

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.

STUDIES ON BACTERIAL SPECK OF TOMATOES

CAUSED BY *PSEUDOMONAS SYRINGAE* PV *TOMATO*

A thesis presented in fulfillment of a  
Masterate of Science by thesis only  
at Massey University

by

Nicholas Brian Pyke

1980

#### ADDENDUM

Pg 1, Para 3: Agrobacterium tumefaciens - 'e' not 'a'

Pg 6, Para 1: feasibility - 'i' not 'a'

Pg 10, para 1: 1st sentence reads:

...oxidase reagent using the method of Kovacs (Lelliott  
et al 1966)

Pg 16, para 2: 'sera' not 'serum'

Pg 16, para 3: 'antiserum' not 'antisera'

Pg 21, para 2: distinguished - 'g' not 'q'

Pg 24, para 1: Klement (1963)

Pg 24, para 1: 24, 28 or 72 '48' not '28'

### Acknowledgements

I am sincerely grateful to Professor K.S. Milne for his advice and encouragement throughout the course of this study and in the preparation of this thesis.

I would also like to thank:

Dr M.J. Hill for helpful discussion and for use of the facilities in the Seed Technology Centre, Massey University.

Mr H.F. Neilson for technical assistance and discussion.

The Central Photographic Unit, Massey University for photography.

Mrs J. Hay for typing this thesis.

Odering's Nurseries, Palmerston North and Persson's Nurseries and Garden Centre, Palmerston North for the use of facilities and for tomato plants and tomato seed.

Mr B. MacKintosh (Wattie Industries Ltd) for tomato plant material and tomato seed.

Arthur Yates and Company for making funds available for this project.

Special thanks to Shirley.

## Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
List of Plates:	ii
List of Figures:	iii
List of Tables:	iv
Abstract.	vii
1. Introduction	1
2. Identification and Taxonomy of the Pathogen	5
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 Morphological Characteristics of <i>P. syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> .	6
2.3 Selective Media	6
2.4 Determinative tests	7
2.5 Pathogenicity tests	10
2.6 Serology	13
2.7 Taxonomy	19
3. Seed - a source of primary inoculum?	25
3.1 Introduction	25
3.2 Plant-Seed Transfer	28
3.2.1 Inoculation of seed	28
3.2.2 Isolation and Identification from seed.	40
3.3 Seed-Seed Transfer	68
3.4 Seed-Plant Transfer	73
3.5 Seed Treatments.	100
4. Soil and Plant Debris	116
5. Alternative Hosts	126
6. Systemic Nature of <i>P. syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i>	132
Appendices	138
Literature Cited	153

<u>List of Plates</u>	<u>Page</u>
Plate 1: Appearance of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> colonies on D4 agar, 1 ppm crystal violet.	9
Plate 2: Fluorescence of bacterial colonies on King's B medium agar under ultraviolet light.	11
Plate 3: <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> on King's B medium agar under natural light.	11
Plate 4: Oxidase reaction of bacterial isolates	12
Plate 5: Appearance of bacterial isolates on 5% sucrose agar	12
Plate 6: Tomato leaves artificially infested with <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> .	14
Plate 7: Bacterial speck lesions on naturally infected tomato fruits.	36
Plate 8: Delayed fruit maturity around the bacterial speck lesions on a naturally infected tomato fruit.	37
Plate 9: Cookes' microtitre plate with a tomato seed and King's B medium broth in each well.	51
Plate 10: King's B medium agar streaked with 12 enrichment cultures from a Cooke's microtitre plate.	51
Plate 11: Tomato seeds on tomato leaf discs embedded in 2% water agar.	59
Plate 12: Germination of tomato seeds on moist blotters in sealed plastic containers.	77
Plate 13: Tomato seedlings at a commercial nursery.	94
Plate 14: Hypersensitive reaction of <i>Nicotiana glutinosa</i> to infestation by <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> .	130
Plate 15: Bacterial speck symptoms on artificially inoculated eggplant leaf.	130
Plate 16: Tomato plant stem showing tin foil wrapped around the pot and lower plant stem after root inoculation.	134
Plate 17: Wilted tomato plants resulting from infection by <i>Pseudomonas solanacearum</i> .	151
Plate 18: Bacterial exudate from tomato plants infected with <i>Pseudomonas solanacearum</i> after exposure to a high relative humidity.	152

<u>List of Figures</u>	<u>Page</u>
Figure 1: Gel double diffusion reactions of bacterial isolates against <i>P. syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> and <i>P. cichorii</i> antisera.	18a 18b
Figure 2: Maximum and minimum daily temperatures as recorded at the DSIR, Palmerston North.	146
Figure 3: Daily rainfall as recorded at the DSIR, Palmerston North and the average daily relative humidity as calculated from Ohakea Air Force Base recordings.	147
Figure 4: Daily mean barometric pressure as recorded at Ohakea Air Force Base.	148

List of TablesPage

Table 1:	Percentage similarity of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> to other pathovars of the type strain on the basis of 86 nutritional and biochemical tests.	22
Table 2:	The effect of the inoculation treatment on the artificial contamination of tomato seed.	29
Table 3:	Recovery of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> from five vacuum infiltrated seedlines.	32
Table 4:	Recovery of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> from injured and uninjured vacuum infiltrated 'VF 145-B-7879' seed.	32
Table 5:	Isolation and identification of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> from vacuum infiltrated seedlines using the Cooke's microtitre plate system.	52
Table 6:	Variation in percentage infestation of vacuum infiltrated 'Dorchester' seed.	53
Table 7:	Isolation and identification of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> from naturally infested seedlines.	54
Table 8:	Variation in the detection of infested 'Beefsteak' seeds collected at different times from the same diseased plot.	54
Table 9:	DSIR's meteorological service recordings for the 16 days prior to each collection date.	55
Table 10:	Isolation and identification of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> from commercial seedlines using the Cooke's microtitre plate system.	56
Table 11:	Isolation and identification of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> from leaf discs inoculated with vacuum infiltrated seed.	61
Table 12:	Isolation and identification of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> from leaf discs inoculated with commercial seedlines.	61
Table 13:	Isolation and identification of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> from both fluorescent and non-fluorescent seeds.	65
Table 14:	Isolation of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> from seeds of four artificially infested tomato seedlines.	70
Table 15:	Isolation of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> from artificially infested 'Dorchester' and 'VF 145-B-7879' seedlines.	70



Table 16: Isolation of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> from lesioned cotyledons and first leaves of tomato seedlings germinated from infested seedlines.	79
Table 17: Isolation of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> from seedlings germinated from vacuum infiltrated 'VF 145-B-7879' seed.	85
Table 18: Isolation of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> from seedlings germinated at 20-30C.	90
Table 19: Isolation of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> from vacuum infiltrated, acid extracted seed.	105
Table 20: Percentage of 'VF 145-B-7879' seeds infested with <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> after vacuum infiltration and after vacuum infiltration plus acid extraction.	106
Table 21: Percentage of hand extracted 'Beefsteak' seeds naturally infested with <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> before and after acid extraction.	107
Table 22: Vacuum infiltrated 'Dorchester' seeds infested with <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> both before and after sodium hypochlorite treatments.	108
Table 23: Infestation of vacuum infiltrated 'Dorchester' seed with <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> both before and after Dichlone 50W <sup>R</sup> seed treatments.	110
Table 24: Infestation of vacuum infiltrated 'Dorchester' seeds with <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> before and after streptomycin sulphate seed treatments.	111
Table 25: Germination of 'Dorchester' seed treated with 2.5g of streptomycin sulphate per kilogram of seed.	112
Table 26: Isolation of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> from transplanted tomato seedlings.	123
Table 27: Isolation of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> from inoculated leaves of some plant species.	131
Table 28: Isolation of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> from the leaves, stems and roots of inoculated tomato plants.	136
Table 29: Isolation of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> from the roots, leaves and stems of inoculated eggplants.	137

Table 30:	Detection of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> from tomato seeds, using an enrichment assay, Trial 2.	143
Table 31:	Isolation of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> from seed using an enrichment assay, Trial 3.	144
Table 32:	Isolation of <i>P.syringae</i> pv <i>tomato</i> from seed using an enrichment assay, Trial 4	145
Table 33:	Effect of 2,4-D on tomato leaf discs and on the germination of 'Fireball' tomato seed.	145

### Abstract

The taxonomy of the causal agent of bacterial speck of tomatoes is discussed and the trinomial *Pseudomonas syringae* pathovar *tomato* (Okabe) Young, Dye and Wilkie is adopted.

A vacuum infiltration method of artificially inoculating seed was used and *P. syringae* pv *tomato* was detected in both artificially and naturally infested seed using sensitive enrichment culture techniques. The pathogen can remain viable between seed harvest and sowing in association with seed but seed-plant transfer was only occasionally demonstrated.

The acid seed extraction method and other germicidal seed treatments were evaluated for their effect on the seedborne pathogen. Streptomycin sulphate as a slurry treatment (2.5g a.i./Kg of seed) just prior to seed sowing was the only totally effective seed treatment tested.

The potential for survival in infected crop debris, soil and on alternative hosts was shown. However, the pathogen was not isolated from weeds in infected tomato crops and no conclusive evidence of systemic infection was found.

INTRODUCTION

The tomato, *Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill., is an important fresh-market and processing crop in New Zealand. The North Island is responsible for 83% of the total production (Anon, 1977). A limited export market for fresh-market tomatoes, mainly to the Pacific Islands, also exists (Anon, 1978).

The area cultivated to tomatoes has been static for the last few years with approximately 800 hectares producing at an average of 68 tonnes per hectare (Anon, 1979). Processing tomatoes, one of the two major processing crops in New Zealand, occupy approximately two-thirds of the total hectareage in tomatoes but only produce about half the total annual yield of approximately 54,500 tonnes. Fresh-market tomatoes occupy the remaining area and produce the other half of the total yield.

This yield does not reflect the genetic potential of the crop due to the influence of a variety of adverse environmental factors, of which diseases frequently are an important part. A number of bacterial, fungal and viral pathogens infect tomatoes and often cause economic loss. One of the bacterial diseases, 'bacterial speck', caused by *Pseudomonas tomato* (Okabe) Alstatt, is regularly of economic importance causing significant yield losses (Tate and van der Mespel, 1976), usually in outdoor tomatoes but occasionally under glass. Other bacterial pathogens may also cause disease in tomatoes in New Zealand including:- *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* Smith and Townsend causing crown gall; *Corynebacterium michiganense* (Smith) Jensen causing tomato canker; *Pseudomonas eichorii* (Swingle) Stapp causing stem bacteriosis; *Pseudomonas solanacearum* Smith causing bacterial wilt; *Pseudomonas syringae* van Hall causing stem necrosis; *Pseudomonas viridiflava* (Burkholder) Dowson causing internal stem rot and *Xanthomonas vesicatoria* Doidge causing bacterial spot.

Bacterial speck of tomatoes was first recorded in 1933 (Okabe 1933; Bryan 1933) and was first found in New Zealand, at Hastings, in 1944 (Reid, 1948) where it was causing serious stunting of a dwarf variety in the field and extensive leaf infection of seedlings in boxes. The disease is now widespread in New Zealand causing economic loss by way of reduced yields and delayed fruit maturity.

Yields are reduced when the tomato foliage is diseased (Schneider, Hall and Grogan, 1975; Grogan, Kimble, Schneider and Ioannou, 1974). The percentage yield loss varies with the plant growth stage at the time of infection; slight yield losses are to be expected even in diseased tomato seedlings which may recover when only the lower branches are diseased. The yield reduction in plants inoculated at the following stages:- (i) third true leaf; (ii) third true leaf and 50% flowering; (iii) third true leaf 50% flowering and first green fruit as compared to a healthy control, were 12, 13 and 13% respectively (Schneider, Hall and Grogan, 1975).

Grogan *et al* (1974) found significant yield reductions in all plants inoculated with the pathogen at seven weeks. Total yields in this trial were reduced by an average of 15% and total ripe fruit yield was reduced by 59%. The disease had no affect on the number of fruit set or on the average weight of either green or red fruit. However, there was a total yield loss due to the delayed maturity because ripe fruit weigh more than green fruit.

If plant roots are diseased the total or red fruit yield, as compared to a healthy control, is not significantly reduced. However, in diseased plants there is a delay of approximately six days to the 50% red stage (Grogan *et al* 1974). Top inoculation of 14 day old plants reduced total yield by 16% and red fruit yield by 20% while top and root inoculation of 14 day old plants reduced total yield and red fruit yield by only 11 and 13% respectively. The bacterium also had a synergistic effect on

maturity, delaying it by as much as 10 days. Root inoculation of 60 day old plants under glass reduced both root and stem weights by 38% and 26% respectively, although the general plant appearance was unaffected (Grogan *et al* 1974).

Although the disease may occur at any stage during the growing season, Schneider and Grogan (1977a) reported that infections occurring in the early spring caused the greatest economic loss. Pohronezny, Volin and Stall (1979) estimated a 50% cull rate of fruit harvested from diseased plots due to the small raised speck lesions which make the fruit unmarketable.

The disease is readily recognized by the characteristic symptoms on both fruit and foliage. The fruit lesions appear as small, dark, raised pustules on the fruit surface while foliar lesions are dark brown to black necrotic areas surrounded by yellow halos (Bryan 1933).

1974-8 > The species causing bacterial speck in tomatoes, *Pseudomonas tomato*, was erected by Okabe in 1933 and named *Phytomonas tomato* Okabe. In the same year Bryan (1933) described a bacterial pathogen of tomatoes and named it *Bacterium punctulans* Bryan. In Bergey's Manual of Determinative Bacteria (1939) *Bacterium punctulans* is listed as a probable synonym of *Phytomonas tomato*. Dowson in 1943, referred to the organism as *Pseudomonas punctulans* (Bryan) Dowson (Reid 1944). The name *Pseudomonas tomato* was proposed in 1944 (Alstatt 1944) and is now most commonly used in the nomenclature of the pathogen. However, recently Young, Dye, Panagopoulos, Bradbury and Robbs (1978) proposed a nomenclature and classification system for plant pathogenic bacteria in which *Pseudomonas tomato* is named *Pseudomonas syringae* pathovar *tomato* (Okabe) Young, Dye and Wilkie. Although the merits of this taxonomic system will be discussed subsequently, all pathogens shall, hereafter in this study, be referred to by the nomenclature of Young *et al* (1978).

### Study Objectives

Although bacterial speck of tomatoes has the potential to cause considerable economic loss, the possible sources of primary inoculum have not been positively identified in New Zealand. This study aimed to identify and determine the importance of the possible sources of primary inoculum and investigate the effectiveness of different control measures. As conflicting opinions exist as to the importance of any seedborne spread of *Pseudomonas syringae* pv *tomato*, most of this dissertation deals with the possible importance of tomato seed as a source of primary inoculum. The importance of any other sources of inoculum was also investigated.