





Available Online at EScience Press

International Journal of Phytopathology

ISSN: 2312-9344 (Online), 2313-1241 (Print) https://esciencepress.net/journals/phytopath

IDENTIFICATION OF HOST RESISTANCE TO BACTERIAL CANKER DISEASE ON APRICOT, PLUM AND PEACH GROWN IN PUNJAB AND KPK, PAKISTAN

- ^aShagufta Bibi, ^aMuhammad Inam-ul-Haq, ^aAbid Riaz, ^bSaad Imran Malik
- ^a Department of Plant Pathology, PMAS-Arid Agriculture University Rawalpindi, Pakistan.
- b Department of Plant Breeding and Genetics, PMAS-Arid Agriculture University Rawalpindi, Pakistan.

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Article History

Received: December 03, 2021 Revised: March 12, 2022 Accepted: March 29, 2022

Keywords

Host Resistance Bacterial Canker Pseudomonas syringae Stone Fruits

Bacterial canker disease caused by Pseudomonas syringae pv. syringae (Pss) has expanded rapidly in Pakistan, notably on stone fruits. The present research aimed to determine peach, plum and apricot cultivars' resistance to Pss bacterial canker. During the 2014–2015 growing season, diseased samples exhibiting symptoms of bacterial canker were collected from peach, plum, and apricot trees in Punjab and KPK provinces, and 48 P. syringae isolates were recovered. In a pathogenicity test, three Pss isolates (PS3, PS9, and PS17) were found to be highly virulent on peach, plum, and apricot, and their resistance to Pss was evaluated. Leaves and shoots of five peach varieties; Early grand, Florida king, 4 ½, 5 ½, 6 ½, four plum varieties; Red beauty, Fazal-e-man ani, Stanley, Producer, and two apricot varieties; Chinese apricot and golden amber, were foliar sprayed with a mixed culture of Pss at a concentration of 10-8 cfu ml-1. Sprayed cultivars were covered with plastic bags for three days to retain moisture and kept in a glass house, where they were closely monitored for the appearance of symptoms. 5 1/2 peach, Fazal-e-Manani plum, and Chinese apricot were found resistant to Pss, 6 ½ peach, Stanley plum were susceptible while Golden amber apricot was found moderately susceptible to Pss. This is the first report of apricot, peach, and plum host resistance to Pss in Pakistan.

Corresponding Author: Muhammad Inam-ul-Haq

Email: dr.inam11@gmail.com © The Author(s) 2022.

INTRODUCTION

Bacterial canker of stone fruits is caused by *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *syringae*, a widespread organism that generally causes disease on stressed trees. All stone fruit can be affected by this disease, but cherries, peaches, and apricots are the most susceptible (Ong and Rhodes, 2022).

Bacterial canker of stone fruits has emerged as a serious threat in many parts of the world (Mohammadi *et al.*, 2001; Ali *et al.*, 2021). It causes localized sunken lesions which are known as cankers or the death of an entire tree. Symptoms of bacterial canker are developed on plant parts like buds, fruits, twigs, and branches. Most

noticeable symptoms include; sunken lesions known as cankers that secrete or ooze out the gummy secretions during the late summer and spring (Hetherington, 2005).

This disease infects all the *Prunus* species including peach (*Prunus persica*), Plum (*Prunus domestica*), apricot (*Prunus armeniaca*), and cherry (*Prunus avium*). Two distinct pathovars of bacterial canker of stone fruits; *P. syringae* pv. syringae and *P. syringae* pv morsprunorum are known and associated with different host range (Ivanova, 2007; Ahmed *et al.*, 2018; Ahmed *et al.*, 2016). *Pseudomonas* spp. are difficult to control because to a lack of proper control techniques, plant resistance, and

endophytic behaviour of the pathogen during various disease phases (Kennelly *et al.*, 2007; Bibi *et al.*, 2017). The control of bacterial canker of stone fruits is unattainable, especially under optimal environmental conditions for infection and disease development (Giovanardi *et al.*, 2016).

The use of stone fruit cultivars resistant to Pss is economically and technically the most practical method for effective management of bacterial canker (Bassi, 1997). Use of resistant cultivars against Pss is technically and economically most effective procedure for the management of many diseases of stone fruits (Bassi, 1997; Donmez *et al.*, 2010). The objective of this study was to evaluate stone fruit cultivars commonly grown in Pakistan for their response to Pss.

MATERIALS AND METHODS Germplasm Collection

Germplasm of Peach; Early grand, Florida king, locally cultivated peach numbers; 4 ½, 5 ½ and 6 ½, Plum; Red beauty, Fazal-e-manani, Stanley and Producer, two varieties of Apricot; Chinese apricot and golden amber were collected from Swat Green and Ali nursery farm Mingora Swat, Pakistan. The germplasm was used to determine the host resistance response against *Pseudomonas syringae*.

Isolation of Pathogen

Infected fruits, stems and leaves of stone fruits were collected from Punjab and KPK province of Pakistan during 2014-15 (Table 1). Pathovars of pathogen were recovered on artificial nutritional media; nutrient agar followed by purification on King's B media. Incubation was done at 28 ± 2 °C for 48 hrs followed by preservation of pure cultures in 30% sterile glycerol at -80 °C (King *et al.*, 1954; Klement *et al.*, 1990).

Table 1. Representation of surveyed locations of Punjab and Khyber Pakhtoon Khwa, Pakistan during 2014-15 and 2015-16.

| Province | District/ Area | Sub Areas | |
|-------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Punjab | Rawalpindi | Murree, Gujar Khan, Chak Shehzad, National Agricultural Research Center, Islamabad | |
| | Attock | Dheri Kot, Shakar Dara, Qaziabad, Madrotha, Thekrian | |
| | Chakwal | Barani Agricultural Research Institute, Chakwal | |
| Khyber Pakhtoon Khwa | Peshawar | Peshawar | |
| | Haripur | Jatti Pind, Nara Amaz, Tofkian, Pind Hashim Khan, Khan Pur | |
| | Abbotabad | Singi Mera, Bagnotar, Balakot, Malkot, Nambal,Sajikot, Nara | |
| | Mansehra | Baffa, Battal, Hilkot, Jaloo, Shinkiari, Dhodal, Bandi, Malik Pura | |
| | Swat | Sher Garh, Sakha Kot, Thanra, Barikot, Mingora, Takht, Sher Palam, Bagh Deri, Matta | |

Hypersensitive Response and Pathogenicity Test

Hypersensitive reaction was performed to check the virulence of recovered bacterial isolates on tobacco, peach, plum and apricot seedlings (Johansson $et\ al.$, 2015; Doolotkeldieva and Bobusheva, 2020). Suspension was prepared using 24-48 hours grown bacterial cultures in sterilized distilled water to make a final concentration of 10^8 cfu ml $^{-1}$. Inoculation of healthy leaves of premaintained peach, plum and apricot nursery was done followed by the covering of leaves with polythene bags in order to maintain 25 ± 2 °C temperature and 65-70 % relative humidity. The response was then recorded after 3-7 days with an interval of 2 days post inoculation (DPI).

Host Resistance Response against Bacterial Canker Pathovars

Preparation of Inoculum

The inoculum of *P. syringae* was prepared in nutrient broth media incubated for two days at 28 °C in a shaking

incubator at 200 rpm. Fresh bacterial colonies from nutrient broth were collected by centrifugation at 10000 rpm for 10-15 minutes. Final concentration of bacterial population 10^8 cfu/ml was made at OD6000 using spectrophotometer in sterilized distilled water as solvent.

Inoculation and Host Response

Bacterial inoculation was done onto the germplasm of 10-12 week old seedlings of peach, plum, and apricot grown in pots on sterile soil under controlled conditions (Temperature (d/n) = 28/24 °C) by applying 30 ml of bacterial suspension (10^8 cfu/ml) as foliar application. Plants inoculated with distilled water were used as control (Lelliott and Stead, 1987). After inoculation, plants were covered with plastic bags to maintain 25 ± 2 °C temperature and 65-70 % relative humidity in controlled conditions, and plants were then examined for disease development. After 2 to 3 weeks, average disease severity rating (ADSR) was assessed by using rating scale; 1 = symptomless; 2 = 2

few necrotic spots; 3 = more spots, some coalescing; 4 = severe spot and leaf defoliation; and 5 = plant dead (Ahmed *et al.*, 2016). Cultivars were arranged separately in glass house by using CRD design with three replicates.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Recovered isolations were identified comparing the findings of Crosse (1959) who revealed *P. syringae* pv. *syringae* and *P. syringae* pv. *morsprunorum* can be readily isolated from leaf surfaces of peach and apricot during the growing season. A total of 48 bacterial isolates were recovered from the presumed infected tissues and leaf samples and kept in 20% glycerol for further investigations.

Hypersensitive Response and Pathogenicity Test

A total of 48 isolates were examined for hypersensitive reaction (HR) on tobacco which revealed 13 isolates showed negative HR response, while the remaining 35 isolates showed positive HR response. Pathogenicity test revealed only 3 isolates were highly virulent on apricot, peach and plum plants in the initial 10 days (Table 2). These findings are in line with the findinds of Kotan and Şahin (2002), where they identified *P. syringae* pv. *syringae* from bacterial canker symptoms on apricot trees in Turkey and confirmed its pathogenicity. Kennelly *et al.* (2007) also reported the strains of *P. syringae pv. syringae* are highly susceptible to stone fruits except to sour cherry.

Host resistance response against *P. syringae* isolates

All the test cultivars of cultivars of peach, plum and apricot showed a susceptible to resistant response following disease severity scale against *P. syringae pv. syringae* (Table 3).

Change in leave color, mostly in susceptible cultivars including 6 ½ in peach, Stanley in plum and Golden Amber in apricot was observed 5 days after inoculation followed by characteristic symptoms of *P. syringae*

appeared on leaves after 10 days. Water-soaked spots of 1 to 3 mm of diameter appeared as first which later on, turned to brownish, dryer and brittle, and eventually fell out giving a shot-hole appearance confirming the symptoms of bacterial canker disease on stone fruits (Agrios, 2005; Doolotkeldieva and Bobusheva, 2020).

Average disease severity rating (ADSR)

Average disease severity rating (ADSR) was determined between 1.87 (5 $\frac{1}{2}$) and 3.87 (6 $\frac{1}{2}$) in peach, 1.73 (Fazale-manani) and 3.93 (Producer), 1.10 (Chinese apricot) and 2.63 (Golden amber) (Table 3).

The lowest ADSR was found in 5 ½ of peach, Fazal-e-Manani of plum and Chinese apricot of apricot. Response on these cultivars were statistically different from other cultivars. In contrast, the highest ADSR was found in 6 ½ of peach, Stanley of plum. These cultivars were statistically higher than other cultivars and were considered as susceptible, because they showed highest susceptibility to *P. syringae* infection. The cultivar 5 ½ of peach, Fazal-e-manani of plum and Chinese apricot of apricot showed small necrotic lesions and were considered as resistant cultivars to *P. syringae*. On the basis of ADSR, the remaining cultivars of peach, plum and apricot were considered as moderately susceptible. Considering the appearance of symptoms shown by the most virulent strains of P. syringae, 5 1/2 of peach, Fazale-manani of plum and Chinese apricot of apricot were grouped as resistant cultivars and had an ADSR of 1.87, 1.73 and 1.10, respectively (Table 3). The response was significantly lower than ADSRs of moderately susceptible cultivars, Florida king and Early grand of Peach, Red beauty and Stanley of plum, and susceptible cultivars 6 ½ and 4 ½ of peach and Producer of plum, while Golden amber of apricot was found moderately susceptible. This is the first study that exhibits host resistance to peach, plum and apricot cultivars to bacterial canker disease in Pakistan.

Table 2. Hypersensitive reaction and virulence of *P. syringae* isolates on tobacco, peach, plum and apricot plants.

| Isolate | Tobacco | Peach | Plum | Apricot |
|---------|---------|-------|------|---------|
| Ps1 | + | + | - | + |
| Ps2 | - | - | - | - |
| Ps3 | + | +++ | +++ | +++ |
| Ps4 | - | - | - | - |
| Ps5 | - | - | - | - |
| Ps6 | + | - | ++ | ++ |
| | | | | |

| Ps7 | + | ++ | + | + |
|------|---|-----|----|-----|
| Ps8 | + | ++ | + | ++ |
| Ps9 | + | +++ | ++ | +++ |
| Ps10 | + | ++ | ++ | + |
| Ps11 | + | - | + | - |
| Ps12 | + | - | + | - |
| Ps13 | - | + | - | ++ |
| Ps14 | + | - | + | - |
| Ps15 | + | + | + | + |
| Ps16 | - | - | - | - |
| Ps17 | + | +++ | ++ | +++ |
| Ps18 | + | + | ++ | + |
| Ps19 | - | + | - | - |
| Ps20 | + | + | - | + |
| Ps21 | + | - | - | + |
| Ps22 | + | - | - | - |
| Ps23 | - | - | - | - |
| Ps24 | + | + | + | + |
| Ps25 | + | + | - | + |
| Ps26 | - | - | - | - |
| Ps27 | + | + | - | + |
| Ps28 | + | + | ++ | - |
| Ps29 | - | - | - | - |
| Ps30 | - | - | - | - |
| Ps31 | - | - | - | - |
| Ps32 | + | ++ | + | + |
| Ps33 | + | - | + | - |
| Ps34 | + | + | - | + |
| Ps35 | + | + | + | + |
| Ps36 | + | + | + | + |
| Ps37 | + | ++ | + | ++ |
| Ps38 | + | - | - | - |
| Ps39 | + | - | + | - |
| Ps40 | + | - | - | - |
| Ps41 | + | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Ps42 | + | - | - | - |
| Ps43 | + | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Ps44 | + | - | - | - |
| Ps45 | - | - | + | - |
| Ps46 | - | - | - | - |
| Ps47 | + | - | - | + |
| Ps48 | + | - | + | - |

Isolates marked '+++' are highly virulent; Isolates marked '++' are moderately virulent; Isolates marked '+' are weakly virulent.

Table 3. Host resistance response of different peach, plum and apricot varieties against *P. syringae* isolates.

| Plant | cultivar | Mean | Response |
|---------|-----------------|------|----------|
| | Early grand | 2.87 | MS |
| | Florida king | 2.10 | MS |
| Peach | 4 1/2 | 3.12 | S |
| | 5 1/2 | 1.87 | R |
| | 6 1/2 | 3.87 | S |
| _ | Red Beauty | 2.63 | MS |
| Plum | Fazal-e-manani | 1.73 | R |
| Piulli | Producer | 3.93 | S |
| | Stenley | 2.89 | MS |
| Annicot | Chinese Apricot | 1.10 | R |
| Apricot | Golden Amber | 2.63 | MS |

Classes: R resistant, MS moderately susceptible, S susceptible

It is evident from the worldwide reports that *P. syringae* is undoubtedly critical bacterial pathogen and is still increasing its host range, infecting more crops, fruits and vegetable particularly posing serious threats to production of stone fruits.

Leaf spot can be found on cultivars of stone fruits susceptible to bacterial canker infection. These leaf spots are surrounded by chlorotic rings during early stages, and then the spots expand in diameter and finally falling out of lea tissues resulting in shot-hole symptom (Kennelly et al., 2007; Doolotkeldieva and Bobusheva, 2020). P. syringae isolates with virulence properties could produce compounds such as siderophore pyoverdine and phytotoxin, similar to syringomycin, which cause dark dry decay (Taguchi et al., 2010; Jones et al., 2007). In this aspect, cultivars which showed severe disease symptoms in leaves can produce critical symptoms on blossoms, shoots and trunks as well. Similarly, in cultivars showing lower leaf spot symptoms, pathogenic potential could be lower in other parts of the plant. Except reports of Kennelly et al. (2007) who suggested that mode of resistance to P. syringae pv. syringae, no reports are found on the area of investigations therefore, it is important that for further studies be conducted to find out the mechanism of resistance to P. syringae pv. syringae.

REFERENCES

Agrios, G. N. 2005. Plant Pathology. Academic Press: London.

Ahmed, R., M. Ashfaq, Z. Akram and M. Inam-ul-Haq. 2016. Pathogenesis and molecular confirmation of *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *syringae* isolates from peach and plum in Pakistan. International Journal of Biosciences, 8: 22-28.

Ahmed, R., M. Inam-ul-Haq, U. Shahzad, S. Hyder, S. Shahzaman, A. Khan, H. Aatif, A. Ahmad and A. Gondal. 2018. First report of bacterial canker caused by *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *morsprunorum* race 1 on peach from Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province of Pakistan. Plant Disease, 102: 2027-27.

Ali, N., A. Ali and M. A. Syed. 2021. Bacterial Plant Diseases and Their Management: Conventional Versus Modern Approaches. In, Microbial Biotechnology in Crop Protection. Springer.

Bassi, D. 1997. Apricot Culture: Present and Future. XI International Symposium on Apricot Culture 488.

Bibi, S., M. Inam-Ul-Haq, A. Riaz, S. I. Malik, M. I. Tahir and R. Ahmed. 2017. Screening and characterization of Rhizobacteria antagonistic to *Pseudomonas syringae* causing bacterial canker of stone fruits in Punjab and KPK. International Journal of Biosciences, 10: 405-12.

Crosse, J. 1959. Bacterial canker of stone-fruits .IV. Investigation of a method for measuring the inoculum potential of cherry trees. Annals of applied Biology, 47: 306-17.

Donmez, M. F., H. Karlidag and A. Esitken. 2010. Identification of resistance to bacterial canker (Pseudomonas syringae pv. syringae) disease on apricot genotypes grown in Turkey. European journal of plant pathology, 126: 241-47.

Doolotkeldieva, T. and S. Bobusheva. 2020. Characterization of *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *syringae* from diseased stone fruits in Kyrgyzstan

- and testing of biological agents against pathogen. International Journal of Phytopathology, 9: 71-91.
- Giovanardi, D., D. Dallai, L. Dondini, V. Mantovani and E. Stefani. 2016. Elicitation of resistance to bacterial canker of stone fruits by humic and fulvic acids (glucohumates): a cDNA-AFLP-dHPLC approach. Scientia Horticulturae, 212: 183-92.
- Hetherington, S. 2005. Bacterial Canker of Stone Fruit. Research Horticulturist Health
- Sciences, Science Alliance and Evaluation. Orange Agricultural Institute.
- Ivanova, L. 2007. First occurrence of apricot blast disease caused by *Pseudomonas syringae* in the north-eastern part of Bulgaria. Balkan Symposium on Fruit Growing 825.
- Johansson, O. N., A. K. Nilsson, M. B. Gustavsson, T. Backhaus, M. X. Andersson and M. Ellerström. 2015. A quick and robust method for quantification of the hypersensitive response in plants. PeerJ, 3: e1469.
- Jones, A. M., S. E. Lindow and M. C. Wildermuth. 2007. Salicylic acid, yersiniabactin, and pyoverdin production by the model phytopathogen *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *tomato* DC3000: synthesis, regulation, and impact on tomato and *Arabidopsis* host plants. Journal of Bacteriology, 189: 6773-86.
- Kennelly, M. M., F. M. Cazorla, A. de Vicente, C. Ramos and G. W. Sundin. 2007. *Pseudomonas syringae* diseases of fruit trees: Progress toward understanding and control. Plant Disease, 91: 4-17.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTIONS

All the authors contributed equally to this work.

- King, E. O., M. K. Ward and D. E. Raney. 1954. Two simple media for the demonstration of pyocyanin and fluorescin. The Journal of laboratory and clinical medicine, 44: 301-07.
- Klement, Z., M. Sasser, K. Rudolph and D. Sands. 1990. Methods in Phytobacteriology. In, Identification of Bacteria Through Fatty Acid Analysis Budapest. Akademiai Kaido.
- Kotan, R. and F. Şahin. 2002. First record of bacterial canker caused by *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *syringae*, on apricot trees in Turkey. Plant pathology, 51: 798-98.
- Lelliott, R. A. and D. E. Stead. 1987. Methods for the diagnosis of bacterial diseases of plants. Blackwell Scientific Publications.
- Mohammadi, M., A. Ghasemi and H. Rahimian. 2001. Phenotypic characterization of Iranian strains of *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *syringae* van Hall, the causal agent of bacterial canker disease of stone fruit trees. Journal of Agricultural Science and Technology, 3: 51-65.
- Ong, K. and C. Rhodes. 2022. Gardening Bacterial Canker of Stone Fruits
- Texas A & M AgriLife Extension, Texas A&M University. Texas, USA.
- Taguchi, F., T. Suzuki, Y. Inagaki, K. Toyoda, T. Shiraishi and Y. Ichinose. 2010. The siderophore pyoverdine of *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *tabaci* 6605 is an intrinsic virulence factor in host tobacco infection. Journal of Bacteriology, 192: 117-26.

Publisher's note: EScience Press remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if

changes were made. The images or other third-party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.