

ISSN 1392-3196 / e-ISSN 2335-8947

Zemdirbyste-Agriculture, vol. 103, No. 4 (2016), p. 363–368

DOI 10.13080/z-a.2016.103.046

***Microdochium nivale* and *M. majus* as causative agents of seedling blight in spring cereals**

Akvilė JONAVIČIENĖ, Skaidrė SUPRONIENĖ, Roma SEMAŠKIENĖ

Institute of Agriculture, Lithuanian Research Centre for Agriculture and Forestry

Instituto 1, Akademija, Kėdainiai distr., Lithuania

E-mail: akvile@lzi.lt

Abstract

Seedling blight, mostly caused by *Fusarium* spp. and *Bipolaris sorokiniana*, is a common disease in spring cereals. This research confirmed the presence of *Microdochium* fungi in a complex of seedling blight causative agents. Pathogens *Microdochium nivale* and *M. majus* in the seed and in stem base of seedlings of spring barley, spring wheat, spring triticale and spring oats were identified and quantified using a quantitative real-time polymerase chain reaction (qPCR) in 2013–2015. Both species were detected in the seed of all spring cereals tested. The amount of *M. nivale* and *M. majus* DNA was the highest in seeds of barley. Both *Microdochium* pathogens were present in the stem base of seedlings of all spring cereals tested; however, a high variation between cereal species and years was established. In most cases, the quantity of *M. nivale* DNA was the lowest in the seedlings of oats, while that of *M. majus* – in the seedlings of barley compared to the other cereal species tested. Higher contents of *M. majus* and *M. nivale* DNA were identified in the stem base of the seedlings emerged from untreated seeds compared with the seedlings emerged from the fludioxonil-treated seeds. However, the effect of tebuconazole on the reduction of *M. nivale* and *M. majus* DNA was inconsistent. Our findings suggest that *M. nivale* and *M. majus* occur in the seed of spring cereals and cause seedling blight, therefore research on these pathogens needs to be extended.

Key words: fludioxonil, *Microdochium majus*, *M. nivale*, seed infection, seedling blight, tebuconazole.

Introduction

Formerly *Microdochium* (syn. *Lanosa navalis* (Fr.), *Fusarium nivale* (Fr.)) were initially identified as *Fusarium* species on the morphological basis (Wollenweber, Reinking, 1935), but later studies differentiated the genus *Microdochium* from *Fusarium* (Samuels, Hallett, 1983). Glynn et al. (2005) described *M. nivale* and *M. majus* as separate species: *Microdochium nivale* (Fr.) Samuels & I.C. Hallett and *Microdochium majus* (Wollenw.) Glynn & S.G. Edwards. Both pathogens are important nontoxigenic fungal pathogens of many cereal crops causing seedling blight, foot rot and also belong to the *Fusarium* head blight fungal complex (Amein et al., 2007; Walker et al., 2009; Nielsen et al., 2011; Jørgensen et al., 2012). *Microdochium* fungi are associated with retardation of seed germination (Hudec, Muchova, 2010) and significant yield losses (Humphreys et al., 1995; Amein et al., 2007).

M. nivale causes seedling blight and brown foot rot and tend to occur under cooler conditions and have trivial meaning in warmer localities (Doohan et al., 2003; Roháčik, Hudec, 2005). Brown foot rot on winter wheat stem base is present in significant amounts with *M. nivale* and *M. majus* (Bateman et al., 2000). *M. nivale* was more common on winter barley than on winter wheat (Dawson, Bateman, 2001). In another study winter wheat was more susceptible to *Fusarium* species and *M. nivale* than winter barley (Hudec, 2007). Usually *Microdochium* species is present as one or both (Nicholson et al., 2002). The Ren

et al. (2015) study established that *M. nivale* was a more aggressive *Fusarium* seedling blight pathogen causing 30% higher disease severity on wheats than *M. majus*. According to Matusinsky et al. (2008), *M. nivale* was found on the stem base most frequently on winter wheat and the statistical association was confirmed between *M. nivale* and *M. majus*. Out of these, *M. nivale* tended to decrease in the summer season.

M. nivale (*Fusarium nivale*) was identified on winter wheat and rye stem base and *M. majus* was found on rye in 1970 in Lithuania (Špokauskienė, 1991), but there is no information about *Microdochium* spp. causal agent on stem base of spring cereals. Cockerell et al. (2009), based on the limited data sets in Scotland, suggested that spring wheat and oats are at risk from high levels of *Microdochium* infection, and spring barley is also at risk but at levels exceeding 30% seed infection. It is known that *Microdochium* affects seedlings at temperatures as low as 3°C (Haigh et al., 2009). In an inoculation experiment at 10°C, Simpson et al. (2000) found that both *Microdochium* species were pathogenic to wheat and rye but only *M. nivale* caused significant disease in oats. These studies showed that *Microdochium* species can be important pathogens in spring cereals also. *M. nivale* and *M. majus* as seedling blight pathogens in spring cereals in Lithuania have not been described before. The present study was undertaken to determine whether *M. nivale* and *M. majus* affect seed and stem

base of spring cereals and estimate the susceptibility of different spring cereal species to both pathogens.

Materials and methods

Field experiment. Field experiments involving spring barley cv. 'NFC Tipple', spring wheat cv. 'Tybalt', spring triticale cv. 'Nilex' and spring oats cv. 'Vendela' were carried out at Institute of Agriculture, Lithuanian Research Centre for Agriculture and Forestry during 2013–2015. Experiments were set up in three treatments using untreated seeds, fludioxonil (25 g l⁻¹, commercial product Maxim 025 FS (Syngenta))-treated seeds at a dose of 2.0 l t⁻¹ and tebuconazole (60 g l⁻¹, commercial product Chambel 6 FS (Makhteshim Chemical Works Ltd.)) at a dose of 0.5 l t⁻¹. Seeds were treated using a liquid seed dresser Hege 11 (Wintersteiger, Austria). The experiments were laid out in a randomized complete block design in four replications with 15 m² plot size. In all experimental years, cereals were pre-crops.

Sampling and DNA extraction. Before sowing, a seed sample of 10 g per species was taken from naturally

infected seeds and homogenized with a mixer mill MM400 (Retsch, Germany). Thirty plants (BBCH 13) with disease symptoms were collected from each treatment from three replications and 1 cm long stem base segments were powdered in liquid nitrogen. A total of 100 mg per each seed and plant sample were taken for the DNA extraction with a NucleoSpin Plant II (Machery-Nagel, Germany) according to the manufacturer's instructions.

Quantitative real-time polymerase chain reaction (qPCR) analysis. qPCR was done according to the protocol of Nielsen et al. (2013) with the following modifications: total volume of 15 µl consisting of 7.5 µl Power SYBR Green PCR Master Mix (Applied Biosystems, USA), 300 nM of each primer, 0.5 µg µl⁻¹ BSA (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Lithuania) and 2.5 µl template DNA. Genomic DNA extracted from seeds and plant stem bases was diluted 1:20 and PCR reactions were performed in duplicate on all samples. PCR was run in a 7900HT Fast Real-time PCR System (Applied Biosystems, USA) using Nielsen et al. (2013) cycling protocol. A list of specific primers used is provided in Table 1.

Table 1. A list of sequences and species specific primers used for analysis

Species detected	Primer	Sequence (5'-3')	Source
<i>Microdochium nivale</i>	Mniv1f	TTGGCTTGACAAACAATACTTTTT	Nielsen et al., 2013
	Mniv1r	AGCACAAACAGGCGTGGATAAG	
<i>Microdochium majus</i>	Mmajus1f	AACCCCTCCCGGGTTCAG	Nielsen et al., 2013
	Mmajus1r	GGATAAACGACACTTGAAGACAGAAAA	
Plant EF1α	Hor1f	TCTCTGGGTTTGAGGGTGAC	Nicolaisen et al., 2009
	Hor2r	GGCCCTTGACCAGTCAAGGT	

M. nivale and *M. majus* pure culture originated from Leibniz-Institut DSMZ, Germany. DNA concentrations and quality of fungi (obtained from pure culture) for standard curves were measured by a biophotometer (Eppendorf, Germany). Six-fold dilution sets starting from 1:10 DNA were used (Suproniene et al., 2010; Nielsen et al., 2013).

Meteorological conditions. Cool weather is favourable for *Microdochium* fungi (Doohan et al., 2003).

Table 2. Meteorological observations

Time	Average air temperature °C			Amount of rainfall mm			Average soil surface temperature °C		
	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015
Week before sowing	8.5	11.9	6.1	2.9	0.7	5.7	4.5	3.1	1.4
Sowing time	10.8	14.7	9.3	–	–	–	0.3	5.8	2.7
Week after sowing	12.4	12.3	11.5	0.0	0.0	18.8	4.7	2.8	5.5
Week after plant emergence	16.1	6.6	10.9	8.0	3.9	13.5	10.4	2.0	6.3
Plant emergence-sampling time	24.3	11.8	15.1	19.4	27.2	13.5	16.1	5.2	8.3

Statistical analysis. Relationships between amounts of pathogen DNA in seeds and stem bases or seedling blight severity were determined by the correlation analyses ($P \leq 0.05$) using *SAS Enterprise Guide 7.1* (SAS Institute Inc.). Standard deviation of the set of data values was calculated. Real-time PCR values are presented as the amount of fungal DNA per amount of plant DNA.

Results and discussion

Naturally infected seeds were analyzed for *Microdochium nivale* and *M. majus* presence by qPCR.

It has been noted that sowing seeds in cold soil increases seed germination time and this can lead to infection of seedlings with soil pathogens (Hwang et al., 2000). During the spring cereal growing seasons, the amount of rainfall was the highest (52 mm) in 2015 and the lowest (30–32 mm) in 2013 and 2014 (Table 2). Average air temperature and the average soil surface temperature during spring cereal growing season was lowest in 2014 and 2015 while highest in 2013.

The results showed that *M. nivale* and *M. majus* were present in all seed samples of spring barley, spring wheat, spring triticale and spring oats (Table 3). Nielsen et al. (2011) also detected *M. nivale* and *M. majus* at significant amounts in almost all winter wheat, spring barley, oats, rye and triticale grain samples. Both fungal species were detected in all Danish cereal species, but *M. majus* prevailed against *M. nivale* in most years in all cereal species except rye, in which *M. nivale* represented a larger proportion of the biomass and was more prevalent than *M. majus* (Nielsen et al., 2013). In our experiments, *M. nivale* and *M. majus* in seeds determined equally while biomass of *M. nivale* in some cases was higher.

Table 3. Quantity of *Microdochium nivale* and *M. majus* (fungal DNA pg per plant DNA ng) on the seed of spring cereals, expressed as mean values and standard deviation

Crop	2013	2014	2015
<i>M. nivale</i>			
Spring barley	5.38 ± 0.43	1.86 ± 0.32	4.49 ± 0.56
Spring wheat	0.31 ± 0.02	0.21 ± 0.02	0.26 ± 0.00
Spring triticale	2.29 ± 0.79	0.07 ± 0.00	0.26 ± 0.24
Spring oats	1.74 ± 0.37	0.43 ± 0.01	0.94 ± 0.39
<i>M. majus</i>			
Spring barley	2.13 ± 0.27	0.46 ± 0.13	2.65 ± 0.54
Spring wheat	0.76 ± 0.07	0.02 ± 0.01	0.29 ± 0.01
Spring triticale	2.35 ± 0.02	0.01 ± 0.00	0.08 ± 0.01
Spring oats	1.35 ± 0.57	0.07 ± 0.03	0.61 ± 0.06

M. nivale was observed in different amounts in all spring cereal seeds and investigation years. A smaller quantity of *M. nivale* DNA was identified in spring wheat seeds compared to other cereal species. According to DNA quantities in seeds, spring barley was the most susceptible to *M. nivale*. Host plant response to pathogen infection was shown in all experimental years. Our results agree with those of Nielsen et al. (2011) who found that the amounts of *M. nivale* and *M. majus* in winter wheat were generally lower than in other cereal grains.

M. majus also prevailed in spring barley seeds and higher DNA quantities were found in 2013 and 2015. The year 2014 was characterised by small quantities of both *Microdochium* species in the seed of spring cereals and in 2013 by large quantities. Significant interactions between cereal genotypes and fungal species have been established suggesting that resistance/tolerance mechanisms and genes may influence the disease caused by individual *Microdochium* species (Ren et al., 2015). Our study suggests that barley might be most susceptible to both *Microdochium* species compared to the other spring crops, while wheat might be most resistant; however, investigations of different genotypes are essential to get more valid results.

In the field trials, visual seedling blight incidence and severity index varied between crops and investigation years, but symptoms of the disease were observed in all investigated crops (data not shown). In all experimental

years, spring oats were the least damaged by seedling blight of all the species tested. Haigh and Hare (2012) have reported that disease symptoms did not occur on seedlings grown from the non-infected seed lot *in vitro* and the presence of *Microdochium* spp. was confirmed on seedlings from the infected seed lot. In our study, all seed lots were infected with both *Microdochium* species and therefore we expected to detect them in disease-affected stem bases.

Analyses of qPCR for identification of causal pathogens in stem base of the seedlings of different spring cereals confirmed the presence of both pathogens *M. nivale* and *M. majus* (Table 4). The amount of their DNA varied between host plants and years. The quantity of *M. nivale* DNA in most cases was the lowest in the seedlings of oats, while *M. majus* – in barley seedlings compared to the other tested species McNeil et al. (2012) found a clear difference in host (spring barley and spring oats) preference of *Microdochium* species. The current study suggests the advantage of *M. majus* over *M. nivale* on spring wheat, spring triticale and spring oats, whereas spring barley was more sensitive to *M. nivale*. Simpson et al. (2000) in the mixed inoculation trial found that *M. nivale* var. *majus* showed a selective advantage on winter wheat and winter oats seedlings and *M. nivale* var. *nivale* showed a strong selective advantage on winter rye seedlings.

Table 4. The presence of *Microdochium nivale* and *M. majus* (fungal DNA pg per plant DNA µg) in naturally infected spring cereal seedling stem bases at BBCH 13 in 2013–2015

Crop	<i>M. nivale</i>				<i>M. majus</i>			
	min	max	average	SD	min	max	average	SD
Spring barley	3.47	92.97	34.3	50.8	0	14.36	6.3	7.4
Spring wheat	0.71	89.27	30.6	50.8	9.36	370.20	132.0	206.3
Spring triticale	0.6	22.70	10.3	11.3	4.78	88.28	40.9	42.9
Spring oats	0	1.06	0.4	0.6	0.34	30.48	11.0	16.9

SD – standard deviation

Stem base of seedlings from untreated seeds contained higher amount of *M. majus* and *M. nivale* DNA than seedlings from fludioxonil-treated seeds (Table 5). Glynn et al. (2008) found that *M. nivale* and *M. majus* were highly sensitive to fludioxonil. There was a significant interaction between species and fungicide, with *M. majus* being proportionally more sensitive to fludioxonil than *M. nivale*. Walker et al. (2009) also reported that fludioxonil used for seed treatments was effective against *Microdochium* spp. Simpson et al.

(2001) reported that tebuconazole showed little control of *M. nivale*. Other studies showed that tebuconazole has intermediate values for *Microdochium* fungi and no differences were found between the *Microdochium* species sensitivity (Walker et al., 2009). In the present study, the seed treatment fungicide fludioxonil tended to decrease the DNA amounts of both *Microdochium* in all crops and tested years. The other seed treatment fungicide tebuconazole showed variable results of biomass reduction of *M. nivale* and *M. majus*.

Table 5. Amounts of *Microdochium nivale* and *M. majus* (fungal DNA pg per plant DNA µg) in the stem bases of spring cereals at BBCH 13, expressed as mean values and standard deviation

Treatment	2013		2014		2015	
	<i>M. nivale</i>	<i>M. majus</i>	<i>M. nivale</i>	<i>M. majus</i>	<i>M. nivale</i>	<i>M. majus</i>
Spring barley						
Untreated	3.47 ± 0.44	4.41 ± 0.12	6.45 ± 0.45	0	92.97 ± 7.56	14.36 ± 0.36
Fludioxonil	0.18 ± 0.02	0	0	0	1.20 ± 0.20	0
Tebuconazole	1.46 ± 0.21	4.03 ± 0.87	1.75 ± 0.18	0	86.02 ± 11.81	2.20 ± 0.20
Spring wheat						
Untreated	1.90 ± 0.61	9.36 ± 0.25	2.50 ± 0.44	16.45 ± 0.93	89.27 ± 10.73	370.20 ± 77.08
Fludioxonil	1.07 ± 0.11	0.72 ± 0.12	0.43 ± 0.33	0	0	0.71 ± 0.01
Tebuconazole	1.21 ± 0.06	9.50 ± 0.97	0.71 ± 0.12	0.15 ± 0.00	1.29 ± 0.29	106.69 ± 7.96
Spring triticale						
Untreated	22.70 ± 5.65	88.28 ± 5.18	0.60 ± 0.10	29.75 ± 0.97	7.55 ± 0.59	4.78 ± 0.55
Fludioxonil	7.47 ± 1.04	37.35 ± 3.08	0	0	0	0.12 ± 0.02
Tebuconazole	14.90 ± 3.39	76.71 ± 5.57	0	0	0.42 ± 0.02	0.59 ± 0.09
Spring oats						
Untreated	1.06 ± 0.06	30.48 ± 0.48	0	0.34 ± 0.04	0	2.22 ± 0.22
Fludioxonil	0.32 ± 0.02	0	0	0	0	0.51 ± 0.01
Tebuconazole	1.46 ± 0.46	0	0	0.10 ± 0.00	0	0.59 ± 0.09

In our experiments, some correlation between quantity of *M. nivale* and *M. majus* DNA in seed and in stem base was found. Strong and significant correlation with both fungi species was determined in spring triticale and spring oats (Table 6). In spring wheat and spring triticale, seedling blight severity index strongly correlated with the DNA quantity of both pathogens in stem base.

The relationship between all parameters tested in spring barley was insignificant and correlation varied from medium to low. According to Turner et al. (2001), visual and PCR analyses on stems varied in relation to disease incidence or severity of symptoms and to the amount of pathogen DNA. Ramanauskienė et al. (2014) have previously reported that stem base and foot rot disease

Table 6. Correlation between quantity of *Microdochium nivale* and *M. majus* DNA in seeds and in stem bases and seedling blight severity index in different spring cereals in 2013–2015

	Quantity of <i>M. nivale</i> in stem bases	Quantity of <i>M. majus</i> in stem bases
Spring barley		
Quantity of <i>M. nivale</i> in seeds	0.685	
Quantity of <i>M. majus</i> in seeds		0.246
Seedling blight severity index	0.285	0.520
Spring wheat		
Quantity of <i>M. nivale</i> in seeds	-0.214	
Quantity of <i>M. majus</i> in seeds		-0.261
Seedling blight severity index	0.743*	0.760*
Spring triticale		
Quantity of <i>M. nivale</i> in seeds	0.968**	
Quantity of <i>M. majus</i> in seeds		0.947**
Seedling blight severity index	0.877**	0.751*
Spring oats		
Quantity of <i>M. nivale</i> in seeds	0.844*	
Quantity of <i>M. majus</i> in seeds		0.857*
Seedling blight severity index	-0.605	-0.176

* – significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed), ** – significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)

incidence did not correlate with fungal DNA amounts from diseased stems. Other authors indicate significant relationship between visual infection symptoms and the incidence of *M. nivale* and *M. majus* on winter wheat (Matusinsky et al., 2008).

Results of our research showed that *M. nivale* and *M. majus* occur in spring cereals (wheat, barley, triticale and oats) and cause seedling blight. Control of seedling blight should be focused on complex pathogens and both *Microdochium* species as well.

Conclusions

1. Pathogens *Microdochium nivale* and *M. majus* were identified and quantified in the seed of spring barley, spring wheat, spring triticale and spring oats using a quantitative real-time polymerase chain reaction. The amount of *M. nivale* and *M. majus* DNA was the highest in the seeds of barley.

2. Real-time PCR confirmed the presence of both pathogens *M. nivale* and *M. majus* in the stem bases of seedlings of all cereal species tested; however,

high variation between cereal species and years was established. In most cases, the quantity of *M. nivale* DNA was the lowest in the seedlings of oats, while that of *M. majus* – in barley seedlings compared to the other tested cereal species.

3. Stem base of the seedlings from the untreated seeds contained significantly higher amount of *M. majus* and *M. nivale* DNA compared to those of the seedlings from the fludioxonil-treated seeds, while tebuconazole showed inconsistent influence on the reduction of DNA amount of *M. nivale* and *M. majus*.

4. Positive correlation between quantity of *Microdochium nivale* and *M. majus* DNA in seed and in stem base of spring triticale and spring oats was determined. Seedling blight severity index significantly correlated with the quantity of DNA of both pathogens in stem base of spring wheat and spring triticale.

Acknowledgements

The paper presents research findings obtained through the long-term research programme “Harmful organisms in agro and forest ecosystems” implemented by Lithuanian Research Centre for Agriculture and Forestry.

Received 09 08 2016

Accepted 31 10 2016

References

- Amein T., Omer Z., Welch C. 2007. Application and evaluation of *Pseudomonas* strains for biocontrol of wheat seedling blight. *Crop protection*, 27: 532–536
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2007.08.007>
- Bateman G. L., Edwards S. G., Marshall J., Morgan L. W., Nicholson P., Nuttall M., Parry D. W., Scrancher M., Turner A. S. 2000. Effects of cultivar and fungicides on stem-base pathogens, determined by quantitative PCR, and on diseases and yield of wheat. *Annals of Applied Biology*, 137: 213–221
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7348.2000.tb00062.x>
- Cockerell V., Jacks M., McNeil M. 2009. Spring cereal seed infection with *Microdochium nivale*: cause for concern? BCPC Symposium Proceedings No. 83, p. 95–101
- Dawson W. A. J. M., Bateman G. L. 2001. Fungal communities and disease symptoms on stem bases of wheat and barley and effects of seed treatments containing Fluquinconazole and Prochloraz. *Journal of Phytopathology*, 149: 665–671
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1439-0434.2001.00690.x>
- Doohan F. M., Brennan J., Cooke B. M. 2003. Influence of climatic factors on *Fusarium* species pathogenic to cereals. *European Journal of Plant Pathology*, 109 (7): 755–768
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1026090626994>
- Glynn N. C., Hare M. C., Parry D. W., Edwards S. G. 2005. Phylogenetic analysis of EF-1 alpha gene sequences from isolates of *Microdochium nivale* leads to elevation of varieties *majus* and *nivale* to species status. *Mycological Research*, 109: 872–880
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0953756205003370>
- Glynn N. C., Hare M. C., Edwards S. G. 2008. Fungicide seed treatment efficacy against *Microdochium nivale* and *M. majus* *in vitro* and *in vivo*. *Pest Management Science*, 64 (8): 793–799
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ps.1558>
- Haigh I. M., Hare M. C. 2012. The effect of freezing temperatures on *Microdochium majus* and *M. nivale* seedling blight of winter wheat. *International Journal of Agronomy*, 2012: 1–5
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2012/359017>
- Haigh I. M., Jenkinson P., Hare M. C. 2009. The effect of a mixture of seed-borne *Microdochium nivale* var. *majus* and *Microdochium nivale* var. *nivale* infection on *Fusarium* seedling blight severity and subsequent colonisation and growth of winter wheat in pot experiments. *Journal of Plant Pathology*, 124 (1): 65–73
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10658-008-9393-z>
- Hudec K. 2007. Pathogenicity of fungi associated with wheat and barley seedling emergence and fungicide efficacy of seed treatment. *Biologia*, 62 (3): 287–291
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2478/s11756-007-0050-3>
- Hudec K., Muchova D. 2010. Influence of temperature and species origin on *Fusarium* spp. and *Microdochium nivale* pathogenicity to wheat seedlings. *Plant Protection Science*, 46 (2): 59–65
- Humphreys J., Cooke B. M., Storey T. 1995. Effects of seed borne *Microdochium nivale* on establishment and grain yield of winter-sown wheat. *Plant Varieties and Seeds*, 8: 107–117
- Hwang F. S., Gossen B. D., Turnbull G. D., Chang K. F., Howard R. J., Thomas A. G. 2000. Effect of temperature, seeding date, fungicide treatment and inoculation with *Fusarium avenaceum* on seedling survival, root rot severity and yield of lentil. *Canadian Journal of Plant Science*, 80 (4): 899–907
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4141/P99-177>
- Jørgensen L. N., Nielsen L. K., Nielsen B. J. 2012. Control of seedling blight in winter wheat by seed treatments – impact on emergence, crop stand, yield and deoxynivalenol. *Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica, Section B: Soil and Plant Science*, 62: 431–440
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09064710.2011.641028>
- Matusinsky P., Mikolasova R., Spitzer T., Klem K. 2008. Colonization of winter wheat stem bases by communities of pathogenic fungi. *Cereal Research Communications*, 36 (1): 77–88
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1556/CRC.36.2008.1.8>
- McNeil M., Mackie J., Cockerell V. 2012. The effect of *Microdochium nivale* and *M. majus* on the establishment of spring barley and oats; evidence of host preference. *Proceedings Crop Protection in Northern Britain*, p. 187–192
- Nicholson P., Turner A. S., Edwards S. G., Bateman G. L., Morgan L. W., Rappy D. W., Marshall J., Nuttall M. 2002. Development of stem base pathogens on different cultivars of winter wheat determined by quantitative PCR. *European Journal of Plant Pathology*, 108 (2): 163–177
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1015087311702>
- Nicolaisen M., Supronienė S., Nielsen L. K., Lazzaro I., Spliid N. H., Justesen A. F. 2009. Real-time PCR for quantification of eleven individual *Fusarium* species in cereals. *Journal of Microbiological Methods*, 76 (3): 234–240
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mimet.2008.10.016>
- Nielsen L. K., Jensen J. D., Nielsen G. C., Jensen J. E., Spliid N. H., Thomsen I. K., Justesen A. F., Collinge D. B., Jørgensen L. N. 2011. *Fusarium* head blight of cereals in Denmark: species complex and related mycotoxins. *Phytopathology*, 101 (8): 960–969
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO-07-10-0188>
- Nielsen L. K., Justesen A. F., Jensen J. D., Jørgensen L. N. 2013. *Microdochium nivale* and *Microdochium majus* in seed samples of Danish small grain cereals. *Crop Protection*, 43: 192–200
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2012.09.002>
- Ramanauskienė J., Gaurilčikienė I., Supronienė S., Ronis A., Česnulevičienė R. 2014. Evaluation of eyespot incidence and structure of *Oculimacula* spp. population in winter rye in Lithuania. *Zemdirbyste-Agriculture*, 101 (4): 425–430
<http://dx.doi.org/10.13080/z-a.2014.101.054>
- Ren R., Yang X., Ray R. V. 2015. Comparative aggressiveness of *Microdochium nivale* and *M. majus* and evaluation of screening methods for *Fusarium* seedling blight resistance in wheat cultivars. *European Journal of Plant Pathology*, 141 (2): 281–294
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10658-014-0541-3>

- Roháčik T., Hudec K. 2005. Influence of agro-environmental factors on *Fusarium* infestation and population structure in wheat kernels. *Annals of Agricultural and Environmental Medicine*, 12 (1): 39–45
- Samuels G. J., Hallett I. C. 1983. *Microdochium stoveri* and *Monographella stoveri* new combinations for *Fusarium stoveri* and *Micronectriella stoveri*. *Transactions of the British Mycological Society*, 81 (3): 473–483
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0007-1536\(83\)80115-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0007-1536(83)80115-6)
- Simpson D. R., Rezanoor H. N., Parry D. W., Nicholson P. 2000. Evidence for different host preference in *Microdochium nivale* var. *majus* and *Microdochium nivale* var. *nivale*. *Plant Pathology*, 49: 261–268
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-3059.2000.00453.x>
- Simpson D. R., Weston G. E., Turner J. A., Jennings P., Nicholson P. 2001. Differential control of head blight pathogens of wheat by fungicides and consequences for mycotoxin contamination of grain. *European Journal of Plant Pathology*, 107 (4): 421–431
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1011225817707>
- Supronienė S., Justensen A. F., Nicolaisen M., Mankeviciene A., Dabkevicius Z., Semaskiene R., Leistrumaitė A. 2010. Distribution of trichothecene and zearalenone producing *Fusarium* species in grain of different cereal species and cultivars grown under organic farming conditions in Lithuania. *Annals of Agricultural and Environmental Medicine*, 17 (1): 79–86
- Špokauskienė O. 1991. Micromycetes of the cereals and their occurrence in Lithuania. 1. Micromycetes of the cereal roots and lower parts of stems. *Ecology*, 4: 9–21
- Turner A. S., Nicholson P., Edwards S. G., Bateman G. L., Morgan L. W., Todd A. D., Parry D. W., Marshall J., Nuttall M. 2001. Evaluation of diagnostic and quantitative PCR for the identification and severity assessment of eyespot and sharp eyespot in winter wheat. *Plant Pathology*, 50: 463–469
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-3059.2001.00592.x>
- Walker A. S., Auclair C., Gredt M., Leroux P. 2009. First occurrence of resistance to strobilurin fungicides in *Microdochium nivale* and *Microdochium majus* from French naturally infected wheat grains. *Pest Management Science*, 65 (8): 906–915
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ps.1772>
- Wollenweber H. W., Reinking O. A. 1935. Die Fusarien, ihre Beschreibung Schadwirkung und Bekämpfung, 355 p. (in German)

ISSN 1392-3196 / e-ISSN 2335-8947

Zemdirbyste-Agriculture, vol. 103, No. 4 (2016), p. 363–368

DOI 10.13080/z-a.2016.103.046

***Microdochium nivale* ir *M. majus* – vasarinių javų daigų puvinų sukėlėjai**

A. Jonavičienė, S. Supronienė, R. Semaškienė

Lietuvos agrarinių ir miškų mokslų centro Žemdirbystės institutas

Santrauka

Vasarinių javų daigų puvinus dažniausiai sukelia *Fusarium* ssp. ir *Bipolaris sorokiniana*. Šis tyrimas patvirtino, kad ir *Microdochium* grybai, sudarę kompleksą su kitais patogenais, sukelia daigų puvinus. *Microdochium nivale* ir *M. majus* patogenai vasarinių miežių, vasarinių kviečių, vasarinių kvietrugių bei avižų sėklose ir daigų apatinės stiebo dalies pažaidose 2013–2015 m. buvo nustatyti taikant kiekybinę ir kokybinę realaus laiko polimerazės grandininę reakciją (*qPGR*). Abi rūšys buvo aptiktos visų vasarinių augalų sėklose. Didžiausias kiekis *M. nivale* ir *M. majus* DNR buvo vasarinių miežių sėklose. Abu *Microdochium* patogenai nustatyti ant visų tirtų vasarinių javų daigų stiebo apatinės dalies, tačiau rasti kiekiai varijavo tarp augalų ir tyrimo metų. *M. nivale* DNR kiekis daugeliu atvejų buvo mažiausias avižų daiguose, o *M. majus* – miežių daiguose, lyginant su kitų tirtų rūšių augalais. Neapdorotų sėklų daigų stiebo apatinėje dalyje buvo nustatyti didesni kiekiai *M. majus* ir *M. nivale* DNR nei beicuotų fludionksnilu, o tebukonazolo įtaka mažinant *M. nivale* ir *M. majus* DNR kiekį buvo nenuosekli. Tyrimo duomenys parodė, kad *M. nivale* ir *M. majus* pažeidžia vasarinių javų sėklas ir sukelia daigų puvinus, todėl šių patogenų tyrimus būtina plėsti.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: daigų puviniai, fludijoksonilas, *Microdochium majus*, *M. nivale*, sėklų infekcija, tebukonazolas.

Please use the following format when citing the article:

Jonavičienė A., Supronienė S., Semaškienė R. *Microdochium nivale* and *M. majus* as causative agents of seedling blight in spring cereals. *Zemdirbyste-Agriculture*, 103 (4): 363–368 DOI 10.13080/z-a.2016.103.046