

Antagonist microorganisms with the ability to control *Pythium* damping-off of tomato seeds in rockwool

Valerie GRAVEL¹, Carole MARTINEZ¹, Hani ANTOUN²
and Russell J. TWEDDELL^{1,*}

¹Centre de recherche en horticulture, Université Laval, Québec, Qc, Canada G1K 7P4;

²Dépt. des sols et génie agroalimentaire, Université Laval, Québec, Qc, Canada G1K 7P4

*Author for correspondence: e-mail: russell.tweddell@crh.ulaval.ca

Received 21 November 2003; accepted in revised form 27 January 2005

Abstract. A total of 237 microorganisms were isolated from five different greenhouse tomato growing media. Of those, 40 microorganisms reduced the *in vitro* mycelial growth of both *Pythium aphanidermatum* and *Pythium ultimum*. The ability of these microorganisms to control damping-off was then tested in rockwool. As a result, *Pseudomonas corrugata* strains 1 and 3, *Pseudomonas fluorescens* subgroup F and G strains 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, *Pseudomonas marginalis*, *Pseudomonas putida* subgroup B strain 1, *Pseudomonas syringae* strain 1 and *Pseudomonas viridiflava* significantly reduced damping-off caused by *P. ultimum* or *P. aphanidermatum*. *Pseudomonas marginalis* was the only microorganism that significantly reduced damping-off caused by both pathogens.

Key words: biological control, greenhouse culture, hydroponic, seed decay

Introduction

Damping-off is an important disease of greenhouse tomato, causing important losses in nurseries where young susceptible transplants are produced. In Canada, this disease is mainly caused by *Pythium ultimum* and *Pythium aphanidermatum*, which are responsible for seed decay as well as pre- and post-emergence damping-off of tomato seedlings. Presently, none of the tomato cultivars used in greenhouse crops are resistant to *Pythium* spp. and in Canada no chemical fungicides are registered to control this pathogen in greenhouse tomato crops (Paulitz and Bélanger, 2001). Consequently, control and management of the disease rely on cultural practices such as proper control of irrigation and UV sterilization of the nutritive solution, but the effectiveness is often questionable (Paulitz, 1997). Since cultural practices alone are not always sufficient to effectively control the disease, alternative strategies are needed.

In Europe and Canada, the rockwool system of production is widely used by commercial greenhouse tomato growers. In such a system, the number of resident potentially competitive microorganisms is extremely low, facilitating dissemination of the pathogen through the nutritive solution (Stanghellini and Rasmussen, 1994) and allowing biocontrol agents with a low competitive ability to become established (Rankin and Paulitz, 1994). Few works have reported on successful biocontrol of *Pythium* in greenhouse hydroponic production systems. Rankin and Paulitz (1994) published the first report of reduction of *Pythium* disease with rhizobacteria in rockwool. They showed that application of specific strains of *Pseudomonas corrugata* and *P. fluorescens* reduced *P. aphanidermatum* root rot of cucumbers. Beneficial effects of application of *P. corrugata* (strain 13) and *P. fluorescens* (strains 63-49, 63-28, 15) on rockwool-grown cucumbers was subsequently reported by McCullagh et al. (1996). *P. fluorescens* 63-28 was also reported to increase the marketable tomato fruit yield and to inhibit efficiently *P. ultimum* in peat-based substrates (Gagné et al., 1993). To our knowledge, no specific microorganisms were reported for their ability to control *Pythium* disease on rockwool-grown tomato.

As part of ongoing research aimed to test different organic materials such as peat, barks and composts as alternatives to rockwool for greenhouse production, the objectives of this study were (1) to isolate microorganisms from these materials and (2) to test their ability to protect tomato seedlings against *Pythium* damping-off.

Materials and methods

Fungi

Virulent strains of *Pythium ultimum* and *P. aphanidermatum* isolated from infected tomato roots were provided by the laboratory of Dr. Richard Bélanger (Université Laval, Québec, QC, Canada). The fungi were grown on potato dextrose agar (PDA; Difco Laboratories, Becton Dickinson, Sparks, MD) at 24 °C. PDA disks covered with *P. ultimum* or *P. aphanidermatum* mycelium conserved in sterile distilled water at 24 °C served as stock cultures. Considering that, at room temperature, zoospores are not produced by *P. ultimum* (van der Plaats-Niterink, 1981), the propagule suspension of *P. ultimum* consisted of hyphae and oospores. The propagule suspension of *P. aphanidermatum* consisted of zoospores, hyphae and oospores. They were both prepared

from liquid cultures (250 ml flasks) containing 100 ml of potato dextrose broth (PDB; Difco Laboratories) incubated on a rotary shaker (150 rpm) at 24 °C for 1 week. PDA disks covered with actively growing mycelium of either *P. ultimum* or *P. aphanidermatum* were used to inoculate the flasks.

Isolation of microorganisms

Microorganisms were isolated, using serial dilutions and spread on selective media in Petri dishes, from rockwool, a mixture of peat and compost (9:1, v:v), a mixture of peat, pine bark and compost (6:3:1, v:v:v), a mixture of peat, pine bark and compost (3:6:1, v:v:v) and a mixture of pine bark and compost (9:1, v:v) in which tomato was previously cultivated. Isolation of microorganisms was performed according to Michaud et al. (2002). One gram of each substrate was added to 10 ml of distilled sterile water. Six dilutions 1/10 were made following homogenization of the mixture. Fungi were isolated on malt agar (Difco Laboratories) containing streptomycin (0.3 g l⁻¹; Sigma-Aldrich, Mississauga, Ontario) and on czapek agar (Sigma-Aldrich). Bacteria were isolated on the following media: tryptic soy agar (TSA; Sigma-Aldrich), TSA amended with crystal violet (0.002 g l⁻¹; Sigma-Aldrich), and pseudomonas agar F (Difco Laboratories) amended with chloramphenicol (0.125 g l⁻¹; Sigma-Aldrich) and ampicillin (0.5 g l⁻¹; Sigma-Aldrich). Crystal violet was added to TSA to facilitate the isolation of Gram-negative bacteria, while ampicillin and chloramphenicol were added to pseudomonas agar F to improve *Pseudomonas* spp. bacteria isolation. Petri dishes were incubated at 24 °C following the spread of the dilutions. Morphologically distinct microorganisms were isolated and grown in pure culture on TSA (bacteria) or PDA (fungi).

Effect of microorganisms on mycelial growth of P. ultimum and P. aphanidermatum

The effect of microorganisms on the growth of the pathogens was performed *in vitro* according to Brown et al. (1987). A drop of each bacterial suspension (4×10^7 bacteria ml⁻¹) was placed on PDA at one side of a Petri dish. A mycelial disk (7 mm in diameter) of either *P. ultimum* or *P. aphanidermatum* was placed on the opposite side of the Petri dish, 3 cm away from the bacteria. Bacterial suspensions were obtained from pure cultures grown in 10 ml of tryptic soy broth (TSB; Sigma-Aldrich) for 24 h on a rotary shaker at 24 °C. Fungal isolates were grown on PDA in pure culture. A PDA disk covered with actively

growing mycelium of each fungus (7 mm in diameter) was placed on PDA at one side of a Petri dish 24 h prior to adding *P. ultimum* or *P. aphanidermatum* as described before. The five following controls were used: *P. ultimum* against *P. ultimum*, *P. ultimum* against *P. aphanidermatum*, *P. aphanidermatum* against *P. aphanidermatum*, *P. ultimum* against a drop of TSB medium and *P. aphanidermatum* against a drop of TSB medium. Triplicate Petri dishes were incubated at 24 °C for 48 h. The presence (+) or the absence (–) of an inhibition zone between the pathogen and the microorganism tested was then recorded.

Effect of microorganisms on damping-off incidence

Microorganisms which inhibited the *in vitro* mycelial growth of *P. ultimum* and *P. aphanidermatum* were tested for their effect on the incidence of damping-off of tomato seedlings. Tomato seeds (cv. Trust F1; De Ruiter Seeds, Columbus, OH) were soaked in distilled water for 6 h, planted in multicellular blocks of rockwool and subsequently received either 1 ml of a bacterial suspension (4×10^7 bacteria ml⁻¹) or 1 ml of a fungal spore suspension (1×10^4 spores ml⁻¹). The seeds received subsequently 1 ml of either propagule (hyphae and oospores) suspension (1×10^4 propagules ml⁻¹) of *P. ultimum* or propagule (zoospores, hyphae and oospores) suspension (1×10^4 propagules ml⁻¹) of *P. aphanidermatum* (prepared from liquid cultures) and were then covered with vermiculite and placed in a growth chamber (16–20 °C, 80% relative humidity and 16 h photoperiod) for 2 weeks. During that period, the rockwool blocks were watered daily with a nutritive solution (1%) of 20–20–20 (N–P–K). Non-infected (non-infected control) and infected (infected control) seeds treated with distilled water were used as controls. Two weeks after sowing, seeds were rated for emergence. The rate of emerged seedlings was then calculated as follows: (number of emerged seedlings/number of seeds planted) \times 100. The rate of decayed seeds was also evaluated and expressed in percent. A completely randomized experimental design with four replicates was used.

Antagonist identification

Bacteria and fungi which inhibited the *in vitro* mycelial growth of both *P. ultimum* and *P. aphanidermatum* were identified using the BIOLOG Identification System (BIOLOG Inc., Hayward, CA) or by 16S rDNA sequencing by Dr. Anne-Marie Simao-Beauvoir (Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Québec, Canada).

Statistical analysis

Data on the effect of microorganisms on damping-off incidence were analyzed with SAS (SAS Institute, Cary, NC), using the general linear models procedure. Data percent values were arcsin transformed before analysis. When significant ($P < 0.05$), treatment means were compared using the Fisher protected LSD test. Each experiment was performed twice. Considering that same trends were obtained in both experiments, results of both experiments were pooled.

Results

A total of 237 microorganisms (160 bacteria and 77 fungi) were isolated from five tomato growing media. They were tested for their ability to inhibit the *in vitro* mycelial growth of the pathogens. In dual cultures on agar, 40 microorganisms (19 bacteria; 21 fungi) were shown to reduce the mycelial growth of both *P. ultimum* and *P. aphanidermatum*, as indicated by the presence of an inhibition zone (Table 1). Most of the antagonistic bacteria and fungi were from the genus *Pseudomonas* and *Penicillium*, respectively. No Gram-positive bacteria isolates were shown to reduce the mycelial growth of either *P. ultimum* or *P. aphanidermatum*.

The isolates that presented an inhibiting effect *in vitro* on both pathogens were then tested for their ability to reduce damping-off of tomato seedlings under growth chamber conditions. Compared to infected-control seeds, *Fusarium oxysporum* strain 2, *Pseudomonas corrugata* strains 1 and 3, *P. fluorescens* subgroup F, *P. fluorescens* subgroup G strains 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, *P. marginalis*, *P. putida* subgroup B strain 1, *P. resinovorans*, *P. syringae* strain 1, *P. viridiflava* and *Trichoderma longibrachiatum* reduced significantly the rate of decayed seeds (Table 2) resulting from *P. ultimum* inoculation. Among these microorganisms, *P. corrugata* strain 3, *P. fluorescens* subgroup F, *P. fluorescens* subgroup G strains 1, 2 and 4, *P. marginalis*, *P. syringae* strain 1 and *P. viridiflava* significantly increased the percentage of emerged tomato seedlings (Table 2).

The application of microorganisms also influenced significantly the percentage of *P. aphanidermatum*-decayed seeds (Table 3). *F. oxysporum* strain 2, *Penicillium janthinellum* strain 4, *P. corrugata* strains 1 and 3, *P. fluorescens* subgroup G strain 3, *P. marginalis*, *P. putida* subgroup B strain 1, *P. resinovorans*, *P. syringae* strain 3 and *P. viridiflava* were shown to reduce significantly the rate of decayed seeds. Among these

Table 1. Effect of microorganisms isolated from different tomato growth substrates on the *in vitro* mycelial growth of *Pythium ultimum* and *Pythium aphanidermatum*

Microorganisms	Source ^a medium	Inhibiting zone ^b	
		<i>P. ultimum</i>	<i>P. aphanidermatum</i>
<i>Acremonium potronii</i>	B	+ ^c ++	+++
<i>Acrodontium griseum</i>	D	++ ^d +	+++
<i>Enterobacter cloacae</i>	D	+++ ^e	+++
Fungus 2-8-8 ^f	B	+++	+++
Fungus 5-12-6 ^f	B	+++	+++
Fungus 8-13-1 ^f	C	+++	+++
<i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> strain 1	C	+++	+++
<i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> strain 2	B	+++	+++
<i>Fusarium tumidum</i>	D	+++	+++
<i>Penicillium brevicompactum</i>	B	+++	+++
<i>Penicillium griseofulvum</i>	C	+++	+++
<i>Penicillium janthinellum</i> strain 1	A	+++	+++
<i>Penicillium janthinellum</i> strain 2	C	+++	+++
<i>Penicillium janthinellum</i> strain 3	C	+++	+++
<i>Penicillium janthinellum</i> strain 4	B	+++	+++
<i>Penicillium janthinellum</i> strain 5	B	+++	+++
<i>Penicillium restrictum</i>	C	+++	+++
<i>Penicillium simplicissimum</i> strain 1	B	+++	+++
<i>Penicillium simplicissimum</i> strain 2	A	+++	+++
<i>Penicillium solitum</i>	A	+++	+++
<i>Pseudomonas corrugata</i> strain 1	R	+++	+++
<i>Pseudomonas corrugata</i> strain 2	A	+++	+++
<i>Pseudomonas corrugata</i> strain 3	R	+++	+++
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> subgroup F	C	+++	+++
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> subgroup G strain 1	C	+++	+++
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> subgroup G strain 2	R	+++	+++
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> subgroup G strain 3	D	+++	+++
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> subgroup G strain 4	C	+++	+++
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> subgroup G strain 5	D	+++	+++
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> subgroup G strain 6	R	+++	+++
<i>Pseudomonas marginalis</i>	A	+++	+++
<i>Pseudomonas putida</i> subgroup B strain 1	C	+++	+++
<i>Pseudomonas putida</i> subgroup B strain 2	C	+++	+++

Table 1. (Continued)

Microorganisms	Source ^a medium	Inhibiting zone ^b	
		<i>P. ultimum</i>	<i>P. aphanidermatum</i>
<i>Pseudomonas resinovorans</i>	R	+++	+++
<i>Pseudomonas syringae</i> strain 1	R	+++	+++
<i>Pseudomonas syringae</i> strain 2	B	+++	+++
<i>Pseudomonas syringae</i> strain 3	C	+++	+++
<i>Pseudomonas viridiflava</i>	R	+++	+++
<i>Trichoderma atroviride</i>	A	+++	+++
<i>Trichoderma longibrachiatum</i>	B	+++	+++
<i>Pythium aphanidermatum</i>		---	---
<i>Pythium ultimum</i>		---	---

^aMicroorganisms were isolated from rockwool (R), a mixture of peat and compost (9:1, v:v) (A), a mixture of peat, pine bark and compost (6:3:1, v:v:v) (B), a mixture of peat, pine bark and compost (3:6:1, v:v:v) (C) and a mixture of pine bark and compost (9:1, v:v) (D).

^bPresence (+) or absence (-) of an inhibition zone between the pathogen and the microorganism.

^{c,d,e}Replicate 1, 2 and 3, respectively.

^fNot identified.

microorganisms, *P. corrugata* strain 1, *P. fluorescens* subgroup G strains 3 and 5, *P. marginalis* and *P. putida* subgroup B strain 1 increased the percentage of emerged *P. aphanidermatum* inoculated seedlings.

Pseudomonas marginalis was the only microorganism out of the 40 tested that significantly reduced damping-off incidence caused by both pathogens with 62.5 and 87.5% of emerged seedlings when inoculated with *P. ultimum* and *P. aphanidermatum*, respectively. None of the fungi tested significantly increased the percentage of emerged seedlings.

Discussion

In this study, a two-step procedure involving *in vitro* and *in vivo* assays was used to select antagonist microorganisms with the ability to control *Pythium* damping-off of tomato seeds (Okamoto et al., 2000; Dal Bello et al., 2003). In order to have a reasonable number of microorganisms for *in vivo* tests, the 237 microorganisms isolated from the different greenhouse tomato growing media were tested for their ability to inhibit

Table 2. Effect of antagonistic microorganisms on the emergence of tomato seedlings and the decay of tomato seeds inoculated with *Pythium ultimum* in rockwool

Microorganisms	Emerged seedlings (%)		Decayed seeds (%)	
Infected control	0	a	100	e
Non-infected control	100	d	0	a
<i>Acremonium potronii</i>	0	a	87.5	de
<i>Acrodontium griseum</i>	0	a	75	cde
<i>Enterobacter cloacae</i>	0	a	50	abcde
Fungus 2-8-8	12.5	ab	62.5	bcde
Fungus 5-12-6	0	a	75	cde
Fungus 8-13-1	0	a	62.5	bcde
<i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> strain 1	0	a	75	cde
<i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> strain 2	25	abc	37.5	abcd
<i>Fusarium tumidum</i>	0	a	75	cde
<i>Penicillium brevicompactum</i>	0	a	62.5	bcde
<i>Penicillium griseofulvum</i>	0	a	62.5	bcde
<i>Penicillium janthinellum</i> strain 1	0	a	75	cde
<i>Penicillium janthinellum</i> strain 2	0	a	62.5	bcde
<i>Penicillium janthinellum</i> strain 3	0	a	62.5	bcde
<i>Penicillium janthinellum</i> strain 4	0	a	50	abcde
<i>Penicillium janthinellum</i> strain 5	0	a	50	abcde
<i>Penicillium restrictum</i>	0	a	100	e
<i>Penicillium simplicissimum</i> strain 1	12.5	ab	50	abcde
<i>Penicillium simplicissimum</i> strain 2	0	a	87.5	de
<i>Penicillium solitum</i>	12.5	ab	62.5	bcde
<i>Pseudomonas corrugata</i> strain 1	37.5	abc	37.5	abcd
<i>Pseudomonas corrugata</i> strain 2	50	abcd	50	abcde
<i>Pseudomonas corrugata</i> strain 3	62.5	bcd	12.5	ab
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> subgroup F	62.5	bcd	25	abc
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> subgroup G strain 1	62.5	bcd	12.5	ab
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> subgroup G strain 2	75	cd	12.5	ab
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> subgroup G strain 3	25	abc	37.5	abcd
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> subgroup G strain 4	75	cd	12.5	ab
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> subgroup G strain 5	50	abcd	25	abc
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> subgroup G strain 6	12.5	ab	62.5	bcde
<i>Pseudomonas marginalis</i>	62.5	bcd	25	abc
<i>Pseudomonas putida</i> subgroup B strain 1	50	abcd	12.5	ab
<i>Pseudomonas putida</i> subgroup B strain 2	25	abc	50	abcde
<i>Pseudomonas resinovorans</i>	50	abcd	37.5	abcd

Table 2. (Continued)

Microorganisms	Emerged seedlings		Decayed seeds	
	(%)		(%)	
<i>Pseudomonas syringae</i> strain 1	62.5	bcd	12.5	ab
<i>Pseudomonas syringae</i> strain 2	25	abc	75	cde
<i>Pseudomonas syringae</i> strain 3	50	abcd	50	abcde
<i>Pseudomonas viridiflava</i>	62.5	bcd	37.5	abcd
<i>Trichoderma atroviride</i>	0	a	87.5	de
<i>Trichoderma longibrachiatum</i>	25	abc	25	abc

In each column, means followed by the same letter are not significantly different ($P > 0.05$) according to the Fisher protected LSD test ($n = 8$).

the *in vitro* mycelial growth of both pathogens, *P. ultimum* and *P. aphanidermatum*. Of those, 40 microorganisms were shown to inhibit the growth of both *P. ultimum* and *P. aphanidermatum* presumably by producing antifungal compounds. These microorganisms were identified as *Acremonium potronii*, *Acrodonium griseum*, *Enterobacter cloacae*, *Fusarium oxysporum*, *F. tumidum*, *Penicillium brevicompactum*, *P. griseofulvum*, *P. janthinellum*, *P. restrictum*, *P. simplicissimum*, *P. solitum*, *Pseudomonas corrugata*, *P. fluorescens* subgroups F and G, *P. marginalis*, *P. putida* subgroup B, *P. resinovorans*, *P. syringae*, *P. viridiflava*, *Trichoderma atroviride* and *T. longibrachiatum*. Three fungi were not further identified. These microorganisms were then tested *in vivo* for their ability to reduce damping-off caused by both pathogens. Among these microorganisms, *P. corrugata* strains 1 and 3, *P. fluorescens* subgroups F and G strains 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, *P. marginalis*, *P. putida* subgroup B strain 1, *P. syringae* strain 1 and *P. viridiflava* reduced damping-off caused by *P. ultimum* or *P. aphanidermatum*. These microorganisms were previously reported for their ability to reduce the development of various pathogens mainly in soil.

Pseudomonas putida is a bacterium frequently isolated from soil which received a lot of attention for its capacity to degrade complex aromatic molecules (Koshelava et al., 2000; Sultana et al., 2001). In this study, two strains of *P. putida* subgroup B were isolated and showed *in vitro* inhibition of both pathogens. However, only *P. putida* strain 1 reduced damping-off of tomato caused by *P. aphanidermatum*. Previous works have reported the biocontrol ability of this bacterium against *Pythium* damping-off of sugarbeet (Shah-Smith and Burns, 1996) and safflower (Liang et al., 1996), durum wheat tan spot caused by *Pyrenophora tritici-repentis* (da Luz et al., 1998), potato silver scurf caused by

Table 3. Effect of antagonistic microorganisms on the emergence of tomato seedlings and the decay of tomato seeds inoculated with *Pythium aphanidermatum* in rockwool

Microorganisms	Emerged seedlings (%)		Decayed seeds (%)	
Infected control	0	a	100	d
Non-infected control	100	d	0	a
<i>Acremonium potronii</i>	0	a	62.5	abcd
<i>Acrodontium griseum</i>	0	a	50	abcd
<i>Enterobacter cloacae</i>	25	ab	50	abcd
Fungus 2-8-8	0	a	62.5	abcd
Fungus 5-12-6	25	ab	62.5	abcd
Fungus 8-13-1	0	a	87.5	cd
<i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> strain 1	0	a	62.5	abcd
<i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> strain 2	0	a	25	abc
<i>Fusarium tumidum</i>	0	a	50	abcd
<i>Penicillium brevicompactum</i>	0	a	100	d
<i>Penicillium griseofulvum</i>	0	a	100	d
<i>Penicillium janthinellum</i> strain 1	0	a	75	bcd
<i>Penicillium janthinellum</i> strain 2	0	a	75	bcd
<i>Penicillium janthinellum</i> strain 3	0	a	75	bcd
<i>Penicillium janthinellum</i> strain 4	37.5	abc	25	abc
<i>Penicillium janthinellum</i> strain 5	12.5	ab	37.5	abcd
<i>Penicillium restrictum</i>	0	a	87.5	cd
<i>Penicillium simplicissimum</i> strain 1	0	a	37.5	abcd
<i>Penicillium simplicissimum</i> strain 2	0	a	75	bcd
<i>Penicillium solitum</i>	25	ab	62.5	abcd
<i>Pseudomonas corrugata</i> strain 1	62.5	bcd	12.5	ab
<i>Pseudomonas corrugata</i> strain 2	25	ab	37.5	abcd
<i>Pseudomonas corrugata</i> strain 3	50	abcd	12.5	ab
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> subgroup F	25	ab	50	abcd
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> subgroup G strain 1	12.5	ab	62.5	abcd
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> subgroup G strain 2	12.5	ab	37.5	abcd
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> subgroup G strain 3	62.5	bcd	12.5	ab
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> subgroup G strain 4	12.5	ab	50	abcd
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> subgroup G strain 5	62.5	bcd	37.5	abcd
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> subgroup G strain 6	12.5	ab	75	bcd
<i>Pseudomonas marginalis</i>	87.5	cd	0	a
<i>Pseudomonas putida</i> subgroup B strain 1	62.5	bcd	25	abc
<i>Pseudomonas putida</i> subgroup B strain 2	12.5	ab	62.5	abcd
<i>Pseudomonas resinovorans</i>	50	abcd	25	abc

Table 3. (Continued)

Microorganisms	Emerged seedlings (%)		Decayed seeds (%)	
<i>Pseudomonas syringae</i> strain 1	0	a	75	bcd
<i>Pseudomonas syringae</i> strain 2	12.5	ab	75	bcd
<i>Pseudomonas syringae</i> strain 3	25	ab	0	a
<i>Pseudomonas viridiflava</i>	25	ab	25	abc
<i>Trichoderma atroviride</i>	0	a	87.5	cd
<i>Trichoderma longibrachiatum</i>	0	a	100	d

In each column, means followed by the same letter are not significantly different ($P > 0.05$) according to the Fisher protected LSD test ($n = 8$).

Helminthosporium solani (Elson et al., 1997; Martinez et al., 2002) and potato soft rot caused by *Erwinia carotovora* (Colyer and Mount, 1984). *P. marginalis* isolated from a mixture of peat and compost strongly reduced the incidence of damping-off caused by both pathogens. To our knowledge, no study has previously reported the antagonistic activity of *P. marginalis* against Oomycetes, but such an activity was reported against *Colletotrichum graminicola* on sorghum (Michereff et al., 1994).

Pseudomonas corrugata was reported to display antagonism against various plant pathogens in different substrates including soil (Pandey et al., 2001), peat moss (Georgakopoulos et al., 2002) and rockwool (Rankin and Paulitz, 1994). Antagonism against *P. ultimum* in maize (Pandey et al., 2001), cucumber and sugar beet (Georgakopoulos et al., 2002), *P. aphanidermatum* in cucumber (Rankin and Paulitz, 1994) and *Gaeumannomyces graminis* var. *tritici* in wheat (Ryder and Rovira, 1993) has been observed. While *P. syringae* was previously reported for its biocontrol activity against apple blue (*Penicillium expansum*) and gray (*Botrytis cinerea*) mold (Zhou et al., 2001, 2002) and against the foodborne pathogen *Escherichia coli* (Janisiewicz et al., 1999) on apple. In the present study, *P. corrugata* and *P. syringae* reduced significantly damping-off of tomato caused by *P. ultimum*. However, their potential use as biocontrol agents of tomato pathogens must be viewed with caution. Indeed, *P. corrugata* and *P. syringae* pv. tomato are well-known tomato pathogens causing pith necrosis and bacterial speck, respectively (Richard and Boivin, 1994).

Pseudomonas fluorescens has been extensively studied for its ability to stimulate the growth of plants (Howie and Echandi, 1983; Kloepper et al., 1988; Kurek and Jaroszuk-Ścisel, 2003) and to reduce the development of various plant pathogens (Paulitz et al., 1992;

Ramamoorthy et al., 2002a). Numerous studies have demonstrated the potential of different strains of *P. fluorescens* as biocontrol agents of different pathogens including *Fusarium sambucinum* (Schisler et al., 2000), *Pythium* sp. group G (Bardin et al., 2003) and *P. ultimum* (Carisse et al., 2003). The ability of isolates of *P. fluorescens* subgroups C and E to reduce cucumber root rot caused by *P. aphanidermatum* has also been reported (Paulitz et al., 1992). Of particular interest, studies have reported the biocontrol potential of specific strains of *P. fluorescens* against *Fusarium* wilt of tomato grown in soil (Larkin and Fravel, 1998), *P. aphanidermatum* damping-off of tomato grown in soil (Ramamoorthy et al., 2002b) and *P. ultimum* damping-off of tomato seedlings grown in Petri dish bioassays (Hultberg et al., 2000). Our results showed the efficiency of different strains of *P. fluorescens* of the subgroups F and G to reduce the incidence of tomato damping-off caused by either *P. ultimum* or *P. aphanidermatum* in rockwool.

Biocontrol agents exert disease suppression by different modes of action including competition, direct parasitism, antibiosis and induction of plant resistance mechanism (Whipps, 2001). None of the mechanisms are necessarily mutually exclusive and frequently several modes of action are exhibited by a single biocontrol agent. The mechanism by which *P. fluorescens* exerts its antagonism against *Pythium* sp. has been extensively studied and appears to involve the production of a variety of antibiotic compounds (Howell and Stipanovic, 1980; Sharifi-Tehrani et al., 1998; Thrane et al., 2000), competition (Mohamed and Caunter, 1995; Ellis et al., 1999) and induced resistance (Benhamou et al., 1996; Ramamoorthy et al., 2002a). *P. putida*, *P. corrugata* and *P. marginalis* were also reported to exert an antagonistic activity through the production of antimicrobial compounds (de Freitas et al., 1991; Harris et al., 1997), competition (Paulitz et al., 1992; Fukui et al., 1994) or induction of plant resistance mechanism (Chen et al., 1998; Ongena et al., 2000, 2002;). In this study, the presence of an inhibition zone occurring between the pathogens and *P. fluorescens*, *P. putida*, *P. corrugata* and *P. marginalis* in dual culture on agar plate suggests that the production of antibiotic compounds is involved in the antagonism observed *in vivo*. However, other modes of action such as competition and induced resistance can not be ruled out.

It is interesting to note that certain microorganisms allowed to reduce the incidence of seed decay caused by either *P. ultimum* or *P. aphanidermatum* but did not allow to decrease the incidence of damping-off. For instance, *F. oxysporum* strain 2 reduced seed decay incidence caused by both pathogens but failed to reduce the incidence of damping-off. Such a phenomenon which was also observed with

T. longibrachiatum, *P. janthinellum* and *P. resinovorans* suggests that some microorganisms protected the seed from decay but failed to protect the epicotyl leading to emergence.

In this study, a two-step procedure including *in vitro* screening has allowed to identify several microorganisms with the ability to reduce damping-off caused by *P. aphanidermatum* or *P. ultimum*. *In vitro* screening is often used as a first filter to identify potential biocontrol agents (Okamoto et al., 2000; Dal Bello et al., 2003). However microorganisms showing no antagonistic activity *in vitro* may display a biocontrol ability *in vivo* (Knudsen et al., 1997). For this reason, the 197 microorganisms showing no antagonistic activity *in vitro* will be tested in future work for their ability to control damping-off in rockwool.

Very few works have reported on successful biocontrol of *Pythium* in greenhouse hydroponic production systems. The results presented in this study have led to the identification of several microorganisms displaying the ability to control tomato damping-off caused by either *P. ultimum* or *P. aphanidermatum* in rockwool. These findings may open the way for new avenues of research in the biological control of *Pythium* diseases in hydroponic systems.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the financial support of Fonds Québécois de la Recherche sur la Nature et les Technologies (FQRNT).

References

- Bardin, S.D., H.C. Huang, L. Liu and L.J. Yanke, 2003. Control, by microbial seed treatment, of damping-off caused by *Pythium* sp. on canola, safflower, dry pea, and sugar beet. *Can. J. Plant Pathol.* 25: 268–275.
- Benhamou, N., R.R. Bélanger and T.C. Paulitz, 1996. Pre-inoculation of Ri T-DNA-transformed pea roots with *Pseudomonas fluorescens* inhibits colonization by *Pythium ultimum* Trow: an ultrastructural and cytochemical study. *Planta (Berlin)* 199: 105–117.
- Brown, A.E., R. Finlay and J.S. Ward, 1987. Antifungal compounds produced by *Epicoccum purpurascens* against soil-borne plant pathogenic fungi. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 19: 657–664.
- Carris, O., J. Bernier and N. Benhamou, 2003. Selection of biological agents from composts for control of damping-off of cucumber caused by *Pythium ultimum*. *Can. J. Plant Pathol.* 25: 258–267.
- Chen, C., R.R. Bélanger, N. Benhamou and T.C. Paulitz, 1998. Induced systemic resistance (ISR) by *Pseudomonas* spp. impairs pre- and post-infection

- development of *Pythium aphanidermatum* on cucumber roots. *Eur. J. Plant Pathol.* 104: 877–886.
- Colyer, P.D. and M.S. Mount, 1984. Bacterization of potatoes with *Pseudomonas putida* and its influence on postharvest soft rot disease. *Plant Dis.* 68: 703–706.
- Dal Bello, G.M., M.N. Sisterna and C.I. Monaco, 2003. Antagonistic effect of soil rhizosphere microorganisms on *Bipolaris sorokiniana*, the causal agent of wheat seedling blight. *Int. J. Pest Manag.* 49: 313–317.
- de Freitas, J.R. and J.J. Germida, 1991. *Pseudomonas cepacia* and *Pseudomonas putida* as winter wheat inoculants for biocontrol of *Rhizoctonia solani*. *Can. J. Microbiol.* 37: 780–784.
- da Luz, W.C., G.C. Bergstrom and C.A. Stockwell, 1998. Seed-applied bioprotectants for control of seedborne *Pyrenophora tritici-repentis* and agronomic enhancement of wheat. *Can. J. Plant Pathol.* 20: 384–386.
- Ellis, R.J., T.M. Timms-Wilson, J.E. Beringer, D. Rhodes, A. Renwick, L. Stevenson and M.J. Bailey, 1999. Ecological basis for biocontrol of damping-off disease by *Pseudomonas fluorescens* 54/96. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* 87: 454–463.
- Elson, M.K., D.A. Schisler and R.J. Bothast, 1997. Selection of microorganisms for biological control of silver scurf (*Helminthosporium solani*) of potato tubers. *Plant Dis.* 81: 647–652.
- Fukui, R., M.N. Schroth, M. Hendson and J.G. Hancock, 1994. Interaction between strains of pseudomonads in sugar beet spermospheres and their relationship to pericarp colonization by *Pythium ultimum* in soil. *Phytopathology* 84: 1322–1330.
- Gagné, S., L. Dehbi, D. Le Quéré, F. Cayer, J.L. Morin, R. Lemay and N. Fournier, 1993. Increase of greenhouse tomato fruit yields by plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) inoculated into the peat-based growing media. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 25: 269–272.
- Georgakopoulos, D.G., P. Fiddaman, C. Leifert and N.E. Malathrakakis, 2002. Biological control of cucumber and sugar beet damping-off caused by *Pythium ultimum* with bacterial and fungal antagonists. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* 92: 1078–1086.
- Harris, A.R., K. Siwek and B.M. Wiseman, 1997. Interactions between damping-off fungi, antagonists and *Capsicum* seedlings. *Appl. Soil Ecol.* 6: 251–263.
- Howell, C.R. and R.D. Stipanovic, 1980. Suppression of *Pythium ultimum*-induced damping-off of cotton seedlings by *Pseudomonas fluorescens* and its antibiotic, pyoluteorin. *Phytopathology* 70: 712–715.
- Howie, W.J. and E. Ehandi, 1983. Rhizobacteria: influence of cultivar and soil type on plant growth and yield of potato. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 15: 127–132.
- Hultberg, M., B. Alsanius and P. Sundin, 2000. *In vivo* and *in vitro* interactions between *Pseudomonas fluorescens* and *Pythium ultimum* in the suppression of damping-off in tomato seedlings. *Biol. Control* 19: 1–8.
- Janisiewicz, W.J., W.S. Conway and B. Leverentz, 1999. Biological control of postharvest decays of apple can prevent growth of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 in apple wounds. *J. Food Prot.* 62: 1372–1375.
- Klopper, J.W., D.J. Hume, F.M. Scher, C. Singleton, B. Tipping, M. Laliberte, K. Frauley, T. Kutchaw, C. Simonson, R. Lifshitz, I. Zaleska and L. Lee, 1988. Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria on canola (rapeseed). *Plant Dis.* 72: 42–46.
- Knudsen, I.M.B., J. Hockenhull, D. Funck Jensen, B. Gerhardson, M. Hökeberg, R. Tahvonen, E. Teperi, L. Sundheim and B. Henriksen, 1997. Selection of biological agents for controlling soil and seed-borne diseases in the field. *Eur. J. Plant Pathol.* 103: 775–784.

- Koshelava, I.A., N.V. Balashova, T.Y. Izmalkova, A.E. Filono, S.L. Sokolov, A.V. Slep'en'kin and A. Boronin, 2000. Degradation of phenanthrene by mutant naphthalene-degrading *Pseudomonas putida* strains. *Microbiology* 69: 663–669.
- Kurek, E. and J. Jaroszuk-Ścisel, 2003. Rye (*Secale cereale*) growth promotion by *Pseudomonas fluorescens* strains and their interactions with *Fusarium culmorum* under various soil conditions. *Biol. Control* 26: 48–56.
- Larkin, R.P. and D.R. Fravel, 1998. Efficacy of various fungal and bacterial biocontrol organisms for control of *Fusarium* wilt of tomato. *Plant Dis.* 82: 1022–1028.
- Liang, X.Y., H.C. Huang, L.J. Yanke and G.C. Kozub, 1996. Control of damping-off of safflower by bacterial seed treatment. *Can. J. Plant Pathol.* 18: 43–49.
- Martinez, C., M. Michaud, R.R. Bélanger and R.J. Tweddell, 2002. Identification of soils suppressive against *Helminthosporium solani*, the causal agent of potato silver scurf. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 34: 1861–1868.
- McCullagh, M., R. Utkhede, J.G. Menzies, Z.K. Punja and T.C. Paulitz, 1996. Evaluation of plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria for biological control of *Pythium* root rot of cucumbers grown in rockwool and effects on yield. *Eur. J. Plant Pathol.* 102: 747–755.
- Michaud, M., C. Martinez, A.-M. Simao-Beaunoir, R.R. Bélanger and R.J. Tweddell, 2002. Selection of antagonist microorganisms against *Helminthosporium solani*, causal agent of potato silver scurf. *Plant Dis.* 86: 717–720.
- Michereff, S.J., N.S.S. Silveira and R.L.R. Mariano, 1994. Antagonism of bacteria to *Colletotrichum graminicola* and potential for biocontrol of sorghum anthracnose. *Fitopatol. Brasil.* 19: 541–545.
- Mohamed, S. and I.G. Caunter, 1995. Isolation and characterization of a *Pseudomonas fluorescens* strain suppressive to *Bipolaris maydis*. *J. Phytopathol.* 143: 111–114.
- Okamoto, H., S. Mamoru, Y. Miyata, M. Yoshikawa and M. Isaka, 2000. Biocontrol of *Phytophthora* root rot of angelica trees by *Enterobacter cloacae* and *Serratia ficaria* strains. *J. Gen. Plant. Pathol.* 66: 86–94.
- Ongena, M., F. Daayf, P. Jacques, P. Thonart, N. Benhamou, T.C. Paulitz and R.R. Bélanger, 2000. Systemic induction of phytoalexins in cucumber in response to treatments with fluorescent pseudomonads. *Plant Pathol.* 49: 523–530.
- Ongena, M., A. Giger, P. Jacques, J. Dommès and P. Thonart, 2002. Study of bacterial determinants involved in the induction of systemic resistance in bean by *Pseudomonas putida* BTP1. *Eur. J. Plant Pathol.* 108: 187–196.
- Pandey, A., L.M.S. Palni and K.P. Hebbar, 2001. Suppression of damping-off in maize seedlings by *Pseudomonas corrugata*. *Microbiol. Res.* 156: 191–194.
- Paulitz, T.C., 1997. Biological control of root rot pathogens in soilless and hydroponic systems. *Hortscience* 32: 193–196.
- Paulitz, T.C. and R.R. Bélanger, 2001. Biological control in greenhouse systems. *Annu. Rev. Phytopathol.* 39: 103–133.
- Paulitz, T.C., T. Zhou and L. Rankin, 1992. Selection of rhizosphere bacteria for biological control of *Pythium aphanidermatum* on hydroponically grown cucumber. *Biol. Control* 2: 226–237.
- Ramamoorthy, V., T. Raguchander and R. Samiyappan, 2002a. Induction of defense-related proteins in tomato roots treated with *Pseudomonas fluorescens* Pf1 and *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *lycopersici*. *Plant Soil* 239: 55–68.
- Ramamoorthy, V., T. Raguchander and R. Samiyappan, 2002b. Enhancing resistance of tomato and hot pepper to *Pythium* diseases by seed treatment with fluorescent pseudomonads. *Eur. J. Plant Pathol.* 108: 429–441.

- Rankin, L. and T.C. Paulitz, 1994. Evaluation of rhizosphere bacteria for biological control of *Pythium* root rot of greenhouse cucumbers in hydroponic culture. *Plant Dis.* 78: 447–451.
- Richard, C. and G. Boivin, 1994. *Maladies et ravageurs des cultures légumières au Canada*. Société Canadienne de Phytopathologie, Ottawa, Canada. pp. 333–394.
- Ryder, M.H. and A.D. Rovira, 1993. Biological control of take-all of glasshouse-grown wheat using strains of *Pseudomonas corrugata* isolated from wheat field soil. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 25: 311–320.
- Schisler, D.A., P.J. Slininger, G. Kleinkopf, R.J. Bothast and R.C. Ostrowski, 2000. Biological control of *Fusarium* dry rot of potato tubers under commercial storage conditions. *Am. J. Potato Res.* 77: 29–40.
- Shah-Smith, D.A. and R.G. Burns, 1996. Biological control of damping-off of sugar beet by *Pseudomonas putida* applied to seed pellets. *Plant Pathol.* 45: 572–582.
- Sharifi-Tehrani, A., M. Zala, A. Natsch, Y. Moëne-Loccoz and G. Défago, 1998. Biocontrol of soil-borne fungal plant diseases by 2,4-diacetylphloroglucinol-producing fluorescent pseudomonads with different restriction profiles of amplified 16S rDNA. *Eur. J. Plant Pathol.* 104: 631–643.
- Stanghellini, M.E. and S.L. Rasmussen, 1994. Hydroponics: a solution for zoosporic pathogens. *Plant Dis.* 78: 1129–1138.
- Sultana, R., B.S. Siddiqui, K. Taraz, H. Budzikiewicz and J.M. Meyer, 2001. An isopyoverdin from *Pseudomonas putida* CFML 90-33. *Tetrahedron* 57: 1019–1023.
- Thrane, C., T.H. Nielsen, M.N. Nielsen, J. Sørensen and S. Olsson, 2000. Viscosinamide-producing *Pseudomonas fluorescens* DR54 exerts a biocontrol effect on *Pythium ultimum* in sugar beet rhizosphere. *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.* 33: 139–146.
- van der Plaats-Niterink, A.J., 1981. *Monograph of the genus Pythium*. Institute of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Sciences and Letters, Baarn, Netherlands. pp. 164–167.
- Whipps, J.M., 2001. Microbial interactions and biocontrol in the rhizosphere. *J. Exp. Bot.* 52: 487–511.
- Zhou, T., C.L. Chu, W.T. Liu and K.E. Schaneider, 2001. Postharvest control of blue mold and gray mold on apples using isolates of *Pseudomonas syringae*. *Can. J. Plant Pathol.* 23: 246–252.
- Zhou, T., J. Northover, K.E. Schneider and X. Lu, 2002. Interactions between *Pseudomonas syringae* MA-4 and cyprodinil in the control of blue mold and gray mold of apples. *Can. J. Plant Pathol.* 24: 154–161.