

**Control of Sudden Death in Cultivated Proteas from
the Southwest of Western Australia**

Christopher Dunne

**Thesis presented to the School of Biology and
Biotechnology, Murdoch University, Western
Australia, for the fulfillment of the requirements of a
Ph.D.**

March 2004

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank the whole WA protea industry, particularly those growers that offered their plantations for the disease surveys and that assisted in the establishment of the field trials. In particular, I would like to thank to Wally and Dawn Lewis at Anniebrook flower farm in Carbanup River. Without your help, assistance and input, this project would not have been possible.

The partnership with the Department of Agriculture has proved very rewarding and I would like to acknowledge the contribution of Mark Heap, Gilly Brown, Lachlan Duncan, Chris Newell, Gerry Parvliet and Digby Gowns.

A number of *Phytophthora* cultures used in the current study were obtained from a culture collection at Conservation and Land Management in Western Australia. I would like to recognize Jeff Boersma for providing the VHSC 8105 *P. cactorum* isolate.

I would like to acknowledge Malatesta Greenwaste Recyclers and Custom Composts for providing the mulch and compost used in the field trials. Also, thanks to Agseed Research and Wrightson seeds for providing the *Brassica* varieties used in the current study.

Thank you to all the staff at Murdoch University who assisted me in this project. I would like to pay particular thanks to Dr Giles Hardy who has been an inspiration and mentor during this period. Also, I would like to recognize Associate Professor Bernie Dell for his supervision. Thanks to the members of the "thesis writing group" (Tania Jackson, Aaron Maxwell and Sarah Collins) for helping with the finer details of the thesis.

Thanks to all my friends and family who have supported me during this time. I would like to recognise the support of my mother, Margaret Dunne.

Finally, and most importantly, thank you to my wife Janelle Martin for putting up with me during this time. I couldn't have done it without you and I will always be indebted to you.

This study funded by an ARC-SPIRT grant (C19940004).

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	6
CHAPTER 1 – LITERATURE REVIEW	9
1.0. Introduction	9
1.1. The cultivated protea industry	9
1.2. Growing proteas	10
1.3. Pests and diseases of proteas	11
1.4. <i>Phytophthora cinnamomi</i>	11
1.4.1. Phytophthora root rot of proteas	15
1.4.2. Symptoms	16
1.4.3. The disease cycle in the southwest of Western Australia	16
1.4.4. Control of <i>Phytophthora</i>	19
1.5. General conclusions	28
1.6. Project objectives	29
CHAPTER 2 – PROTEA DEATH AND DECLINE IN PLANTATIONS FROM THE SOUTHWEST OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA	31
2.1. Introduction	32
2.2. Methods	32
2.2.1. Plantation surveys	32
2.2.2. Isolation of fungi associated with diseased proteas	32
2.2.3. Inorganic nutrient analysis	33
2.2.4. Pathogenicity trials	34
2.3. Results	36
2.3.1. Plantation surveys	36
2.3.2. <i>Phytophthora cinnamomi</i> pathogenicity trial	38
2.3.4. <i>Fusarium</i> pathogenicity trial	42
2.4. Discussion	42
2.4.1. Plantation visits	42
2.4.2. Pathogenicity tests	43
CHAPTER 3 – DO BIOFUMIGANTS SUPPRESS THE VEGETATIVE GROWTH OF FIVE <i>PHYTOPHTHORA</i> SPECIES <i>IN VITRO</i>?	45
3.1. Introduction	46
3.2. Methods	47
3.2.1. Experimental design	47
3.2.2. Experimental isolates	47
3.2.3. Preparation of biofumigant tissues	47
3.2.4. Determination of suppression (growth tests)	48
3.2.5. Quantification of biofumigant tissue	50
3.2.6. Post treatment isolate viability	50
3.2.7. Statistical analysis	51
3.3. Results	51
3.3.1. Suppression by the root and shoot tissues of <i>Brassica juncea</i> and <i>B. napus</i>	51
3.3.2. Suppression by combining <i>Brassica</i> tissues	54
3.3.3. Suppression using synthetic PE-ITC	56
3.3.4. ITC content of the <i>Brassica</i> tissues	60
3.3.5. Viability of isolates after exposure to volatiles	60
3.4. Discussion	61

CHAPTER 4 – DO BIOFUMIGANTS AFFECT THE SPORULATION AND SURVIVAL OF <i>PHYTOPHTHORA CINNAMOMI</i>?	64
4.1. Introduction	64
4.2. Methods	65
4.2.1. Experimental design	65
4.2.2. <i>Phytophthora cinnamomi</i> isolate	65
4.2.4. Monitoring of infective and survival structures	66
4.2.5. Statistical analysis	67
4.3. Results	69
4.3.1. Quantification of the biofumigant tissues	69
4.3.2. The effect of biofumigants on <i>Phytophthora cinnamomi</i> sporangia	69
4.3.3. The effect of biofumigants on <i>Phytophthora cinnamomi</i> chlamydospores	72
4.3.4. The effect of biofumigants on the infectivity of <i>Phytophthora cinnamomi</i>	75
4.4. Discussion	76
CHAPTER 5 – DO BIOFUMIGANTS AFFECT INOCULUM POTENTIAL, INFECTIVITY AND DISEASE INCIDENCE IN <i>PHYTOPHTHORA CINNAMOMI</i>?	79
5.1. Introduction	80
5.2. Methods	80
5.2.1. Experimental Design	80
5.2.2. Biological materials	81
5.2.3. Monitoring of inoculum potential, infectivity and disease incidence	82
5.2.4. Statistical analysis	83
5.3. Results	84
5.3.1. Inoculum potential and infectivity in soil cores	84
5.3.2. Inoculum potential and infectivity in soil leachate	87
5.3.3. Disease incidence in <i>Lupinus angustifolius</i>	88
5.4. Discussion	90
CHAPTER 6 - CAN SOIL SOLARISATION, FUMIGATION AND BIOFUMIGATION REDUCE <i>PHYTOPHTHORA CINNAMOMI</i> INFECTION OF <i>LEUCADENDRON SAFARI</i> SUNSET?	93
6.1. Introduction	94
6.2. Methods	94
6.2.1. Field trial design	94
6.2.3. Biological materials	95
6.2.4. Soil treatments	99
6.2.5. Soil analysis	104
6.2.6. Inoculation	109
6.2.7. Monitoring of plant death	109
6.2.8. Rainfall and temperature data	109
6.2.9. Statistical analysis	109
6.3. Results	110
6.3.1. The soil treatments	110
6.3.2. Post-treatment analysis	116
6.4. Discussion	128
CHAPTER 7 - CAN <i>BRASSICA JUNCEA</i> OR <i>B. NAPUS</i> REDUCE <i>PHYTOPHTHORA CINNAMOMI</i> INFECTION OF <i>LEUCADENDRON SAFARI</i> SUNSET?	134
7.1. Introduction	134
7.2. Methods	134
7.2.1. Experimental design	134
7.2.2. Biological materials	134

7.2.3. Soil analysis	136
7.2.4. Inoculation	140
7.2.5. Monitoring of disease incidence	140
7.2.6. Statistical analysis	140
7.3. Results	141
7.3.1. Treatment analysis	141
7.3.2. Post-treatment analyses	144
7.4. Discussion	154
CHAPTER 8 – GENERAL DISCUSSION	158
8.1. Plantation visits	158
8.2. Effect of biofumigants on <i>Phytophthora cinnamomi</i>	159
8.3. Field trials	160
8.4. Biofumigation in protea cultivation	162
8.4.1. Mechanisms of suppression	162
8.4.2. Optimising biofumigation	162
8.4.3. Incorporation methods	163
8.4.4. Enhanced biodegradation	163
8.5. Integrated management of <i>Phytophthora cinnamomi</i>	164
8.5. Limitations of the current study	168
8.6. Future research directions	169
8.7. Conclusions	170
REFERENCES	171

Abstract

Phytophthora cinnamomi Rands is a common and devastating pathogen of cultivated proteas worldwide. Webb (1997) described a Sudden Death plant disease of proteas in Western Australia (WA) protea plantations. Proteas that suffer the syndrome display symptoms such as stunted growth, wilting, chlorosis and often death. In the current study, a number of protea plantations in the southwest of WA were visited to quantify the extent that *P. cinnamomi* was attributing to deaths of cultivated proteas. The survey indicated that *P. cinnamomi* is the major cause of Sudden Death in proteas. A range of other fungi (*Fusarium*, *Botryosphaeria*, *Pestalotiopsis*, *Alternaria*) and pests (nematodes, mealy bug, scale insects) were also identified to be contributing to protea death and decline in WA plantations. In many cases the factors contributing to protea disease appeared complex, with a range of physical factors or nutritional imbalances commonly associated with these pathogens and pests. As *P. cinnamomi* was the major cause of death of cultivated proteas the remainder of the experiments described in this dissertation investigated its control in horticultural plantings.

Biofumigation has the potential to become an important technique in an overall integrated management approach to *P. cinnamomi*. In this thesis, biofumigation refers to the suppression of pathogens and pests by the incorporation of *Brassica* plants into the soil. Two biofumigants (*Brassica juncea* (L.) Czern., *B. napus* L.) were screened for their effect on the *in vitro* growth of five common *Phytophthora* species (*P. cinnamomi*, *P. cactorum* (Lebert & Colin) Schroeter., *P. citricola* Sawada, *P. cryptogea* Pethyb. & Laff. and *P. megasperma* Drechsler). Growth was determined by the measuring dry weight and radial growth of vegetative hyphae. *B. juncea* was found to be superior in its suppressive effect compared to *B. napus*. There was also significant variation in the sensitivity of the *Phytophthora* species to the suppressive effects of the biofumigants. *P. cinnamomi* was the most sensitive of the five species investigated. Where the rates of the biofumigant were sufficient to suppress growth of *Phytophthora*, the suppressive effect was mostly fungicidal.

To determine how *B. juncea* and *B. napus* affect the infective ability and survival of *P. cinnamomi*, their effects on sporangia and chlamydospores production in soil was

investigated *in vitro*. *P. cinnamomi* colonised Mira cloth discs were added to soil amended with the two *Brassica* species, before being removed every two days over an eight day period for the determination of sporangia production, chlamyospore production and infective ability. Only the soils amended with *B. juncea* significantly reduced sporangia production in *P. cinnamomi*. Both *Brassica* species increased the percentage of aborted or immature sporangia and reduced the infective ability of the pathogen. Neither *Brassica* species had any effect on zoospore release or chlamyospore production in *P. cinnamomi*.

Soil cores and soil leachate were collected from biofumigant-amended field soils to determine the inoculum potential and infective ability of the pathogen under glasshouse conditions. Amending the soil with both *Brassica* species had an immediate suppressive effect on the inoculum potential and infective ability of the *P. cinnamomi*. However, after this initial suppression there was a gradual increase in the recovery of the pathogen over the monitoring period of four weeks. To determine if the suppression would result in decreased disease incidence in a susceptible host, *Lupinus angustifolius* L. seeds were planted in the biofumigant amended soil. *B. juncea* amended soils reduced the disease incidence of *P. cinnamomi* by 25%. *B. napus* had no effect on disease incidence in *L. angustifolius*.

Although the current study had demonstrated that biofumigants could suppress the growth, sporulation and infection of *P. cinnamomi*, it was unclear if this would equate to a reduction in disease incidence when applied in the field. A field trial was conducted on a protea plantation in the southwest of Western Australia that compared biofumigation with *B. juncea* to chemical fumigation (metham sodium) and soil solarisation. The three soil treatments were used in an integrated management approach to control *P. cinnamomi* that included the use of a hardwood compost, mulch and water sterilisation. All treatments were monitored during their application to ensure the treatments were conducted successfully. The three soil treatments significantly reduced the recovery of the pathogen and the infective ability of the pathogen to a soil depth of 20 cm. Metham sodium was the most suppressive soil treatment and soil solarisation was the least suppressive treatment. Only the metham sodium treatment resulted in a

significant reduction in the incidence of root rot in *Leucadendron salignum* P.J. Bergius x *laureolum* (Lam.) Fourc (c.v. Safari Sunset) over the monitoring period of three years.

Another field trial was conducted on the same protea plantation to compare the effectiveness of *B. juncea* and *B. napus*, without the use of other control strategies, to reduce the incidence of *P. cinnamomi* infection of *Leucadendron* Safari Sunset. The concentration of isothiocyanates was monitored for seven days after the incorporation of the biofumigants. Although both *Brassica* species reduced the recovery and infective ability of the pathogen, neither biofumigant reduced the incidence of root rot in *Leucadendron* Safari Sunset.

In conclusion, *P. cinnamomi* is the most common and devastating pathogen in WA protea plantations. The current study demonstrated that *P. cinnamomi* is sensitive to the suppressive nature of biofumigants. Biofumigants can suppress the *in vitro* growth, sporulation, infective ability of *P. cinnamomi* and reduce the incidence of the disease caused by the pathogen in the glasshouse. Of the two *Brassica* species investigated, *B. juncea* was superior in its ability to control *P. cinnamomi* compared to *B. napus*. When applied in the field, biofumigation using *B. juncea* was found to be more suppressive than soil solarisation, but not as effective as metham sodium.