t h Ц Ъ S 0 u r C Ð k n 0 wledg

z

s C

C

Effect of Field Treatments against Root-Knot Nematodes on Soil Suppressiveness against Fusarium oxysporum f.sp. linii

Willemijn Cuijpers and Geert-Jan van der Burgt Louis Bolk Institute, Hoofdstraat 24, 3972 LA Driebergen, The Netherlands, w.cuijpers@louisbolk.nl

Introduction Soil treatments that are applied in organic horticulture with the aim of eradicating problems with soil-borne pathogens can affect soil biodiversity, and thus soil suppressiveness against diseases. To select proper soil treatments, it is necessary to know if and how these treatments influence soil suppressiveness.



Flax plants inoculated with low levels (10⁴ cfu/g soil) Results 60 of *Fusarium* showed no significant differences in disease development 50 between treatments. When inoculated with high levels of *Fusarium* 40 (10⁵ cfu/g soil) the AUDPC showed significant differences (P<0.05). 30 Disease suppressiveness of the RICASA treatment was significantly 20 higher than of the unamended control treatment, while the soil 10 treatments with mustard (covered or uncovered) had in-between levels of disease development (Figure 1). Suppression of Fusarium wilt control mustard, not mustard (low AUDPC levels) showed a negative correlation with the Maturity covered covered Index and the number of flagellates, and a positive correlation with the number of nematodes in cp-class 2. When including a third variable into the model, suppressiveness also has a positive correlation with the Enrichment Index and a negative correlation with the total fungal / bacterial biomass.





Figure 1. Area Under Disease Progressive Curve (AUDPC)

Table 1. Best regression models for AUDPC of the *Fusarium oxysporum* f.sp. *linii* / flax pathosystem

Regression models with 2 parameters ^a	% variance accounted for
32.1*** + 14.3 × [Maturity Index 1-5 [*]] – 2.9 × [nematodes cp-class 2 ^{*b}]	48.3
35.6 ^{***} + 9,3 × [∑ Maturity Index 1-5 [*]] – 2.5 × [nematodes cp-class 2 ^{*b}]	44.5
-30.9 ^{ns} + 13.5 × [∑ Maturity Index 1-5 ^{**}] + 4.7 × [flagellates ^{*b}]	42.9
Regression models with 3 parameters	
-31.0 ^{ns} + 13.2 × [∑ Maturity Index 1-5 ^{***}] - 2.8 × [nematodes cp-class 2 ^{**b}] + 5.3 × [flagellates ^{**b}]	70.6
-23.2 ^{ns} + 18.0 × [Maturity Index 1-5 ^{***}] – 3.3 × [nematodes cp-class 2 ^{***b}] + 4.5 × [flagellates ^{**b}]	67.5
329.5 ^{***} - 3.9 × [nematodes cp-class 2 ^{***b}] – 3.1 × [Enrichment Index ^{**}] + 79.1 × [total fungal biomass / total bacterial biomass	5**] 67.4

^a *=P<0.05, **P<0.01, ***P<0.001, ns = not significant ^b log-transformed (In) data

Conclusion and Discussion Regression analysis results in models pointing at the predominance of bacteria and bacteria-feeding nematodes in *Fusarium* suppressive soil. A low Maturity Index, a high Enrichment Index, and a low fungal/bacterial biomass rate are all indicative of ecosystems that are predominantly based on bacteria and bacteria feeders. Nematodes in cp-class 2 are characterised by their stress-tolerance, and by the possibility to slow down metabolism for a longer period. The question remains whether the disease suppressiveness is actually mediated by these bacteria and bacteria feeders, or if their dominance is a mere result of the application of organic amendments in combination with the stress of toxic compounds, that are released when these amendments start to decompose.

ISHS



