	91
Bark responses to <i>P. cinnamomi</i> at 24 days after phosphite treatment.....	92
Xylem responses to <i>P. cinnamomi</i> .....	93
5.4 Discussion .....	101

<b>Chapter 6: Influence of temperature and phosphite treatment on the responses of clonal <i>Eucalyptus marginata</i> to abiotic wounding and colonisation by <i>Phytophthora cinnamomi</i></b> .....	107
6.1 Introduction.....	107
6.2 Materials and methods .....	108
6.2.1 Experimental design .....	108
6.2.1.1 Experiment 1 .....	108
6.2.1.2 Experiment 2 .....	109
6.2.1.3 Experiment 3 .....	109
6.2.2 Plant material .....	110
6.2.3 Experimental conditions.....	110
6.2.4 Inoculum material, inoculation and abiotic wounding procedure ....	111
6.2.5 Spray application .....	111
6.2.6 Monitoring .....	112
6.2.7 Harvest.....	112

6.2.8	Preparation and examination of histological samples.....	113
6.2.9	Statistical analysis.....	113
	Experiment 1 .....	113
	Experiment 2 .....	114
	Experiment 3 .....	115
6.3	Results .....	115
6.3.1	Experiments 1 and 2: 20 and 28°C.....	115
	6.3.1.1 Description of lesions .....	115
	6.3.1.2 Acropetal lesion extension .....	115
	6.3.1.3 Colonisation by <i>P. cinnamomi</i> beyond the lesion.....	116
	6.3.1.4 Circumferential lesion spread.....	116
	6.3.1.5 Wilting/death.....	117
	6.3.1.6 Stem growth .....	117
	6.3.1.7 Histology of wound response in uninoculated stems.....	125
	Pre-existing cells.....	125
	Periderm formation .....	125
	6.3.1.8 Histology of response in stems inoculated with <i>P. cinnamomi</i> .....	130
	Tissue damage .....	130
	Wound responses .....	130
	Pre-existing cells.....	130
	Periderm formation .....	131
	Extent of suberisation .....	131
	6.3.1.9 Responses of uninoculated versus inoculated stems .....	136
6.3.2	Experiment 3: 23 and 24°C.....	136
6.4	Discussion.....	140
<b>Chapter 7:</b>	<b>General discussion.....</b>	<b>144</b>
7.1	Introduction.....	144
7.2	Is phosphite effective against <i>P. cinnamomi</i> in <i>E. marginata</i> ? .....	144
7.3	Anatomical responses of <i>E. marginata</i> to <i>P. cinnamomi</i> and wounding... ..	145
7.4	Effectiveness of wound periderm against <i>P. cinnamomi</i> in <i>E. marginata</i> ..	146
7.5	Resistance of the resistant clonal line .....	148
7.6	Conclusion.....	149
	Appendix 1: List of abbreviations .....	150
	References .....	151

### **Acknowledgments**

Firstly I would like to thank my supervisors, Giles Hardy and Bryan Shearer, for their guidance and patience.

Thank you to Alcoa World Alumina Australia for providing in-kind support with vehicles and clonal plants and allowing me to use their mine-sites and glasshouse for my research. In particular, I thank Ian Colquhoun for his support.

I also wish to thank the following:

- Daniel Hüberli, Kay Howard and Meredith Fairbanks for their comments on this thesis and technical assistance
- Fellow students/researchers at Murdoch University for their assistance
- Matthew Williams and Mike Calver for assistance with statistical analysis
- Chris Loane and other staff in the Chemistry Department at Murdoch University for braving the HPIC and conducting phosphite analysis for me
- The Australian Research Council for funding the phosphite analysis
- Joanna Young, Richard Robinson and Emer O’Gara for helping me to grasp the concept of periderm formation and other histological responses
- Gordon Thomson for assisting with the technicalities of the histological work
- The Department of Conservation and Land Management for allowing me to use their laboratory and equipment in Manjimup
- The Bureau of Meteorology for providing weather information

Finally, I would like to give special thanks to my husband (David), my parents (Lyn and George Bennallick), and my good friend (Fiona Sanger M.D.) for their support and technical assistance.