

**SPORE TRAPPING COUPLED WITH QUANTITATIVE PCR:  
POTENTIAL FOR APPLICATION TO BIOSECURITY  
SURVEILLANCE**

**BERNADETTE K. VOGELZANG**  
**B.Ag.Sc (Hons), The University of Adelaide**

**Thesis submitted for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
The University of Adelaide**

**Faculty of Sciences,  
School of Agriculture, Food and Wine**

**September 2011**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Abstract .....	i
2	Declaration .....	iii
3	Acknowledgements .....	iv
4	Abbreviations .....	vii
1	Introduction and literature review .....	1
1.1	Introduction.....	1
1.2	Inoculum dispersal.....	2
1.3	Air sampling .....	3
1.4	Methods for identification and quantification .....	5
1.4.1	Conventional methods.....	5
1.4.2	Serological methods .....	5
1.4.3	Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) .....	6
1.4.4	Reverse-transcriptase PCR (RT-PCR) .....	8
1.4.5	Use of PCR to detect fungal spores in air samples.....	9
1.5	Use of spore trapping and PCR in biosecurity.....	13
1.6	Storage of spore trap samples .....	15
1.7	Effect of heat and relative humidity on yield of DNA from air samples .....	16
1.8	Epidemiological models .....	17
1.9	Model pathogens.....	19
1.9.1	Leptosphaeria maculans .....	19
1.9.2	Didymella pinodes.....	23
1.9.3	Didymella rabiei .....	26
1.9.4	Use of model pathogens to test the spore trapping system.....	28
1.10	Conclusions .....	28

1.11	Research Aims.....	29
1.12	Research Objectives .....	29
2	General materials and methods.....	30
2.1	Trial site .....	30
2.2	Model pathogens .....	30
2.2.1	Fungal isolates .....	30
2.2.2	Infested stubble.....	31
2.2.3	Collection of ascospores from infested stubble .....	32
2.2.4	Assessment of fruiting bodies on stubble .....	33
2.2.5	Assessment of ascospore release from stubble .....	34
2.3	Air sampling.....	35
2.3.1	Trap plants .....	35
2.3.2	Spore traps .....	36
2.3.3	Application of adhesives to spore tape .....	37
2.3.4	Effect of dissolving adhesive in hexane on spore capture.....	37
2.3.5	Spore tape processing .....	38
2.3.6	Storage of spore tapes .....	39
2.3.7	Microscopic examination of the spore tapes .....	39
2.4	Estimation of spore numbers on tapes .....	40
2.4.1	Spore concentration in suspension.....	40
2.4.2	Spore counts on tapes .....	42
2.5	Quantitative PCR assays .....	42
2.6	Statistical analysis .....	43
3	Development of DNA methodology.....	44
3.1	Introduction.....	44
3.2	Materials and methods .....	45
3.2.1	Initial experiment using UltraClean <sup>®</sup> kit .....	46

3.2.2	Comparison of methods for disrupting conidia.....	46
3.2.3	Efficacy of DNA Extraction Method 1 on different pathogens .....	47
3.2.4	Removal of conidia from tape segments .....	48
3.2.5	Sensitivity of DNA extraction/qPCR system on conidia .....	49
3.2.6	Variability in calculated DNA values from conidia between qPCR assays .....	49
3.2.7	Spore disruption and DNA extraction from ascospores.....	50
3.2.8	Investigation of ascospore disruption.....	51
3.2.9	Sensitivity of DNA extraction/qPCR system on ascospores.....	52
3.2.10	Effect on DNA yield of applying Tanglefoot® dissolved in hexane to spore trap tapes.....	52
3.3	Results.....	53
3.3.1	Initial experiments using UltraClean® kit .....	53
3.3.2	Comparison of methods for disrupting conidia.....	53
3.3.3	Efficacy of DNA Extraction Method 1 on different pathogens .....	54
3.3.4	Removal of conidia from tape segments .....	55
3.3.5	Sensitivity of DNA extraction/qPCR system on conidia .....	55
3.3.6	Variability in calculated DNA values from conidia between qPCR assays .....	57
3.3.7	Spore disruption and DNA extraction from ascospores.....	58
3.3.8	Investigation of ascospore disruption.....	60
3.3.9	Sensitivity of DNA extraction/qPCR system on ascospores.....	61
3.3.10	Effect on DNA yield of applying Tanglefoot® dissolved in hexane to spore trap tapes.....	62
3.4	Discussion.....	62
3.4.1	Sensitivity.....	62
3.4.2	DNA extraction efficiency – spore removal and disruption.....	63

3.4.3	Spore types.....	64
3.4.4	Variability .....	64
3.4.5	PCR inhibition .....	65
3.4.6	Effect on DNA yield of applying Tanglefoot® dissolved in hexane to spore trap tapes.....	66
3.5	Conclusions.....	66
4	Factors affecting efficacy of DNA-based tests .....	67
4.1	Introduction.....	67
4.2	Materials and methods .....	68
4.2.1	Specificity .....	68
4.2.2	Effect of heat and relative humidity on DNA yield.....	69
4.2.3	Sample storage.....	71
4.3	Results.....	73
4.3.1	Specificity .....	73
4.3.2	Effect of heat and relative humidity on DNA yield.....	74
4.3.3	Sample storage.....	76
4.4	Discussion .....	77
4.4.1	Specificity .....	77
4.4.2	Effect of heat and relative humidity on DNA yield.....	79
4.4.3	Sample storage.....	82
4.5	Conclusions.....	83
5	Comparison of field data with predictions from epidemiological models .....	85
5.1	Introduction.....	85
5.2	Materials and methods .....	86
5.2.1	Spore trap.....	86
5.2.2	Inoculum source.....	87
5.2.3	DNA diagnostics.....	89

5.2.4	Microscopy .....	89
5.2.5	Trap plants .....	90
5.2.6	Epidemiological models .....	90
5.2.7	Generating model predictions .....	91
5.2.8	Model calibration .....	92
5.3	Results for <i>L. maculans</i> .....	93
5.4	Results for <i>D. pinodes</i> .....	103
5.4.1	Spore trap .....	103
5.4.2	Trap plants .....	107
5.4.3	Comparison with model predictions.....	108
5.4.4	G1 Blackspot Manager model modifications.....	109
5.4.5	G1 Blackspot Manager model calibration.....	113
5.4.6	Comparison with model predictions.....	116
5.5	Results for <i>D. rabiei</i> .....	116
5.6	Discussion.....	117
5.6.1	<i>L. maculans</i> .....	117
5.6.2	<i>D. pinodes</i> .....	119
5.6.3	<i>D. rabiei</i> .....	124
5.6.4	Accuracy of the spore trapping/qPCR methodology.....	124
5.7	Conclusions.....	125
6	Examination of assumptions: Release of <i>L. Maculans</i> ascospores after drought and dispersal of <i>D. pinodes</i> inoculum in dust .....	127
6.1	Introduction.....	127
6.1.1	Release of <i>L. maculans</i> ascospores after drought.....	127
6.1.2	Dispersal of <i>D. pinodes</i> in dust experiment .....	131
6.2	Aims.....	132
6.3	Materials and methods .....	132

6.3.1	Release of <i>L. maculans</i> ascospores after drought.....	132
6.3.2	Dispersal of <i>D. pinodes</i> in dust experiment.....	134
6.4	Results.....	138
6.4.1	Release of <i>L. maculans</i> ascospores after drought.....	138
6.4.2	Dispersal of <i>D. pinodes</i> in dust experiment.....	141
6.5	Discussion.....	143
6.5.1	Release of <i>L. maculans</i> ascospores after drought.....	143
6.5.2	Dispersal of <i>D. pinodes</i> in dust experiment.....	145
6.6	Conclusions.....	147
7	General discussion.....	148
7.1	Development and improvement of the methodology.....	148
7.2	Reliability of the spore trapping system in hot, dry environments.....	150
7.3	Field comparison with other spore quantification methods.....	151
7.4	Potential modifications of the system to facilitate biosecurity surveillance..	153
7.5	Conclusion.....	155
8	References.....	156
9	Appendices.....	171

# 1 ABSTRACT

---

---

Plant disease surveillance is used in biosecurity to enable early detection of incursions of new pathogens, to monitor disease status during eradication programs, and to demonstrate that an area is free of a particular pathogen for trade purposes. Monitoring for plant pathogens currently relies on detection of symptoms by suitably skilled personnel, but the difficulties of distinguishing diseases based on symptoms, and of timing surveillance to coincide with symptom expression, can result in new pathogens not being detected until they are already widespread. The aims of this research were, firstly, to investigate the efficacy of spore trapping combined with quantitative PCR diagnostic assays for biosecurity surveillance and, secondly, to use the system to test predictions of spore release generated by epidemiological models.

Methodology for detection and quantification of airborne spores using spore traps and quantitative PCR assays was optimised and tested on three model pathogens endemic on pulse and oilseed crops in South Australia:

1. *Leptosphaeria maculans*, cause of blackleg (phoma stem canker) of canola (oilseed rape, *Brassica napus*)
2. *Didymella pinodes*, which causes ascochyta blight (blackspot) of field pea (*Pisum sativum*), and
3. *Ascochyta rabiei*, cause of ascochyta blight of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*)

The PCR tests were shown to be both specific and sensitive when applied to spore trap samples, and results were borne out by close correlation with microscopic counts of ascospores on tapes of trapped spores. Poor reproducibility of results was largely addressed by replication of PCR assays and use of an exogenous control to allow variation to be taken into account. Implications of the imprecision remaining in the system are discussed in relation to epidemiological research leading to biosecurity surveillance. Storage of spore trap samples at -20°C was found to be a suitable system for ascospores of *L. maculans*, with no reduction in the yield of DNA after 6 months. The finding that DNA yield from conidia of *L. maculans* was reduced, however, indicated that further research may be needed before applying these findings to other species and/or types of spore. The potential for reduced yield of DNA from spore trap samples collected during periods of extremely hot weather, and the possibility that dust



may affect yields, were identified as factors to be considered in assessing qPCR results. Nevertheless, the system proved to be generally robust in weather conditions prevailing in southern Australia.

The data from 2 years of monitoring for model pathogens were used to calibrate epidemiological models to the field site and to refine the models, as required. The findings that ascospores of *D. pinodes* were released during rain events in the summer led to incorporation of an additional cycle of ascospore formation and release, commencing during the cropping season, into the G1 Blackspot Manager model (model pathogen 1). Furthermore, the detection of *D. pinodes* DNA in spore trap samples on rainless days led to the incorporation of a relative humidity factor into the model. A minor modification was made to the Blackleg Sporacle model to smooth the model prediction curve (model pathogen 2). These changes, and the calibration of the models to the field site, need to be validated in further seasons. The results of monitoring for *D. rabiei* indicated that few or no ascospores were released from chickpea stubble, suggesting that the second mating type required for sexual reproduction, Mat 1-1, either does not occur in South Australia or is present as only a very small proportion of the population (model pathogen 3).

In investigating questions arising from the above experiments, it was found that 7-month-old canola stubble exposed to prolonged dry conditions continued to release ascospores immediately upon wetting, for up to 5 months (i.e. up until early summer, 12 months after harvest), but did not continue beyond the (Australian) early summer into the mid- and late-summer and autumn of the following year. This suggested that infested canola stubble from the season before the last is unlikely to be a significant source of infection for the current year's canola crop emerging in autumn.

DNA of *D. pinodes* was readily detected in dust generated at harvest but application of the dust to field pea seedlings failed to cause blackspot. The implications of these findings in relation to disease spread and biosecurity surveillance are discussed.

The results obtained using the optimised methodology for spore trapping coupled with PCR diagnostics provided a good match with those obtained using trap plants, and with predictions of epidemiological models. Spore trapping coupled with qPCR proved to be a useful tool for epidemiological studies, which can be applied in biosecurity surveillance.

## 2 DECLARATION

---

---

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of another degree or diploma in any University and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no other material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference is given. I give consent to this thesis being made available for photocopying and loan from the University Library.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bernadette Klazina Vogelzang

\_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

### 3 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

---

I wish to thank my supervisors, Eileen Scott, Jenny Davidson, Kathy Ophel-Keller and Moin Salam. I am truly grateful to each of them for their patience, dedication and support whenever needed. In particular I wish to acknowledge;

Eileen for being there with her wealth of experience and her meticulous attention to both the detail and the overall logic of my thesis

Jenny for her moral and practical support, her wealth of knowledge of field crop pathology, and for making herself readily available for discussion and advice about matters big and small

Kathy for her honesty and sound advice and for encouraging me to keep my eye on the bigger picture

Moin for his help with modelling and in particular for dedicating his time during my trip to Western Australia to help me make sense of my field data

For financial, logistical and technical support I wish to acknowledge the Cooperative Research Centre for National Plant Biosecurity (CRCNPB) and the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI).

For financial assistance with travel to attend the International Congress of Plant Pathology in Italy in 2008, and to visit laboratories in France and the UK, I acknowledge the CRCNPB, SARDI, the Australasian Plant Pathology Society (SA branch) and the Farrer Memorial Trust.

I would also like to thank;

The other members of the SARDI Pulse and Oilseed Pathology group; Rohan Kimber, Marzena Kryszynska-Kaczmarek, Chris Wilmshurst and Michelle Russ. It was a lot of fun working in the group and I thank them for all the practical help I received

Members of the SARDI Root Disease Testing Service (RDTS), and associates, for help with molecular work; Alan McKay, Teresa Mammone, Herdina, Jan Gooden, Valeria Torok, Ian Riley, Russell Burns, Danuta Pounsett and Irena Dadei, and in particular a big thank you to Ina Dumistrescu for performing the qPCR assays

Chris Dyson, SARDI, for unstinting statistical advice

Members of Eileen Scott's fungal and bacterial pathology research group and other students who shared the long road with me, for their support, advice and camaraderie, including; Kieren Arthur, Amanda Benger, Steve Coventry, Kerrie Davies, Evelina Facelli, Danièle Giblot-Ducray, Dale Godfrey, Rohan Kimber, Kiong Kueh, Susanne McKay, Sue Pederick, Cathy Todd, Tu Anh Vu Thanh and Erminawati Wuryatmo

Mark Sosnowski, SARDI, for help, pictures and advice on *Leptosphaeria maculans*

Klaus Oldach and Paul Bogacki, SARDI Gene Function Group, for helpful advice and guidance with molecular work, and for making themselves available whenever asked

Jon West and colleagues at Rothamsted Research for valuable advice, training and encouragement, and for hosting my visit in September 2008

Bernard Tivoli, Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique (INRA), Rennes and colleagues for advice on *D. pinodes* ascospore production in culture, and for hosting my visit in 2008

Jean-Noel Aubertot, INRA, Toulouse, France, and colleagues for information on modelling, and for hosting my visit in 2008

Tony Fotheringham for help with field work, and for allowing me to conduct work on his farm during important scoping studies. Thanks also to both him and his wife Sally for cups of tea, hot meals and other refreshments!

Phil Winchester for allowing me to conduct field work on his farm and for his help in conducting the dispersal in dust study

Staff of the SARDI Kingsford and Turretfield Research Stations, particularly Ian Gollan, for assistance in maintaining field sites and supplying rainfall data

Trent Potter, SARDI, for supplying me with canola stubble and keeping my in the loop on matters relating to canola

Larn McMurray, SARDI Field Crop Evaluation Group, for assistance in scoping studies for the dispersal in dust experiment

Barbara Howlett and Anton Cozijnsen, University of Melbourne, for providing *Leptosphaeria maculans* cultures for work on ascospore production in culture

Pip Payne, Department of Agriculture and Food, Western Australia, for advice on quantifying spores from stubble in the wind tunnel

Paul Ingram and staff of SARDI Greenhouse Services

Arthur Buivydas, for assistance with construction of a shelter for the drought experiment

Annette Hutson, Tracey O'Malley and Natasha Lock, SARDI Sustainable Systems, for administrative support

Staff of SARDI Cereal Pathology Group for lending me the vacuum suction device used to remove dust from plastic sheets during the dispersal in dust experiment

Dr Odile Carisse, Horticultural Research and Development Centre, Québec, Canada, for long-distance advice on DNA extraction from spores

Family and friends, in particular;

My husband, Michael, for sharing the journey (including a day in the field as my “techo”), and for believing in me throughout

My sister Ingrid and her husband Derek for moral support and encouragement.

My yoga teachers at Centre Om; Wendy Samek, Ali Eastland, Paula Wafer, Jacqueline Iles, Scott, Angela, Lisa and Loretta and massage therapists Lisa Scarfo and Carly Flinn who between them helped keep me fit and healthy in body, mind and soul.

## 4 ABBREVIATIONS

---

---

¼ PDA	One quarter strength potato dextrose agar
AWS	Automatic weather station
BOM	Australian Bureau of Meteorology
Ct	In quantitative PCR, the cycle threshold at which the increase in fluorescence exceeds the background for the fluorescence-labelled probe
DAFWA	Department of Agriculture and Food Western Australia
fg	Femtogram ( $10^{-15}$ gram)
<i>g</i>	Earth's gravitational acceleration (measure applied in centrifugation)
LCS	Lack of correlation weighted by the standard deviations
MSD	Mean squared deviation
PCR	Polymerase chain reaction
PDA	Potato dextrose agar
pg	Picogram ( $10^{-12}$ gram)
qPCR	Quantitative PCR (real-time PCR)
RDTs	Root Disease Testing Service (SARDI)
RFLP	Restriction fragment length polymorphism
RH	Relative humidity
RMSD	Root mean squared deviation
RO water	Reverse osmosis water
RT-PCR	Reverse-transcriptase PCR
SARDI	South Australian Research and Development Institute
SB	Squared bias
SDSD	Squared difference between standard deviations
SE	Standard error of the mean
SNP	Single nucleotide polymorphism
Syn.	Synonym
UK	United Kingdom
USA	United States of America