

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF DIAGNOSTIC TOOLS FOR THE
GRAPEVINE PATHOGEN *EUTYPA LATA*.**

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Science
in
Genetics

at

Massey University
Palmerston North
New Zealand

Paula Elizabeth Jones
July 2001

ABSTRACT.

Eutypa lata is the causal agent of Eutypa dieback on grapevines. The fungus invades the vine and grows there unnoticed, possibly for several years, causing discolouration and deformation of the vine shoots and leaves. Most berries fail to establish on these shoots and the fungus eventually kills the vine. The damaging effects of this fungus have had a notable financial impact on the grape and wine industry world wide and *E. lata* is at present the primary constraint on vineyard longevity in many places including California and Australia. Little is known about the occurrence and distribution of Eutypa dieback within New Zealand. This is due mainly to difficulties associated with identification of the disease in grapevines.

To develop a molecular probe for the identification of *E. lata* from grapevine wood the Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) amplified the Internal Transcribed Spacers (ITS1 and ITS2) and the intervening 5.8S gene of ribosomal DNA (rDNA) from representative isolates. The sequences of the *E. lata* ITS regions were used to design two pairs of primers, each of which was subsequently shown to be specific for the amplification of predicted-size fragments from genomic DNA of *E. lata*. The primer pairs were further tested using template DNA extracted from healthy grapevines and from other fungi commonly isolated from dieback diseased grapevines but no PCR amplification was observed. Simple DNA extraction protocols, leading to the rapid release of DNA, were tested to enable identification of *E. lata* from pure culture and grapevine wood; however, a suitable DNA extraction method from these materials was not found.

Currently the only known source of inoculum is ascospores, which are released from perithecia during and immediately after rainfall. However, few perithecia have been found in New Zealand vineyards. This has prompted the study of the mating habits of *E. lata*. As the sexual stage of *E. lata* cannot be obtained in culture at present, the analysis of its mating system must be performed in natural populations. Molecular characterisation of the mating type at the outset of a mating project allows significant savings in time and effort as it drastically reduces the number of crosses that must be set up. So far, cloning of mating type (*MAT*) genes from fungi has been hampered by low conservation among them. Most ascomycete fungi have one mating type gene with two alternative forms or idiomorphs (*MAT1-1* and *MAT1-2*). One of the pair of *MAT* genes, *MAT1-2*, encodes a protein with a conserved DNA binding motif called the high mobility group (HMG) box. There is sufficient sequence conservation at the borders of the HMG box to allow PCR amplification. New Zealand isolates of *E. lata*, including sixteen single ascospore isolates from one perithecium, were tested for the presence of a *MAT1-2* idiomorph using this PCR based approach. Five different sets of primers were used which were designed to anneal at different target sites with different specificities. PCR products of the expected size were obtained and sequenced, but despite exhaustive attempts to optimise PCR specificity, none of these had convincing homology to fungal mating type genes.

Progress on the basic aspects of the genetics of *E. lata* will continue to be hampered until the organism is induced to complete its life cycle in culture. Molecular studies into the mating type genes which regulate sexual compatibility and sexual reproduction in

the fungus should lead to a deeper understanding of the life-cycle of *E. lata* and the critical influence of sex on population genetics. In addition, it will provide a scientific basis for a management program urgently needed to minimise the impact of this disease.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

There have been many people that have helped me through the past two years, to you all I am extremely grateful.

Firstly, I would like to thank God for keeping me going when the difficulties were piling up. To Mum and Dad, Vicki and Greg and the members of my extended family, Sheralee, Alan and Seamus. You have been truly wonderful companions. I thank you all for the sacrifices you have made to help me finish this and for putting up with a complete mental case in the process (I owe you some).

However, special thanks to Mum and Sheralee for keeping this whole crazy thing together.

Janet, when you encouraged me to take the Masters with Rosie and Peter because "it would be fun". You certainly weren't wrong. Thanks so much for making my Masters degree such a memorable journey.

A big thank you to Jonathan and Rohan. "He dang near shot me wif a bb gun, as enny fool kin plainly see." Thanks fo' all yer he'p an' th' stress relief. It is ben pow'ful fun, as enny fool kin plainly see. And also to Christine and Jennifer, may the *Ciborinia* seasons be long. Bec, Bek, Beccy and Seth, the lab hasn't been the same since you left us. To James and Ramon in the wine cellar, many thanks for passing the time away with me, best wishes.

Thank you to Carolyn for always having the time to answer my questions, for probing the Southern blot and also for all your input while Rosie was away. I would also like to thank Lisa, Andrea, and the other members of Scottbase, Shuguang, Xiu-wen and Michelle. Also to the members of the IMBS, I can only sincerely wish all of you good luck for your futures. May the 'PCR Gods' always be shining upon the members of the IMBS.

Thanks to Hugh Nielsen for the kind words and the many stories, and thanks also to the others at INR for always making me feel welcome there, even when I was only in your space part time.

Special thanks also to Renée and Natalie, Helen and James, Kayden and Hannah, the boys at Heretaunga St (Dee, Jeff, Tony and Kevin), Toni, Andrew, Wayne, Sherrilyn and Rob (126b, a legend flat), Fiona and Greg, Lorelei, Gareth, Tim, Chris and Richard. Thanks for all the support and for nodding politely and looking interested when I try to explain to you exactly what it is I do.

To my Palmerston North families the Williamsons and the Wehners thankyou so much for caring for me when I was up and down and when I kept coming back to Palmerston North for another year and another year (this one is the last, I'm sure of it!).

To Robin Sage and the team at Erindale Vineyard Partnership I wish to express my gratitude for your cooperation and support. I'll catch up with you at the Rose and Crown one day.

Thank you to the American Vineyard Foundation, Massey University Research Foundation, New Zealand Winegrowers Association and the Queenstown Molecular Biology Society for funding and supporting this research.

Finally, but certainly not least. I would like to thank my supervisors, Rosie Bradshaw and Peter Long. Rosie, I count it a privilege to have worked with someone so talented, thank you for your patience. Thanks Peter for always being so friendly and for your guidance in determining the direction of this research.

It was a thesis of two halves, full credit to all those involved. Thankfully, grapevines were the winner on the day.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

1. INTRODUCTION.	1
1.1 WINEMAKING- A RISING STAR AMONG NEW ZEALAND'S INDUSTRIES.	1
1.1.1 FROM THE VINE TO THE BOTTLE.	1
1.1.2 THE NEW ZEALAND GRAPE AND WINE INDUSTRY.	1
1.2 EUTYPY DIEBACK.	2
1.2.1 EPIDEMIOLOGY	2
1.2.1.1 Spore release.	2
1.2.1.2 Infection.	3
1.2.2 SYMPTOM DEVELOPMENT.	4
1.2.2.1 Role of Eutypine	5
1.2.2.2 Formation of asexual and sexual stages.	6
1.2.3 HOST RANGE AND EFFECT ON YIELD.	7
1.2.3.1 Grape varieties.	7
1.2.3.2 Other crops.	7
1.2.3.3 Effect on yield.	8
1.2.4 MANAGEMENT.	9
1.2.4.1 Sanitation methods.	9
1.2.4.2 Fungicide control.	9
1.2.4.3 Biological control.	9
1.3 APPLICATION OF MOLECULAR MARKER TECHNOLOGY TO <i>EUTYPY LATA</i>.	10
1.4 A MOLECULAR APPROACH TO THE IDENTIFICATION OF <i>EUTYPY LATA</i>.	11
1.4.1 DETECTION PROBLEMS OF <i>EUTYPY LATA</i> .	11
1.4.2 CULTURING <i>EUTYPY LATA</i> .	12
1.4.3 THE ADVANTAGES OF A PCR BASED PATHOGEN IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM.	12
1.4.4 RDNA GENES AND THEIR USE AS MOLECULAR MARKERS.	12
1.4.5 DETECTION OF FUNGI USING THE ITS REGION.	13
1.4.6 LIMITATIONS OF THE ITS REGION FOR USE IN DETECTION.	14
1.4.7 RANDOM AMPLIFICATION OF POLYMORPHIC DNA ANALYSIS.	15
1.5 THE MATING SYSTEM OF <i>EUTYPY LATA</i>.	15
1.5.1 MATING TYPES.	15
1.5.2 MATING TYPE LOCI OF FILAMENTOUS ASCOMYCETES.	16
1.5.3 CLONING OF MATING TYPE GENES.	17
1.6 AIMS.	19
2. MATERIALS AND METHODS.	20
2.1 FUNGAL STRAINS, BACTERIAL STRAINS AND PLASMIDS.	20
2.1.1 INFECTED GRAPEVINE SAMPLES.	20
2.2 MEDIA.	21
2.2.1 LURIA-BERTANI (LB) MEDIA.	21
2.2.2 POTATO DEXTROSE AGAR (PDA).	21
2.2.3 MALT AGAR (MA).	21
2.2.4 15% V8 AGAR.	21
2.2.5 WATER AGAR (H ₂ O AGAR).	21
2.2.6 CORN MEAL AGAR (CMA).	21
2.3 GROWTH AND MAINTENANCE OF CULTURES.	22

2.3.1	FUNGAL CULTURES.	22
2.3.1.1	Subculturing.	22
2.3.1.2	Long-term storage of cultures.	22
2.3.1.3	Collection of fungal mycelium in preparation for DNA extraction.	22
2.3.1.4	Preparation of Single Spore Isolate (SSI) cultures.	22
2.3.1.4.1	<i>Eutypa lata</i> cultures.	22
2.3.1.4.2	<i>Botryosphaeria obtusa</i> cultures.	23
2.3.1.5	Isolation of fungal cultures from infected grapevine pieces.	23
2.3.1.6	Artificial inoculation of grapevine wood for PCR testing.	23
2.3.2	BACTERIAL CULTURES.	24
2.4	COMMON BUFFERS AND SOLUTIONS.	24
2.4.1	TE BUFFER.	24
2.4.2	1x TAE BUFFER.	24
2.4.3	1x TBE BUFFER.	24
2.4.4	10x TNE BUFFER.	24
2.4.5	20x SSC SOLUTION.	24
2.4.6	ETHIDIUM BROMIDE SOLUTION.	24
2.4.7	RNASE A (DNASE FREE).	24
2.4.8	10x GEL LOADING BUFFER	24
2.4.9	AL-SAMARRAI DNA EXTRACTION LYSIS BUFFER.	25
2.4.10	PREHYBRIDISATION SOLUTION.	25
2.4.11	50x DENHARDT'S SOLUTION.	25
2.4.12	BLOCKING SOLUTION.	25
2.4.13	SOUTHERN WASH SOLUTION.	25
2.4.14	MEMBRANE STRIPPING SOLUTION.	25
2.4.15	COTTON BLUE DYE.	25
2.4.16	HOESCHT'S FLUORESCENT DYE SOLUTION.	25
2.5	DNA ISOLATION	25
2.5.1	DNA ISOLATION FROM FUNGAL CULTURES (NUCLEON PHYTOPURE™ KIT).	25
2.5.2	DNA ISOLATION FROM FUNGAL CULTURES (AL-SAMARRAI & SCHMID, 2000).	26
2.5.3	QIAGEN® HIGH QUALITY COLUMN PURIFICATION OF PLASMID DNA.	26
2.6	PURIFICATION OF DNA.	26
2.6.1	ETHANOL PRECIPITATION.	26
2.6.2	PHENOL/CHLOROFORM EXTRACTION.	26
2.6.3	QIAGEN® AGAROSE GEL PURIFICATION OF DNA FRAGMENTS.	27
2.6.4	QIAGEN® PURIFICATION OF DNA FROM A PCR REACTION.	27
2.7	DETERMINATION OF DNA CONCENTRATION.	27
2.7.1	DETERMINATION OF DNA CONCENTRATION BY SPECTROPHOTOMETRIC ASSAY.	27
2.7.2	DETERMINATION OF DNA CONCENTRATION BY FLUOROMETRIC ASSAY.	27
2.7.3	DETERMINATION OF DNA CONCENTRATION BY GEL ELECTROPHORESIS.	27
2.8	RESTRICTION ENDONUCLEASE DIGESTION OF DNA.	28
2.8.1	RESTRICTION ENDONUCLEASE DIGESTION OF GENOMIC DNA.	28
2.8.2	RESTRICTION ENDONUCLEASE DIGESTION OF PLASMID DNA.	28
2.9	AGAROSE GEL ELECTROPHORESIS.	28
2.9.1	MINI GELS.	28
2.9.2	OVERNIGHT GELS.	28
2.10	DETERMINATION OF THE MOLECULAR WEIGHTS OF DNA FRAGMENTS.	28
2.11	DNA SUBCLONING TECHNIQUES.	29
2.11.1	LIGATION REACTIONS.	29
2.11.2	TRANSFORMATION OF <i>E. COLI</i> BY ELECTROPORATION.	29
2.11.2.1	Preparation of electroporation competent <i>E. coli</i> cells.	29
2.11.2.2	Electroporation.	29
2.12	SOUTHERN BLOTTING AND HYBRIDISATION.	30

2.12.1	SOUTHERN BLOTTING (CAPILLARY).	30
2.12.2	PREPARATION AND LABELLING OF PROBE.	30
2.12.2.1	Preparation of DIG labelled DNA probe.	30
2.12.2.2	Preparation of [α - ³² P] dCTP labelled DNA probe.	31
2.12.3	SOUTHERN BLOT HYBRIDISATION.	31
2.12.4	REMOVAL OF [α - ³² P] dCTP LABELLED DNA FROM SOUTHERN BLOT MEMBRANES (STRIPPING).	31
2.13	AMPLIFICATION OF DNA BY THE POLYMERASE CHAIN REACTION (PCR).	31
2.13.1	rDNA PCR.	32
2.13.1.1	Universal ITS PCR.	32
2.13.1.2	Eutypa lata specific PCR.	32
2.13.2	PCR AMPLIFICATION DIRECT FROM FUNGAL CULTURES.	33
2.13.2.1	PCR amplification from boiled agar culture.	33
2.13.2.2	PCR amplification direct from growing mycelia.	33
2.13.2.3	PCR amplification using fungal spore extracts.	33
2.13.2.4	PCR amplification from Eutypa lata mycelia (Lecomté et al., 2000).	33
2.13.3	PCR AMPLIFICATION DIRECT FROM <i>EUTYPA LATA</i> INFECTED GRAPEVINE WOOD.	33
2.13.3.1	PCR amplification of Eutypa lata infected grapevine wood (Lecomté et al., 2000).	34
2.13.4	DEGENERATE PCR.	34
2.13.5	COLONY SCREEN PCR.	35
2.13.6	RANDOMLY AMPLIFIED POLYMORPHIC DNA (RAPD) PCR.	35
2.13.7	5' ANCHORED MICROSATELLITE PCR.	35
2.14	DNA SEQUENCING.	36
2.15	SEQUENCE ALIGNMENT.	36

3. VINE SURVEY OF EUTYPA DIEBACK AND DEVELOPMENT OF A MOLECULAR DIAGNOSTIC TOOL. **39**

3.1	INTRODUCTION.	39
3.1.1	SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES.	39
3.2	COLLECTION OF SAMPLES AND FUNGAL ISOLATIONS.	40
3.2.1	MATERIAL AND METHODS.	40
3.2.1.1	Collection of samples.	40
3.2.1.2	Isolation of fungal colonies.	40
3.2.2	RESULTS.	40
3.2.2.1	Distribution of symptoms.	40
3.2.2.2	Fungal isolations.	41
3.2.2.3	Colony characteristics of Eutypa lata and Botryosphaeria spp. isolates.	45
3.3	DEVELOPMENT OF A MOLECULAR TOOL FOR THE DETECTION OF <i>EUTYPA LATA</i>.	47
3.3.1	DATABASE SEARCHING.	47
3.3.2	DNA EXTRACTION OF GRAPEVINE AND FUNGAL DNA.	48
3.3.3	PCR AMPLIFICATION OF THE ITS REGION.	48
3.3.3.1	PCR amplification of the ITS region of grapevine DNA	50
3.3.4	SEQUENCING OF THE ITS REGION.	50
3.3.5	SEQUENCE ALIGNMENT.	51
3.3.6	PRIMER DESIGN.	54
3.3.7	PCR AMPLIFICATION WITH THE <i>EUTYPA LATA</i> SPECIFIC PRIMERS.	58
3.3.7.1	Primers E.l.ITS1 and E.l.ITS4	58
3.3.7.2	Primers E.l.ITS2 and E.l.ITS3.	58

3.4	CONFIRMATION OF PRIMER SPECIFICITIES FOR <i>EUTYPA LATA</i> USING FUNGI ISOLATED FROM DISEASED GRAPEVINES.	59
3.4.1	<i>BOTRYOSPHERA</i> SP. PCR AMPLIFICATION.	59
3.4.2	PCR AMPLIFICATION WITH OTHER FUNGAL SPECIES.	61
3.5	COMPARISON OF <i>EUTYPA LATA</i> DETECTION BY SPECIFIC PCR AMPLIFICATION AND SELECTIVE MEDIA ISOLATION FROM INFECTED WOOD.	61
3.6	DEVELOPMENT OF AN ASSAY TO DETECT <i>EUTYPA LATA</i> IN GRAPEVINE WOOD.	65
3.6.1	DETECTION OF <i>EUTYPA LATA</i> DIRECT FROM MYCELIAL EXTRACTS.	65
3.6.2	DETECTION OF <i>EUTYPA LATA</i> IN GRAPEVINE WOOD.	67
3.7	DISCUSSION.	68
3.7.1	COLLECTION OF GRAPEVINE WOOD.	68
3.7.2	ANALYSIS OF <i>EUTYPA LATA</i> FUNGAL COMMUNITY.	69
3.7.3	SEQUENCE ANALYSIS OF THE ITS RIBOSOMAL DNA IN THREE <i>EUTYPA LATA</i> ISOLATES AND DEVELOPMENT OF A PCR BASED ASSAY FOR THE DETECTION OF <i>EUTYPA LATA</i> .	70
3.7.3.1	The <i>Eutypa lata</i> ITS sequence.	70
3.7.3.2	Primer design.	71
3.7.3.3	Primer specificity.	71
3.7.3.4	Primer sensitivity.	72
3.7.3.5	General discussion of method.	73
3.7.4	DEVELOPMENT OF A PCR BASED ASSAY.	73
3.7.4.1	PCR amplification direct from fungal cultures or crude mycelial extracts.	73
3.7.4.2	PCR amplification direct from grapevine wood.	73
3.7.5	CONCLUSIONS.	75

4. ISOLATION AND CLONING OF THE *EUTYPA LATA* MATING TYPE GENE. 76

4.1	INTRODUCTION.	76
4.1.1	SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES.	76
4.2	<i>MAT</i> GENE SEQUENCE ANALYSIS.	76
4.2.1	DATABASE SEARCHING.	76
4.2.2	<i>MAT1-1</i> AMINO ACID SEQUENCE ALIGNMENT.	77
4.2.3	<i>MAT1-2</i> AMINO ACID SEQUENCE ALIGNMENT.	82
4.3	PCR AMPLIFICATION OF THE <i>MAT1-2</i> HMG BOX.	85
4.3.1	ESTABLISHMENT OF <i>NEUROSPORA CRASSA</i> AS A POSITIVE CONTROL FOR PCR.	85
4.3.2	POLYMORPHISM ANALYSIS OF <i>EUTYPA LATA</i> ISOLATES EL01, E11PDA2, E11787 AND E11788	85
4.3.2.1	Randomly Amplified Polymorphic DNA (RAPD) analysis.	85
4.3.2.2	Randomly amplified microsatellite DNA (RAMS) analysis.	86
4.3.3	ATTEMPTS TO ISOLATE THE <i>EUTYPA LATA MAT1-2</i> GENE VIA HETEROLOGOUS PROBING.	86
4.3.3.1	Preparation of a DIG labelled DNA probe.	86
4.3.3.2	Preparation of a [γ - ³² P]dCTP labelled DNA probe and Southern hybridisation	87
4.3.4	OPTIMISATION OF PCR AMPLIFICATION CONDITIONS.	87
4.3.5	SEQUENCE ANALYSIS OF PRODUCTS FROM FOUR NEW ZEALAND ISOLATES.	90
4.4	OBTAINING AND TESTING NEW <i>EUTYPA LATA</i> ISOLATES.	91
4.4.1	ISOLATION OF SIXTEEN SINGLE ASCOSPORE <i>EUTYPA LATA</i> ISOLATES.	91
4.4.2	PCR AMPLIFICATION OF SINGLE ASCOSPORE ISOLATES.	93
4.4.3	SEQUENCE ANALYSIS OF PCR PRODUCTS FROM SINGLE ASCOSPORE ISOLATES.	100
4.5	DESIGNING PRIMERS TO A NEW AREA OF THE <i>MAT1-2</i> GENE.	102
4.6	DISCUSSION.	104
4.6.1	ATTEMPTS TO ISOLATE THE <i>MAT1-2</i> HMG BOX BY HETEROLOGOUS PROBING.	104

4.6.2	GENETIC DIVERSITY ANALYSIS.	107
4.6.2.1	RAMS analysis.	107
4.6.3	PCR AMPLIFICATION OF THE <i>MAT1-2</i> HMG BOX.	109
4.6.4	CONCLUSIONS.	112

5. DISCUSSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS. 113

5.1	<i>E. LATA</i> DETECTION.	113
5.1.1	FUTURE WORK.	114
5.2	<i>E. LATA</i> MATING TYPE IDENTIFICATION.	115
5.2.1	FUTURE WORK.	116
5.3	CONCLUDING REMARKS.	118
5.3.1	AIM 1- TO DEVELOP A PCR BASED TEST FOR THE DETECTION OF <i>EUTYPA LATA</i> WITHIN GRAPEVINE WOOD.	118
5.3.1.1	Progress.	118
5.3.1.2	Future work.	118
5.3.2	AIM 2- TO DEVELOP A PCR ASSAY TO ENABLE THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE MATING TYPE IDIOMORPHS OF <i>EUTYPA LATA</i> .	118
5.3.2.1	Progress.	118
5.3.2.2	Future work.	118
5.3.3	CONCLUSION.	119

6. REFERENCES. 120

7. APPENDIX 1-VINE ISOLATION RAW MATERIAL. 131

7.1	<i>VINE 2.</i>	131
7.2	<i>VINE 7.</i>	132
7.3	<i>VINE 8.</i>	132
7.4	<i>VINE 9.</i>	133
7.5	<i>VINE 10.</i>	134
7.6	<i>VINE 11.</i>	134
7.7	DESCRIPTION OF UNIDENTIFIED ISOLATES.	135
7.8	TOTAL FUNGAL GENERA OBTAINED.	135

8. APPENDIX 2-PLASMID MAPS. 136

8.1.1	PGEM-T VECTOR.	136
8.1.2	PGEM-T EASY VECTOR.	136

LIST OF FIGURES.

Figure 1.1 Typical foliar symptoms of grapevine dieback on Cabernet Sauvignon.	4
Figure 1.2 Typical <i>E. lata</i> perithecia on Cabernet Sauvignon grapevine wood.	6
Figure 1.3 The ribosomal DNA unit.	13
Figure 3.1 Original agar isolation plates from <i>Vine 7</i> .	41
Figure 3.2 Cross section of a diseased cordon of <i>Vine 4</i> from Erindale vineyard.	41
Figure 3.3 Mean number of fungal isolates per vine across three different agar isolation media.	43
Figure 3.4 Mean number of fungi isolated from six diseased grapevines.	44
Figure 3.5 Typical morphology of the anamorph of <i>E. lata</i> , (<i>Libertella blepharis</i> stage (previously <i>Cytosporina</i>)).	45
Figure 3.6 Variability in cultures of <i>E. lata</i> and <i>Botryosphaeria</i> spp. sixteen days after inoculation on PDA agar.	46
Figure 3.7 Typical features of colonies of <i>Botrytis cinerea</i> , <i>Mucor</i> sp., <i>Glomerella cingulata</i> , <i>Pestalotia</i> sp., <i>Phomopsis</i> sp., <i>Fusarium</i> sp. and <i>Gliocladium</i> .	47
Figure 3.8 Location on nuclear rDNA of PCR primers designed to PCR amplify the ITS regions.	49
Figure 3.9 Agarose gel (1%) with PCR amplification products of the ITS1-5.8s-ITS2 region of rDNA from 3 <i>E. lata</i> isolates (E11787, E11788 and EL01) and 1 <i>Botryosphaeria</i> sp., using ITS4 and ITS5 as primers.	49
Figure 3.10 Multiple alignment (Gene-Jockey II®) of ITS1-5.8S-ITS2 sequences of four isolates of <i>E. lata</i> and one isolate of <i>Botryosphaeria</i> species.	52
Figure 3.11 Design of the <i>E. lata</i> specific nested PCR reactions.	54
Figure 3.12 Multiple sequence alignment (Gene-Jockey II®) ITS1-5.8S-ITS2 of plant pathogenic fungi.	55
Figure 3.13 Agarose gel (1%) with PCR amplification products of the ITS1-5.8s-ITS2 region of the rDNA from 4 <i>E. lata</i> isolates in duplicate, using the primers E.l.ITS1 and E.l.ITS4 (E.l.ITS) and ITS1 and ITS4 (ITS).	59
Figure 3.14 Agarose gel (1%) with PCR amplification products of the ITS1-5.8s-ITS2 region of the rDNA from 3 <i>E. lata</i> isolates, using the primers E.l.ITS2 and E.l.ITS3.	60
Figure 3.15 Amplified ITS1-5.8s-ITS2 products fractionated by 1% agarose gel electrophoresis.	63
Figure 3.16 Agarose gel (1%) of PCR products amplified from the genomic DNA of 9 <i>E. lata</i> isolates and a <i>Botryosphaeria</i> sp. isolate (E11PDA1 Bot) with the <i>E. lata</i> specific ITS primers (E.l.ITS1-E.l.ITS4).	65
Figure 3.17 Agarose gel (1%) of PCR products amplified from the mycelial extract of the <i>E. lata</i> isolate E11787 with the <i>E. lata</i> specific ITS primers (E.l.ITS1-E.l.ITS4).	66
Figure 3.18 Agarose gel (1%) of PCR products amplified from the mycelial extracts of three <i>E. lata</i> isolates (E01, E11787 and E11788) with the <i>E. lata</i> specific ITS primers (E.l.ITS1-E.l.ITS4).	67
Figure 4.1 Alignment (Gene-Jockey II®) of the <i>MAT1-1</i> amino acid sequences from pyrenomycete fungi.	80
Figure 4.2 Alignment (Gene-Jockey II®) of pyrenomycete <i>MAT1-2</i> HMG box polypeptides.	83

Figure 4.3 Agarose gel (1.5%) with 5' anchored PCR amplification products from the 4 laboratory <i>E. lata</i> isolates obtained with the anchored CT primer.	86
Figure 4.4 Agarose gel (2%) with PCR amplification products obtained over a variety of dNTP concentrations with the NeHMG1-NeHMG2 PCR primers.	88
Figure 4.5 Agarose gels (2%) with PCR amplification products obtained from four <i>E. lata</i> isolates (EL01, E11PDA2, E11787 and E11788).	90
Figure 4.6 Agarose gel (1%) of PCR products amplified from the genomic DNA of 6 <i>E. lata</i> single ascospore isolates with the ITS primers (ITS1-ITS4) and <i>E. lata</i> specific (E.l.ITS) primers (E.l.ITS1-E.l.ITS4).	92
Figure 4.7 Anchored CT microsatellite analysis of 16 single ascospore <i>E. lata</i> isolates (E.l.SSI 1-E.l.SSI 16).	94
Figure 4.8 Anchored AAG microsatellite analysis of 16 single ascospore <i>E. lata</i> isolates (E.l.SSI 1-E.l.SSI 16).	96
Figure 4.9 Anchored TG microsatellite analysis of 16 single ascospore <i>E. lata</i> isolates (E.l.SSI 1-E.l.SSI 16).	98
Figure 4.10 Agarose gel (2%) of PCR products amplified from the genomic DNA of 9 <i>E. lata</i> single ascospore isolates using the NeHMG1-NeHMG2 primers.	101
Figure 4.11 Agarose gel (2%) showing the PCR products obtained from PCR amplification of genomic DNA from 15 <i>E. lata</i> single ascospore isolates E.l.SSI 1-16) and the PCR primers NeHMG1-NeHMG2.	101
Figure 4.12 Nucleotide sequence (292 bases, 5'-3') and predicted translation sequence (three forward frames) of clone 88.32 from <i>E. lata</i> .	103
Figure 4.13 PCR amplification with the <i>MAT1-2</i> primers SmHMG1 and SmHMG3 and SmHMG2 and SmHMG3 primers.	104
Figure 4.14 Alignment (Gene-Jockey II [®]) of the full-length <i>MAT1-2</i> amino acid sequences of four pyrenomycete species.	105

LIST OF TABLES.

Table 2.1 Fungal strains, bacterial strains and plasmids.	20
Table 2.2 PCR and sequencing primers.	37
Table 3.1 Origin and cultivar of infected grapevine cordons.	45
Table 3.2 Total number of fungal colonies, fungal genera and <i>E. lata</i> and <i>Botryosphaeria</i> sp. colonies obtained on three different agar media.	47
Table 3.3 Number of disease lesions from which <i>E. lata</i> and <i>Botryosphaeria</i> sp. were isolated together.	48
Table 3.4 Summary of ITS sequences of fungal plant pathogens obtained from GenBank database.	53
Table 3.5 Fungal species and strains for which the ITS region (ITS1-5.8S-ITS2 rDNA) has been sequenced in this project.	55
Table 3.6 <i>E. lata</i> specific PCR analysis of fungi found in diseased grapevine wood.	66
Table 4.1 Ascomycete genera from which <i>MAT1-2</i> genes have been obtained using degenerate PCR methods based on Arie <i>et al.</i> (1997).	77
Table 4.2 Summary of <i>MAT1-1</i> sequences obtained from the GenBank database.	78
Table 4.3 Summary of <i>MAT1-2</i> sequences obtained from the GenBank database.	79
Table 4.4 PCR primers designed to the <i>MAT1-2</i> HMG box region.	82
Table A Raw data from <i>Vine 2</i> agar isolations.	131
Table B Raw data from <i>Vine 7</i> agar isolations.	131
Table C Raw data <i>Vine 8</i> agar isolations.	132
Table D Raw data <i>Vine 9</i> agar isolations.	133
Table E Raw data <i>Vine 10</i> agar isolations.	133
Table F Raw data <i>Vine 11</i> agar isolations.	134
Table G Numbers of fungal isolates found in diseased vines.	135