Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Mohammad Arif, University of Hawai'i at Manoa, United States

REVIEWED BY Emilio Marco Stefani, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Italy Gamze Boluk-Sari, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Türkiye *CORRESPONDENCE Tanja Dreo

🖾 tanja.dreo@nib.si

RECEIVED 29 June 2023 ACCEPTED 27 December 2023 PUBLISHED 13 February 2024

CITATION

Alič Š, Bačnik K and Dreo T (2024) Retrospective survey of *Dickeya fangzhongdai* using a novel validated real-time PCR assay. *Front. Microbiol.* 14:1249955. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2023.1249955

COPYRIGHT

© 2024 Alič, Bačnik and Dreo. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Retrospective survey of *Dickeya fangzhongdai* using a novel validated real-time PCR assay

Špela Alič, Katarina Bačnik and Tanja Dreo*

National Institute of Biology, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Dickeya fangzhongdai, an aggressive plant pathogen, causes symptoms on a variety of crops and ornamental plants including bleeding canker of Asian pear trees. Historical findings stress the need for a specific detection tool for *D. fangzhongdai* to prevent overlooking the pathogen or assigning it to general *Dickeya* spp. Therefore, a qualitative real-time PCR for specific detection of *D. fangzhongdai* has been developed and validated. The developed assay shows selectivity of 100%, diagnostic sensitivity of 76% and limit of detection with 95% confidence interval in plant matrices ranging from 311 to 2,275 cells/mL of plant extracts. The assay was successfully used in a retrospective survey of selected host plants of relevance to Europe and environmental niches relevant to *D. fangzhongdai*. Samples of potato tubers and plants, plants from the *Malinae* subtribe (apple, pear, quince, and Asian pear tree) and fresh surface water from Slovenia were analyzed. *D. fangzhongdai* was not detected in any plant samples, however, 12% of surface water samples were found to be positive.

KEYWORDS

molecular testing, diagnostics, plant pathogen, real-time PCR, Dickeya, survey, water

1 Introduction

Dickeya fangzhongdai is one of the more recently described species of the pectinolytic genus Dickeya (Tian et al., 2016). This genus groups diverse bacterial isolates that cause soft-rot disease in a variety of plant species, including economically important crops and ornamental plants, and cause wilting, black leg, and soft-rot symptoms (Toth et al., 2011). Reports of soft-rot disease caused by the genus Dickeya have been limited to herbaceous plants, however, D. fangzhongdai was originally described as a causative agent of bleeding canker of Asian pear (Pyrus pyrifolia) in China (Tian et al., 2016). The pathogen description was later expanded to soft rot strains isolated from various plant species, prevalently in monocots (Alič et al., 2017a, 2018), and isolates from surface water (Pritchard et al., 2013a; Alič et al., 2018). Since the description of the species, multiple reports of the pathogen have been made in various host plants (see Table 1), including affecting fruits of additional tree species (Jaffar et al., 2019). The species description has also been expanded to include strains isolated in the last century. Extension of the host range of Dickeya spp. to trees is a relatively new observation, however, it does not appear to be a unique characteristic of D. fangzhongdai, since it was also reported for D. dadantii (Ogoshi et al., 2019; Fujikawa et al., 2020). Both species predominantly affect fruit trees such as pear, apple, peach, and jackfruit trees (Tian et al., 2016; Ogoshi et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2020; Fujikawa et al., 2020; Choi et al., 2021). Based on the literature, the majority of the reported D. fangzhongdai strains and all tree infections have been reported in Asian countries (Table 1). There is little information regarding the economic damage and the extent of bacterial occurrence in host plants outside of Asia. The bacteria were reported as a causative agent of soft rot of orchids in commercial production in Europe (Alič et al., 2017a) and Canada (Zhou et al., 2021), which originated with material from Asia and Europe, and as the causative agent of soft rot of onions in USA (Ma et al., 2020). However, based on the outbreak reports, it has a more significant impact on agriculture in Asia. While data on losses is limited, several authors report outbreaks on various economically important plants such as orchids (Shen et al., 2019; Balamurugan et al., 2020; Wei et al., 2021; Chi et al., 2022), banana (Yang et al., 2022), onion (Tsai et al., 2019; Wei et al., 2021), jack fruit (Jaffar et al., 2019), Asian pear (Tian et al., 2016; Choi et al., 2021), and even staple food crops such as taro (Dobhal et al., 2020; Huang et al., 2021; Hugouvieux-Cotte-Pattat et al., 2022). Based on the reports, it can be surmised that D. fangzhongdai is well established in Asia.

There are currently no data on whether the strains causing bleeding canker can infect and cause soft rot symptoms of herbaceous plants in nature, however, based on inoculation experiments, pear isolates can cause symptoms on potato, tomato, cabbage, and orchids (Chen et al., 2020). The ability to persist in potato plants was also reported for the orchid pathogens D. fangzhongdai S1 and B16 (Alič et al., 2017a). In addition, D. fangzhongdai was isolated from field grown potato tubers in a 2020 study in the Netherlands. The isolates showed high virulence in a field bioassay, capable of causing blackleg to a similar extent as Pectobacterium brasiliense (van der Wolf et al., 2022). As yet, the species is not associated with diseases of food crops outside of Asia. However, the high aggressiveness of some D. fangzhongdai strains (Alič et al., 2017a; Chen et al., 2020; van der Wolf et al., 2022), the general adaptability of the genus Dickeya (Toth et al., 2011) and the plasticity of the species phenotype (Alič et al., 2018) call for caution.

Multiple D. fangzhongdai outbreaks (Tian et al., 2016; Jaffar et al., 2019; Shen et al., 2019; Tsai et al., 2019; Balamurugan et al., 2020; Ma et al., 2020; Choi et al., 2021; Zhou et al., 2021; Chi et al., 2022; Yang et al., 2022) in recent years suggest that the pathogen is present and spreading in Asia and also other continents. It was indicated before that trade plays can promote the spread of the Dickeya disease (Toth et al., 2011). Moreover, there is evidence that ornamental plants may represent potential routes for the introduction of additional Dickeya species and strains with a broad host range (Parkinson et al., 2009; Toth et al., 2011), as observed in D. solani spread to potato. Therefore, close consideration should be given to potential infection routes and the adaptability of these pathogens to other plant hosts and environments. Especially so for pathogens like D. fangzhongdai with a broad host range that predominantly consists of economically important plants with high trade rates (Hinsley et al., 2018). However, only adequately validated diagnostic tools enable timely identification of D. fangzhongdai infected plants to support prevention of its introduction and aid epidemiological investigations. Therefore, there is a great need for the development of specific and reliable diagnostic tools that enable monitoring the presence and spread of D. fangzhongdai. Two detection tests specific to D. fangzhongdai species were previously developed: a real-time PCR test described by Tian et al. (2020) specifically developed and tested on D. fangzhongdai strains from Asian pear trees, and a loop-mediated isothermal amplification (LAMP) test described by DeLude et al. (2022) that was comprehensively validated on taro, onion, and orchid matrices.

The aims of this study were to (i) develop a qualitative realtime PCR for specific detection of *D. fangzhongdai* in various plant matrices (and extend validation to novel matrices including potato and orchids) and ecological niches, (ii) to validate the developed test according to the guidelines of the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) (European and Mediterranean Plant Protection organization, 2021), and compare its performance with the previously developed test described by Tian et al. (2020), and (iii) to use the newly developed test in a retrospective survey to assess the presence of these bacteria in potato plants with soft rot symptoms, and surface water in Slovenia.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Selection of host plants and niches relevant for *D. fangzhongdai* survey

Based on previous experience with the occurrence of softrot and a literature search, an informed selection of potential target plants and environmental niches was made. The literature search was performed using Google Scholar, to find reports of novel *D. fanzhongdai* outbreaks and isolates. Further, the GenBank database (Sayers et al., 2022) was searched for *D. fanzhongdai* nucleotide sequences that have not yet been reported in any publication. Based on the search results, a table (Table 1) was created, summarizing the currently reported *D. fangzhongdai* strains, hosts, geographical origin, and year of isolation.

Average nucleotide identity (ANI) was calculated for all reported *D. fangzhongdai* isolates with publicly available genome sequences to confirm isolate identification using the Genome-based distance matrix calculator (Richter et al., 2016; Sayers et al., 2022).

2.2 Bacterial strains

Bacterial strains used in the study are shown in Table 2. *Dickeya* spp. were grown overnight on Casamino acid-Peptone-Glucose (CPG; Schaad et al., 2001) medium at 28°C. Bacteria of other genera were grown overnight on yeast-extract peptone glucose agar (YPGA; EU, 1993), CPG or nutrient agar (NA; Schaad et al., 2001) medium at 25°C.

2.3 Samples and sample preparation

2.3.1 Analytical specificity

Suspensions of target and non-target bacteria (Table 2) were prepared from overnight cultures in 10 mM phosphate buffer (PB; 1.07 g Na₂HPO₄, 0.4 g NaH₂PO₄ × 2H₂O per liter of water, pH 7.2) to an approximate concentration of 10⁶ cells/mL (Densitometer DEN-1, Biosan). Inclusivity was determined on five *D. fangzhongdai* isolates from three different geographical regions (Asia, America, Europe) and 3 different host niches (herbaceous

<i>D. fangzhongdai</i> strain	GenBank accession ¹	Host ²	Origin ²	Year of isolation	References ³
DSM 101947 (JS5) ^T	CP025003 ⁴	Pyrus pyrifolia	China	2009-2010	Tian et al., 2020
LN1	CP031505 ⁴	Pyrus pyrifolia	China	2009-2010	Tian et al., 2020
QZH3	CP031507 ⁴	Pyrus pyrifolia	China	2009–2010	Tian et al., 2020
ECM-1	MT820458	Pyrus pyrifolia	Korea	2019	Choi et al., 2021
ECM-2	MT820459	Pyrus pyrifolia	Korea	2019	Choi et al., 2021
ECM-3	MT820460	Pyrus pyrifolia	Korea	2019	Choi et al., 2021
B16	CP087226 ⁴	Phalaenopsis sp.	Slovenia	2010	Alič et al., 2017a
S1	JXBO0000000 ⁴	Phalaenopsis sp.	Slovenia	2012	Alič et al., 2017a
FSPAD1	MK394174	Phalaenopsis aphrodite	China	2017	Shen et al., 2019
Kot1	MN400213	Dendrobium nobile	India	2018	Balamurugan et al., 2020
Kot2	MN400214	Dendrobium nobile	India	2018	Balamurugan et al., 2020
Kot5	MN400217	Dendrobium nobile	India	2018	Balamurugan et al., 2020
Ph1	MZ081223	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph2	MZ081209	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph3	MZ081210	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph20	MZ081228	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph21	MZ081208	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph22	MZ081211	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph29	MZ081212	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph16	MZ081224	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph17	MZ081225	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph18	MZ081226	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph19	MZ081227	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph4	MZ081204	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph5	MZ081202	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph6	MZ081213	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph7	MZ081214	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph8	MZ081215	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph9	MZ081216	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph10	MZ081205	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph11	MZ081217	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph12	MZ081200	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph13	MZ081218	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph14	MZ081203	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph15	MZ081201	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph23	MZ081229	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph24	MZ081221	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph25	MZ081198	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph26	MZ081199	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
Ph27	MZ081220	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021

TABLE 1 Reports of *D. fangzhongdai* species in the literature to date. Most of the reported *D. fangzhongdai* strains were isolated in Asia.

(Continued)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

<i>D. fangzhongdai</i> strain	GenBank accession ¹	Host ²	Origin ²	Year of isolation	References ³
Ph28	MZ081222	Phalaenopsis sp.	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
VNO1 (LC.H1)	MW281723	Paphiopedilum concolor	Vietnam	2020	Chi et al., 2022
VNO2 (YB.H6)	MW281724	Paphiopedilum concolor	Vietnam	2020	Chi et al., 2022
VNO3 (LS.HD9)	MW281726	Phalaenopsis amabilis	Vietnam	2020	Chi et al., 2022
VNO4 (TN.PD11)	MW281727	Dendrobium anosmum	Vietnam	2020	Chi et al., 2022
VNO5 (HN.PD16)	MW281728	Dendrobium anosmum	Vietnam	2020	Chi et al., 2022
VNO6 (SL.PD20)	MW281729	Dendrobium anosmum	Vietnam	2020	Chi et al., 2022
VNO7 (QN.PD24)	MW281730	Dendrobium anosmum	Vietnam	2020	Chi et al., 2022
VNO8 (GL.PD26)	MW281731	Dendrobium anosmum	Vietnam	2020	Chi et al., 2022
VNO9 (BP.HD29)	MW281732	Phalaenopsis amabilis	Vietnam	2020	Chi et al., 2022
908C	JADCNJ00000004	Orchid	Canada	2020	Zhou et al., 2021
ZXC1	MN853405	Colocasia esculenta	China	NA	Huang et al., 2021
MPC2	MN853406	Colocasia esculenta	China	NA	Huang et al., 2021
Orc3-1	MT613404	Colocasia esculenta	Taiwan	NA	Huang et al., 2020 (GenBank submission)
Orc6-2	MT613403	Colocasia esculenta	Taiwan	NA	Huang et al., 2020 (GenBank submission)
M1L2b-2	MT613402	Colocasia esculenta	Taiwan	NA	Huang et al., 2020 (GenBank submission)
TH11	MT613401	Colocasia esculenta	Taiwan	NA	Huang et al., 2020 (GenBank submission)
M1L1	MT613400	Colocasia esculenta	Taiwan	NA	Huang et al., 2020 (GenBank submission)
C2	MT613399	Colocasia esculenta	Taiwan	NA	Huang et al., 2020 (GenBank submission)
M1D3-2	MT613398	Colocasia esculenta	Taiwan	NA	Huang et al., 2020 (GenBank submission)
20-1	MT613397	Colocasia esculenta	Taiwan	NA	Huang et al., 2020 (GenBank submission)
M1O1-2	MT613396	Colocasia esculenta	Taiwan	NA	Huang et al., 2020 (GenBank submission)
M1A1-2	MT613395	Colocasia esculenta	Taiwan	NA	Huang et al., 2020 (GenBank submission)
918-9-1	MT613394	Colocasia esculenta	Taiwan	NA	Huang et al., 2020 (GenBank submission)
918-8-2	MT613393	Colocasia esculenta	Taiwan	NA	Huang et al., 2020 (GenBank submission)
918-9-2	MT613392	Colocasia esculenta	Taiwan	NA	Huang et al., 2020 (GenBank submission)

(Continued)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

<i>D. fangzhongdai</i> strain	GenBank accession ¹	Host ²	Origin ²	Year of isolation	References ³
B7-15 16S	MT613391	Colocasia esculenta	Taiwan	NA	Huang et al., 2020 (GenBank submission)
PL145	MN812278	Colocasia esculenta	Hawaii, USA	NA	Dobhal et al., 2020
PL146	MN812277	Colocasia esculenta	Hawaii, USA	NA	Dobhal et al., 2020
NCPPB 2929	MZ611617	Colocasia esculenta	Solomon Islands	NA	Hugouvieux-Cotte-Pattat et al., 2022
NCPPB 3274	CM001979 ⁴	Aglaonema	St. Lucia	1983	Pritchard et al., 2013a
643b	CP092458 ⁴	Aglaonema sp.	USA	2020	Asselin et al., 2022 (GenBank submission)
CAS9	MZ081207	Allium fistulosum	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
IAS4	MZ081219	Allium fistulosum	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
TAS1	MZ081206	Allium fistulosum	Taiwan	NA	Wei et al., 2021
N1	MK256333	Allium fistulosum	Taiwan	2018	Tsai et al., 2019
AP6	CP092460 ⁴	Allium cepa	USA	2014	Ma et al., 2020
GZF2-2	MZ76892	Musa spp.	China	NA	Yang et al., 2022
GZF1-8	OK668082	<i>Musa</i> spp.	China	NA	Yang et al., 2022
ZG5	MW332472	Pinellia ternata	China	China 2020	
MK7	CM001984 ⁴	River water	Scotland (UK)	NA	Pritchard et al., 2013a
ND14b ⁵	CP009460 ⁴	Waterfall	Malaysia	2013	Chan, 2014 (GenBank submission)
M005 ⁵	JSXD00000000 ⁴	Waterfall	Malaysia	2013	Chan and Tan, 2014 (GenBank submission)
M074 ⁵	JRWY00000000 ⁴	Waterfall	Malaysia	2013	Chan and Tan, 2014 (GenBank submission)
GR29	MH429934	Estuarine water	India	2017	Khandeparker and Eswaran, 2018 (GenBank submission)
631d	MH842153	Artocarpus heterophyllus	Malaysia	2018	Jaffar et al., 2019
131	MH842152	Artocarpus heterophyllus	Malaysia	2018	Jaffar et al., 2019
241	MH197139	Artocarpus heterophyllus	Malaysia	2018	Jaffar et al., 2019
YZY-SG-17	MW160421	<i>Belamcandae</i> Rhizoma	China	NA	Liu, 2020 (GenBank submission)
Secpp 1600	CP023484 ⁴	Radish	China	2016	Cheng et al., 2017 (GenBank submission)
VNO2R	MW281725	NA	Vietnam	2020	Chi et al., 2022
Onc5	CP080400 ⁴	NA	China	2021	Pan, 2021 (GenBank submission)
IPO4215	OM809171	Solanum tuberosum	Netherlands	2020	van der Wolf et al., 2022
IPO4216	OM809172	Solanum tuberosum	Netherlands	2020	van der Wolf et al., 2022

¹GenBank accession numbers are provided for genomic (whole genome data) sequences or, if those are not available, accession numbers for 16S ribosomal RNA gene, *dnaX*, *gapA* or other accessible gene are provided.

²Sample description for GenBank submissions were derived from the sample metadata or the submission title if metadata were not available.

³For the GenBank submissions the first author and the year of the submission is stated. Each GenBank submission is clearly noted by the term "GenBank submission" in the brackets.

⁴Genome sequence included in the ANI analysis.

⁵Strains were originally described as other species, but later identified as *D. fangzhongdai* (Alič et al., 2018).

TABLE 2 Table of bacteria isolates used to determine analytical specificity of the developed real-time PCR test.

<table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container>	Isolate	Host plant	Origin and year of isolation
Dickey fungehongialIntermediationDSMS 101947 (ISS)TPyrus pyrifoliaChina. 2009B16Phalaenopsis sp.Scoland, NAMK7Aglaonema sp.Sclucia, 1983S1Phalaenopsis sp.Scoland, NAS1Phalaenopsis sp.Scorena, 2012Dickeya solariIntercomeIntercomeDickeya solariSalanum tuberosumFrance, 2008RNS 08.23.31ASolanum tuberosumBelgium, 2007GBBC 2000Solanum tuberosumBelgium, 2007GBBC 500Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NAGBBC 500Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NADickeya dadantii SuSPs. dieffenbachite LMG 2592Dickeya dadantii suSPs. Alfeffenbachite SuSGSolanum tuberosumDickeya dadantii suSPs. dieffenbachite LMG 2592Dianthus caryophyllusICK, 1956Niko 49Solanum tuberosumISA, 1957Staling 2001Solarum tuberosumFrance, 2004Dickeya dadantii suSPs. dieffenbachite LMG 2592Dianthus caryophyllusICK, 1956Staling 2014Solarum tuberosumICK, 1956Staling 2014Chrysanthemum morifoliumSola, 1961Nickeya datantii suSPs. dieffenbachite LMG 2592Solarum tuberosumICK, 1956Staling 2014Chrysanthemum morifoliumSola, 1961Staling 2014Chrysanthemum morifoliumSola, 1961Nickeya aradisiacaSolarum tuberosum morifoliumSola, 1961Staling 2014Zea maysSolanus, 1961Staling 2014Sol	Target species		
DSMS 101947 (ISS) ^T Pyrus pyrifoliaChina, 2009B16Phalaenopsis sp.Solvenia, 2010MK7Aglaonema sp.St. Lucia, 1983S1Phalaenopsis sp.Solvenia, 2012Dickeya solaniISolvenia, 2012IPO 2222 ^T Solanum tuberosumFrance, 20087044NANAGBBC 2040Solanum tuberosumBelgium, 2007GBBC 500Solanum tuberosumBelgium, 2007GBBC 500Solanum tuberosumBelgium, 2007GBBC 1021Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NAGBBC 1021Solanum tuberosumSolanus, 1001Jbickeya adadntii subsp. dieffenbachiae LMG 25992Jieffenbachia sp.Jbickeya dadantii subsp. dieffenbachiae LMG 25992Jieffenbachia sp.Jbickeya dadantii subsp. and inficioaINANANANS 04.9Solanum tuberosumINA 1956RS3NANARS49Solanum tuberosumISA, 1956StataNANARS04.9Solanum tuberosumISA, 1956Jbickeya dadartii subsp. diofinimINA 1902Jbickeya adaquatiiSolanum tuberosumISA, 1956StataNASolanum tuberosumJbickeya adaquatiiSolanum tuberosumISA, 1956StataNASolanum tuberosumISA, 1956Jbickeya aquatica NCPPBZea mays var. rugosUSA, 1957Jbickeya aquatica NCPPBSilver varerUSA, 1950Jbickeya aquatica NCPPBSilver varerUSA,	Dickeya fangzhongdai		
B16Phalaenopsis sp.Slovenia, 2010MK7Kive waterSochad, NANCPPB 3274Aglaonena sp.St. Lucia, 1983S1Phalaenopsis sp.Sovenia, 2012Dickeya solaniIIncoventa, 2007RNS 08.23.3.1ASolanum tuberosumFrance, 20087044NANAGBBC 2040Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NAGBBC 500Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NAGBBC 1021Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NAGBBC 1021Solanum tuberosumSolanus, 100Joickeya dadantii subsp. alefferbachia ELMG 25992Diefferbachia sp.USA, 1957Dickeya dadantii subsp. alefferbachia ELMG 25992NANANS 04.9Solanum tuberosumITA ence, 2004Jukeya dadantii subsp. alefferbachia ELMG 25992NANANS 04.9Solanum tuberosumIta 1965NS 04.9Solanum tuberosumIta 1965NS 04.9Solanum tuberosumSta, 1956RS 04.9Solanum tuberosumIta 1962Dickeya dadantii subsp. alefferbachia ELMGIta 1962NS 04.9Solanum tuberosumIta 1962Dickeya adadantiiSolanum tuberosumIta 1962Dickeya adadantiiSolanum tuberosumIta 1962Dickeya adadantiiSolanum tuberosumIta 1962Dickeya adadantiiSolanum tuberosumIta 1962Dickeya adadatiiSolanum tuberosumIta 1962Dickeya adadatiiSolanum tuberosumIta 1962Dickeya	DSMS 101947 (JS5) ^T	Pyrus pyrifolia	China, 2009
NK7River waterScoland, NANCPPB 3274Aglaonema sp.St. Lucia, 1983S1bhalaenopsis sp.Stovenia, 2012Dickeya solaniIInternet set set set set set set set set set s	B16	Phalaenopsis sp.	Slovenia, 2010
NCPPB 3274Aglaonema sp.St. Lucia, 1983S1Phalaenopsis sp.Slovenia, 2012Dickeya solaniIIncome serve	MK7	River water	Scotland, NA
S1Phalaenopsis sp.Slovenia, 2012Norkeya solaniIDickeya solaniSolanum tuberosumThe Netherlands, 2007IPO 2222 TSolanum tuberosumFrance, 2008RNS 08.23.3.1ASolanum tuberosumBelgium, 20077044NANAGBBC 2040Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NAGBBC 500Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NAGBBC 1021Solanum capitatumBelgium, NAGBBC 2040Solanum tuberosumSolanum tuberosumDickeya dadantii NCPPBPelargonium capitatuUX, 1957Bidfenbachiae LMGJoanthus caryophyllusUX, 1956Sta3NANARNS 04.9Solanum tuberosumFrance, 2004Dickeya duantinemimorifoliumISA, 1956NS 04.9Solanum tuberosumUSA, 1956Dickeya chrysanthemiUSA, 1956Dickeya chrysanthemiUSA, 1957Dickeya aparadisiacaNusa paradisiacaDickeya aparadisiacaSolanum tuberosumDickeya aquatia NCPPBSolanum tuberosumPectobacteriumSolanum tuberosumPectobacteriumSolanum tuberosumCardovoron myey.Solanum tuberosumCardovoron myey.Solanum tuberosumPectobacteriumSolanum tuberosumPectoba	NCPPB 3274	Aglaonema sp.	St. Lucia, 1983
Non-target speciesDickeya solaniIIPO 2222 ^T Solanum tuberosumThe Netherlands, 2007RNS 08.23.3.1ASolanum tuberosumFrance, 20087044NANAGBBC 2040Solanum tuberosumBelgium, 2007GBBC 500Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NAGBBC 1021Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NADickeya dadantii NCPPBPelargonium capitatunConoro Islands, 1961988Dickeya dadantii subsp. dieffenbachiae LMGJieffenbachia sp.USA, 195710keya dianthicolaJieffenbachia sp.USA, 1957823NANANARNS 04.9Solanum tuberosumFrance, 200410keya dianthicolaII10keya dianthicolaNANA823NANARNS 04.9Solanum tuberosumUSA, 195610keya caryesChrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 195610keya 20a0 ^T Chrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 195610keya 20a0KaryesUSA, 195610keya 20a1Solanum tuberosumUSA, 195610keya 20a2Mas paradisiacaColombia, 197310keya 20a5Musa paradisiacaSolanum tuberosum10keya aparadisiacaSolanum tuberosumSolanus, 197310keya aparadisiacaSolanum tuberosumSolanus, 197310keya aparadisiacaSolanum tuberosumSolanus, 197310keya aparadisiacaSolanum tuberosumSolanus, 197310keya aparadisiacaSolanum tuberosumSolanus, 1984	S1	Phalaenopsis sp.	Slovenia, 2012
Dickeya solaniImage: solanum tuberosumThe Netherlands, 2007IPO 2222TSolanum tuberosumFrance, 2008RNS 08.23.3.1ASolanum tuberosumFrance, 20087044NANAGBBC 2040Solanum tuberosumBelgium, 2007GBBC 500Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NAGBBC 1021Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NAGBBC 1021Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NADickeya dadantii NCPPB 898Pelargonium capitatum prickeya dadantii subsp. dieffenbachiae LMG 25992Comoro Islands, 1961Dickeya dianthicolaDieffenbachia sp.USA, 1957LMG 2485TDianthus caryophyllusUK, 19568233NANARNS 04.9Solanum tuberosum morifoliumSola, 1956Dickeya dirysanthemiImage: solanum tuberosum morifoliumUSA, 1956NCPPB 402Chrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956Dickeya aquatica NCPPB A02Zea maysUSA, 1970Dickeya aquatica NCPPB A054Solanum tuberosumUSA, 1970Dickeya aquatica NCPPB A1589Solanum tuberosumNaLMG 2505TZea maysUK, 2008Dickeya aquatica NCPPB A1589Solanum tuberosumNew Zealand, 2005Pectobacterium carotovrum subsp. carotovrum subsp. carotovrum subsp. carotovrum subsp. carotovrum NCPPB B1848Solanum tuberosumNa>	Non-target species		
IPO 2222 ^T Solanum tuberosumThe Netherlands, 2007RNS 08.23.3.1ASolanum tuberosumFrance, 20087044NANAGBBC 2040Solanum tuberosumBelgium, 2007GBBC 500Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NAGBBC 1021Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NAGBBC 1021Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NADickeya dadantii NCPPB 898Pelargonium capitatumComoro Islands, 1961Dickeya dadantii subsp. dieffenbachiae LMG 25992Dieffenbachia sp.USA, 1957Dickeya dianthicolaDianthus caryophyllusUK, 1956RNS 04.9Solanum tuberosumFrance, 2004RNS 04.9Solanum tuberosumFrance, 2004Dickeya dianthicolaIILMG 2485 ^T Solanum tuberosumUSA, 1956RNS 04.9Chrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956Dickeya chrysanthemuUSA, 1956INCPPB 402Chrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956Dickeya aquatica NCPPB LMG 2542Solanum tuberosumUSA, 1970Dickeya aquatica NCPPB Sta9River waterUK, 2008Pectobacterium varailiense PRI 3710Solanum tuberosumNaPectobacterium atrosepticum LMG 23867Solanum tuberosumINK, 1957Pectobacterium scarotovorum NCPPB B488Solanum tuberosumINK, 1957Pectobacterium carotovorum subsp. carotovorum NCPPB B488Solanum tuberosumINK, 1956Pectobacterium carotovorum NCPPB B488Solanum tuberosumINK, 1956 <td>Dickeya solani</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Dickeya solani		
NNS 08.23.3.1ASolanum tuberosumFrance, 20087044NANAGBBC 2040Solanum tuberosumBelgium, 2007GBBC 500Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NAGBBC 1021Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NAGBBC 1021Solanum tuberosumComoro Islands, 1961Dickeya dadantii NCPPB 898Pelargonium capitatum pelargonium capitatumComoro Islands, 1961Dickeya dadantii subsp. dieffenbachiae LMG 25992Dieffenbachia sp.USA, 1957Dickeya dianthicolaLMG 2485TDianthus caryophyllusUK, 19568823NANARNS 04.9Solanum tuberosumFrance, 2004Dickeya chrysanthemiLMG 2804TChrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956NCPPB 402Chrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956Dickeya zeaeLMG 2497Zea mays var. rugosaUSA, NALMG 2505TZea maysUSA, 1970Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589River waterColombia, 1973LMG 2542Solanum tuberosum Arotovorum yus brasiliense PRI 3710Solanum tuberosum solanum tuberosumPectobacterium carotovorum NCPPB 848Solanum tuberosumLW, 1957Pectobacterium carotovorum NCPPB 8488Solanum tuberosumLW, 1957	IPO 2222 ^T	Solanum tuberosum	The Netherlands, 2007
7044NANAGBBC 2040Solanum tuberosumBelgium, 2007GBBC 500Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NAGBBC 1021Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NADickeya dadantii NCPPB 898Pelargonium capitatum solanut isubsp. dieffenbachiae LMG 25992Comoro Islands, 1961Dickeya dianthicolaDieffenbachia sp.USA, 1957LMG 2485TDianthus caryophyllusUK, 19568823NANARNS 04.9Solanum tuberosumFrance, 2004Dickeya chrysanthemiIILMG 2804TChrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956NCPPB 402Chrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956Dickeya zeaeIILMG 2505TZea mays var. rugosaUSA, 1970Dickeya quatica NCPPB 4589Solanum tuberosumNaPectobacterium carotovorum pv. brasiliense PRI 3710Solanum tuberosumNew Zealand, 2005Pectobacterium carotovorum subsp. carotovorum NCPPB 1848Solanum tuberosumNew Zealand, 2005	RNS 08.23.3.1A	Solanum tuberosum	France, 2008
GBBC 2040Solanum tuberosumBelgium, 2007GBBC 500Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NAGBBC 1021Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NADickeya dadantii NCPPB 898Pelargonium capitatum solanus is ubsp. dieffenbachiae LMG 25992Comoro Islands, 1961Dickeya dianthicolaDieffenbachia sp.USA, 1957LMG 2485TDianthus caryophyllusUK, 19568823NANARNS 04.9Solanum tuberosumFrance, 2004Dickeya chrysanthemiTLMG 2804TChrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956NCPPB 402Chrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956Dickeya paradisiaca LMG 2497Zea mays var. rugosaUSA, 1970Dickeya paradisiaca LMG 2505TSolanum tuberosumClonbia, 1973Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589Solanum tuberosumNaPectobacterium carotovorum pv. brasiliense PRI 3710Solanum tuberosum golanum tuberosumNew Zealand, 2005Pectobacterium carotovorum NCPPB LMSSolanum tuberosum sp. carotovorum NCPPB LS489Solanum tuberosum sp. carotovorum NCPPB LS489Solanum tuberosum sp. carotovorum NCPPB	7044	NA	NA
GBBC 500Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NAGBBC 1021Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NADickeya dadantii NCPPB 898Pelargonium capitatum gelfenbachiae sp.Comoro Islands, 1961Dickeya dadantii subsp. dieffenbachiae LMG 25992Dieffenbachia sp.USA, 1957Dickeya dianthicolaDianthus caryophyllusUK, 1956LMG 2485TDianthus caryophyllusUK, 19568823NANARNS 04.9Solanum tuberosumFrance, 2004Dickeya chrysanthemiChrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956NCPPB 402Chrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956Dickeya zeaeChrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1970Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589Zea maysUSA, 1970Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589Solanum tuberosumNew Zealand, 2005Dickeya aquatica NCPPB tasseSolanum tuberosum morifoliumNew Zealand, 2005Pectobacterium carotovorum pv. brasiliense PRI 3710Solanum tuberosum sp. Carotovorum NCPPB ka88NAPectobacterium carotovorum NCPPB Lia48Solanum tuberosum sp. Carotovorum NCPPB ka88Solanum tuberosum sp. carotovorum NCPPB ka88Solanum tuberosum sp. carotovorum NCPPB ka88	GBBC 2040	Solanum tuberosum	Belgium, 2007
GBBC 1021Solanum tuberosumBelgium, NADickeya dadantii NCPPB 898Pelargonium capitatum spintieComoro Islands, 1961898Dickeya dadantii subsp. dieffenbachiae LMG 25992Dickeya dianthicolaUSA, 1957Dickeya dianthicolaIILMG 2485 ^T Dianthus caryophyllusUK, 19568823NANARNS 04.9Solanum tuberosumFrance, 2004Dickeya chrysanthemiIILMG 2804 ^T Chrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956NCPPB 402Chrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956Dickeya zeaeIILMG 2497Zea mays var. rugosaUSA, NALMG 2505 ^T Zea maysUSA, 1970Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589River waterUK, 2008Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589Solanum tuberosum solanum tuberosumNew Zealand, 2005Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589Solanum tuberosum solanum tuberosumNew Zealand, 2005Pectobacterium tarsoepticum LMG 2386 ^T Solanum tuberosum solanum tuberosum sansiliense PRI 3710Solanum tuberosum solanum tuberosum arrosopticum LMG 2386 ^T Pectobacterium carotovorum subsp. carotovorum NCPPB 1848Solanum tuberosumUK, 1957	GBBC 500	Solanum tuberosum	Belgium, NA
Dickeya dadantii NCPPB 898Pelargonium capitatumComoro Islands, 1961B88Dickeya dadantii subsp. dieffenbachiae LMG 25992Dieffenbachia sp.USA, 1957Dickeya dianthicolaIILMG 2485 ^T Dianthus caryophyllusUK, 19568823NANARNS 04.9Solanum tuberosumFrance, 2004Dickeya chrysanthemiIILMG 2804 ^T Chrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956NCPPB 402Chrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956Dickeya zeaeIILMG 2497Zea mays var. rugosaUSA, 1970Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589River waterUSA, 1970Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589Solanum tuberosumNAPectobacterium carotovorum pv. brasiliense PRI 3710Solanum tuberosumNew Zealand, 2005Pectobacterium carotovorum NCPPB 1848Solanum tuberosumUK, 1957	GBBC 1021	Solanum tuberosum	Belgium, NA
Dickeya dadantii subsp. dieffenbachiae LMG 25992Dieffenbachia sp.USA, 1957Dickeya dianthicolaLMG 2485TDianthus caryophyllusUK, 19568823NANARNS 04.9Solanum tuberosumFrance, 2004Dickeya chrysanthemiLMG 2804TChrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956NCPPB 402Chrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956Dickeya zeaeLMG 2505TZea mays var. rugosaUSA, 1970Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589River waterUK, 2008Pectobacterium carotovorum pv. brasiliense PRI 3710Solanum tuberosum Solanum tuberosum LMG 2386TNAPectobacterium carotovorum NCPPB 488Solanum tuberosum carotovorum NCPPB 4889NAPectobacterium carotovorum NCPPB 4889Solanum tuberosum Solanum tuberosum LMG 2386TUK, 1957Pectobacterium carotovorum NCPPB 4889Solanum tuberosum Solanum tuberosum AnaNAPectobacterium carotovorum NCPPB 4848Solanum tuberosum Solanum tuberosum AnaUK, 1957Pectobacterium carotovorum NCPPB 4848Solanum tuberosum Solanum tuberosum AnaSolanum tuberosum Solanum t	Dickeya dadantii NCPPB 898	Pelargonium capitatum	Comoro Islands, 1961
Dickeya dianthicolaImage: Case of the second se	Dickeya dadantii subsp. dieffenbachiae LMG 25992	Dieffenbachia sp.	USA, 1957
LMG 2485TDianthus caryophyllusUK, 19568823NANARNS 04.9Solanum tuberosumFrance, 2004Dickeya chrysanthemiLMG 2804TChrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956NCPPB 402Chrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956Dickeya zeaeLMG 2497Zea mays var. rugosaUSA, 1970Dickeya paradisiaca LMG 2505TMusa paradisiaca River waterColombia, 1973Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589River waterUK, 2008Pectobacterium carotovorum pv. brasiliense PRI 3710Solanum tuberosum Solanum tuberosumNAPectobacterium atrosepticum LMG 2386TSolanum tuberosum 	Dickeya dianthicola		
8823NANARNS 04.9Solanum tuberosumFrance, 2004Dickeya chrysanthemiLMG 2804 ^T Chrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956NCPPB 402Chrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956Dickeya zeaeLMG 2497Zea mays var. rugosaUSA, 1970LMG 2505 ^T Zea maysUSA, 1970Dickeya paradisiaca LMG 2542Musa paradisiaca River waterColombia, 1973Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589River waterUK, 2008Pectobacterium wasabiae LMG 25890Solanum tuberosum Solanum tuberosumNAPectobacterium carotovorum pv. brasiliense PRI 3710Solanum tuberosum Cattleya sp.UK, 1957Pectobacterium carotovorum NCPPB 1848Cattleya sp.Brazil, 1966	LMG 2485 ^T	Dianthus caryophyllus	UK, 1956
RNS 04.9Solanum tuberosumFrance, 2004Dickeya chrysanthemiLMG 2804TChrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956NCPPB 402Chrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956Dickeya zeaeLMG 2497Zea mays var. rugosaUSA, 1970LMG 2505TZea maysUSA, 1970Dickeya paradisiaca LMG 2542Musa paradisiaca River waterColombia, 1973Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589River waterUK, 2008Pectobacterium carotovorum pv. brasiliense PRI 3710Solanum tuberosum Solanum tuberosum LMG 2386TNAPectobacterium carotovorum NCPPB 1848Solanum tuberosum Solanum tuberosumUK, 1957	8823	NA	NA
Dickeya chrysanthemiChrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956LMG 2804TChrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956NCPPB 402Chrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956Dickeya zeaeIILMG 2497Zea mays var. rugosaUSA, NALMG 2505TZea maysUSA, 1970Dickeya paradisiaca LMG 2542Musa paradisiaca River waterColombia, 1973Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589River waterUK, 2008Pectobacterium wasabiae LMG 25890Solanum tuberosum NANAPectobacterium carotovorum pv. brasiliense PRI 3710Solanum tuberosum LMG 2386TUK, 1957Pectobacterium carotovorum NCPPB 1848Cattleya sp.Brazil, 1966	RNS 04.9	Solanum tuberosum	France, 2004
LMG 2804TChrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956NCPPB 402Chrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956Dickeya zeaeLMG 2497Zea mays var. rugosaUSA, NALMG 2505TZea maysUSA, 1970Dickeya paradisiaca LMG 2542Musa paradisiacaColombia, 1973Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589River waterUK, 2008Pectobacterium wasabiae LMG 25890Solanum tuberosum NANAPectobacterium carotovorum pv. brasiliense PRI 3710Solanum tuberosum Solanum tuberosum LMG 2386TUK, 1957Pectobacterium carotovorum NCPPB 1848Cattleya sp.Brazil, 1966	Dickeya chrysanthemi		
NCPPB 402Chrysanthemum morifoliumUSA, 1956Dickeya zeaeLMG 2497Zea mays var. rugosaUSA, NALMG 2505TZea maysUSA, 1970Dickeya paradisiaca LMG 2542Musa paradisiaca River waterColombia, 1973Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589River waterUK, 2008Pectobacterium wasabiae LMG 25890Solanum tuberosum New Zealand, 2005Pectobacterium carotovorum pv. brasiliense PRI 3710NANAPectobacterium atrosepticum LMG 2386TSolanum tuberosum Cattleya sp. Cattleya sp.Brazil, 1966Petabacterium carotovorum NCPPB 1848Cattleya sp.Brazil, 1966	LMG 2804 ^T	Chrysanthemum morifolium	USA, 1956
Dickeya zeaeImage: Cattleya sp.Dickeya zeaeZea mays var. rugosaUSA, NALMG 2505TZea maysUSA, 1970Dickeya paradisiaca LMG 2542Musa paradisiaca River waterColombia, 1973Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589River waterUK, 2008Pectobacterium wasabiae 	NCPPB 402	Chrysanthemum morifolium	USA, 1956
LMG 2497Zea mays var. rugosaUSA, NALMG 2505TZea maysUSA, 1970Dickeya paradisiaca LMG 2542Musa paradisiaca River waterColombia, 1973Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589River waterUK, 2008Pectobacterium wasabiae 	Dickeya zeae		
LMG 2505TZea maysUSA, 1970Dickeya paradisiaca LMG 2542Musa paradisiaca River waterColombia, 1973Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589River waterUK, 2008Pectobacterium wasabiae LMG 25890Solanum tuberosum New Zealand, 2005New Zealand, 2005Pectobacterium carotovorum pv. brasiliense PRI 3710NANAPectobacterium atrosepticum LMG 2386TSolanum tuberosum LMG 2589.UK, 1957Pectobacterium atrosepticum LMG 2386TCattleya sp.Brazil, 1966Pata LASSolanum NCPPB LASSolanum NCPPB LASBrazil, 1966	LMG 2497	Zea mays var. rugosa	USA, NA
Dickeya paradisiaca LMG 2542Musa paradisiacaColombia, 1973Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589River waterUK, 2008Pectobacterium wasabiae LMG 25890Solanum tuberosum New Zealand, 2005Pectobacterium carotovorum pv. brasiliense PRI 3710NANAPectobacterium atrosepticum LMG 2386TSolanum tuberosum Solanum tuberosumUK, 1957Pectobacterium atrosepticum LMG 2386TCattleya sp.Brazil, 1966Petabacterium carotovorum NCPPB 1848Cattleya sp.Brazil, 1966	LMG 2505 ^T	Zea mays	USA, 1970
Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589River waterUK, 2008Pectobacterium wasabiae LMG 25890Solanum tuberosumNew Zealand, 2005Pectobacterium carotovorum pv. brasiliense PRI 3710NANAPectobacterium atrosepticum LMG 2386TSolanum tuberosumUK, 1957Pectobacterium atrosepticum LMG 2386TCattleya sp.Brazil, 1966Pectobacterium satovorum subsp. carotovorum NCPPB 1848Cattleya sp.Brazil, 1966	Dickeya paradisiaca LMG 2542	Musa paradisiaca	Colombia, 1973
Pectobacterium wasabiae LMG 25890Solanum tuberosumNew Zealand, 2005Pectobacterium carotovorum pv. brasiliense PRI 3710NANAPectobacterium 	Dickeya aquatica NCPPB 4589	River water	UK, 2008
Pectobacterium carotovorum pv. brasiliense PRI 3710NANAPectobacterium atrosepticum LMG 2386TSolanum tuberosumUK, 1957Pectobacterium 	Pectobacterium wasabiae LMG 25890	Solanum tuberosum	New Zealand, 2005
Pectobacterium atrosepticum LMG 2386TSolanum tuberosumUK, 1957Pectobacterium carotovorum subsp. carotovorum NCPPB 	Pectobacterium carotovorum pv. brasiliense PRI 3710	NA	NA
Pectobacterium Cattleya sp. Brazil, 1966 carotovorum subsp. carotovorum NCPPB 1848	Pectobacterium atrosepticum LMG 2386 ^T	Solanum tuberosum	UK, 1957
	Pectobacterium carotovorum subsp. carotovorum NCPPB 1848	Cattileya sp.	Brazil, 1966

TABLE 2 (Continued)

lsolate	Host plant	Origin and year of isolation
Clavibacter michiganensis subsp. sepedonicus NCPPB 4053	Solanum tuberosum	Sweden, 1994
Pseudomonas sp. 183/03-2	Pyrus communis	Slovenia, 2003
Escherichia coli GSPB 48	NA	NA
Brenneria alni CFBP 3923	Alnus cordata	Italy, 1990
Brenneria quercina NCPPB 1852	Quercus sp.	USA, 1966
Proteus vulgaris	environmental bacteria	NA
Pantoea ananatis 940/18-11	Zea mays	Slovenia, 2011
Pantoea agglomerans 363/18-2	Zea mays	Slovenia, 2018
Erwinia amylovora 106/13-1	Pyrus sp.	Slovenia, 41395
Serratia liquefaciens 103/14-8	Lycopersicon esculentum	Slovenia, 41760
Enterobacter sp. NCCPB 4168	NA	NA, 2001
Burkholderia gladioli pv. gladioli NCPPB 1891	Gladiolus sp.	NA, 1966
Acidovorax avenae subsp. cattleyae NCPPB 4196	Phalaenopsis sp.	Brazil, 2000
Paraburkholderia caryophylli NCCPB 353	NA	USA, 1954
Bacillus polymyxa NCCPB 4162	Solanum tuberosum	France, 2001
Ralstonia solanacearum 12/19-3	Solanum tuberosum	Slovenia, 2019

plants, trees, water). Exclusivity was determined on other *Dickeya* spp. (17 isolates), selected bacteria from *Enterobacteriaceae* family (15 strains), and bacteria colonizing the same host plant niches (5 isolates) as the target bacteria (Table 2).

2.3.2 Analytical sensitivity

A D. fangzhongdai B16 and JS5T bacterial suspension with concentration of 10⁷ cells/mL was prepared in a 10 mM PB with 30% (V/V) glycerol. DNA was extracted and standard curves were prepared by 10-fold dilutions in TE buffer (Sigma-Aldrich, Merck, Germany) with the addition of salmon sperm DNA (25 μ g/mL).

2.3.3 Diagnostic sensitivity

Plant extracts were prepared from relevant asymptomatic plants, namely orchids (genus *Phalaenopsis*), potato (*Solanum tuberosum*, cultivar Carrera), and apple (*Malus domestica*). For the preparation of *Phalaenopsis* extracts, leaf material was collected in July 2019 and surface sterilized with 70% ethanol. One gram of leaf tissue was macerated in 3.5 mL of sterile 10 mM phosphate buffered saline (10 mM PBS; 1.08 g Na₂HPO₄, 0.4 g NaH₂PO₄ × 2H₂O, 8 g NaCl, 1 L distilled water, pH 7.2). The supernatant was

10.3389/fmicb.2023.1249955

separated from the plant tissue by pipetting. A field sample of an asymptomatic potato plant, cultivar Carrera, was collected in July 2016. The surface of the sampled plant stems was cleaned and surface sterilized with 70% ethanol. The asymptomatic potato stem was cut into smaller pieces (approximately 2 cm size) and covered with sterile 10 mM PBS buffer, vortexed, and incubated for several minutes (up to 20 min) at room temperature. The supernatant was separated from the plant tissue by pipetting. An apple extract was prepared from Malus domestica asymptomatic plant material collected in July 2018. The sample material consisted of twigs that were surface sterilized with 70% ethanol. Vascular tissue was scraped from sampled twigs and covered with sterile 10 mM PBS containing 0.1% Tween 20, vortexed, and incubated with shaking for 90 min at room temperature. The supernatant was then separated from the plant tissue and centrifuged at 1,500 g for 10 min, transferred to a new tube and centrifuged at 7,000 g for 20 min. The pellets were suspended in 2 mL of 10 mM PBS.

The health status of plant extracts was confirmed with realtime PCR analysis using generic *Dickeya* spp. assay (Pritchard et al., 2013b).

Surface water was sampled from the Pivka River in a western part of Slovenia in August 2017. Temperature and pH of the water at the time of sampling were 22°C and 7, respectively. One liter of water was aliquoted to 250 mL and centrifuged for 20 min at 10,000 g at 4–10°C. Pellets were resuspended in 1 mL of 10 mM PB buffer. The absence of *Dickeya* spp. in the surface water extract was confirmed by real-time PCR analysis using generic *Dickeya* spp. assay (Pritchard et al., 2013b).

Standard curves of *Dickeya fangzhongdai* B16 in plant extracts and surface water extract were prepared by mixing bacterial suspensions with aliquots of extracts to final concentrations ranging from 10^7 to 10^1 cells/mL of plant or surface water extract.

2.3.4 Retrospective survey

A retrospective survey was performed on the collection of DNA extracts from sample material selected as described in Section "2.1 Selection of host plants and niches relevant for *D. fangzhongdai* survey." Potato samples, *Malinae* samples, and surface water samples previously obtained in diagnostic activity in the years 2017–2021 were included in the survey. Altogether, 278 plant samples were analyzed, consisting of 130 potato samples, 148 *Malinae* samples and 53 surface water samples.

2.3.4.1 Samples of potato plants and tubers

Samples of potato plants and tubers with soft rot symptoms were analyzed. The surface of the sampled plants was cleaned, and surface sterilized with 70% ethanol. Symptomatic material was covered with sterile 10 mM PBS buffer, vortexed, and incubated for several minutes (up to 20 min) at room temperature. The supernatant was separated from plant tissue. DNA was extracted as described in Section "2.3 Samples and sample preparation." Extracted DNA was stored below -15° C until analysis. Potato samples comprised of potato plants with soft rot symptoms (119 samples) and potato tubers with soft rot (11 samples).

2.3.4.2 Malinae samples

Tree samples (from the *Malinae* subtribe) were surface sterilized with 70% ethanol. Vascular tissue was scraped from sampled twigs and covered with sterile 10 mM PBS containing 0.1% Tween 20, vortexed, and incubated for 90 min at room temperature. The supernatant was then separated from the plant tissue and centrifuged at 1,500 g for 10 min, transferred to a new tube and centrifuged at 7,000 g for 20 min. The pellets were suspended in 2 mL of 10 mM PBS. DNA was extracted as described in Section "2.4 DNA extraction and purification." Extracted DNA was stored below -15° C until analysis. The *Malinae* samples were included apple samples (84 samples), pear samples (8 samples) and Asian pear sample (1 sample) with fire blight symptoms, and mixed *Malinae* samples (55 samples) sampled for latent testing to fire blight.

2.3.4.3 Surface water samples

Fifty diagnostic samples of surface water were collected from different freshwater. All samples were collected in summer, and the temperature and pH of the water at the sampling site were recorded (**Supplementary Table 1**). Samples were analyzed as follows: one liter of water was aliquoted to 250 mL and centrifuged for 20 min at 10,000 g at 4–10°C. Pellets were resuspended in collectively 1 mL of 10 mM PB buffer. DNA was extracted as described in Section "2.3 Samples and sample preparation." Extracted DNA was stored below -15° C until analysis.

2.4 DNA extraction and purification

DNA was extracted from 100 μ L aliquots of pure bacterial suspensions, spiked plant extracts, spiked surface water, field plant samples, and surface water samples using magnetic beads-based DNA extraction on QuickPick SML Plant DNA kits (BioNobile, Finland), according to Pirc et al. (2009), with the minor modification of using 440 μ L lysate in the downstream purification.

DNA used for analytical specificity was extracted from $500 \ \mu L$ of pure bacterial suspension in PB buffer using heat lysis. Samples were incubated at 95°C for 10 min in a thermoblock, and then immediately put on ice for 3 min. After centrifugation for 1 min at 6,000 rpm supernatant was collected.

2.5 Real-time PCR assay design

A *D. fangzhongdai* specific real-time PCR assay was designed according to Alič et al. (2022). Unique diagnostic markers of *D. fangzhongdai* strains were identified by RUCS (Thomsen et al., 2017). A positive dataset comprised of 10 *D. fangzhongdai* genomic sequences was compared to a negative dataset of 39 *Dickeya* spp. genomic sequences, including *D. solani*, *D. dadantii*, *D. dianthicola*, *D. chrysanthemi*, *D. undicola*, *D. aquatica*, *D. zeae*, and *D. paradisiaca* (Supplementary Table 2). The complete genome sequence of *D. fangzhongdai* ND14b was selected as the positive reference genome.

Specificity of the identified unique sequences was confirmed by Blastn (Altschul et al., 1990) analysis against the whole GenBank database. Altogether, nine suitable unique sequences of sufficient length (above 100 bp) were identified. Primers and hydrolysis probes for real-time PCR were designed using Primer Express version 2.0 (Applied Biosystems). The quality of the designed assays was evaluated *in silico* by OligoAnalyzer Tool (IDT) and Blastn (Altschul et al., 1990), and experimentally.

TABLE 3 Primers and probes used in real-time PCR assays designed and evaluated in this study.

Assay	Name	Sequence (5'-3')	Amplicon length
Df_tr	Df_tr_F	GGCCGCGTCTAT GTTCTCA	76 bp
	Df_tr_P	FAM- ACTGCATGGCGTCAATAT TTCCCCC-BHQ1	
	Df_tr_R	ACATACATTTGACACCGT CATATTTGT	

The optimal assay, assay Df_tr (Table 3; Supplementary Table 3), designed against a transcriptional regulator gene (Dickeya_fangzhongdai_ND14b.0976; GenBank locus tag LH89_04605), was selected for validation (Alič et al., 2019). Assays with poor performance or those targeting hypothetical genes or genes of extrachromosomal origin were omitted from further analysis.

2.6 Setup of the real-time PCR experiment

Real-time PCR reactions were performed on a QuantStudio 7 (Applied Biosystems, Thermo Fisher) using universal cycling conditions (2 min at 50°C, 10 min at 95°C, followed by 45 cycles of 15 s at 95°C and 1 min at 60°C, with 1.6°C/s ramping speed) according to the PCR Master Mix manufacturer's recommendations. The reaction volume of 10 μ L contained, in final concentrations: 1x TaqManTM Universal PCR Master Mix (Applied Biosystems, Thermo Fisher), 900 nM primers (Eurofins), 200 nM probe (Eurofins), and 2 μ L DNA. The QuantStudioTM real-time PCR Software 1.3 and 1.6 (Applied Biosystems, Thermo Fisher Scientific) were used for fluorescence acquisition and calculation of the threshold cycles (Cq). The baseline was set automatically, and the fluorescence threshold was set manually to intersect with the linear part of the amplification curves of all real-time PCR assays.

Analysis parameters in Df_tr validation procedure included the automatic baseline setting, and the fluorescence threshold set manually to 0.05.

Amplification of the plant endogenous sequence COX was used as an extraction and amplification control [COX; Weller et al. (2000), forward primer and probe and Mumford et al. (2004), reverse primer)]. real-time PCR assays for non-specific detection of *Dickeya* spp., assay ECH (Pritchard et al., 2013b) was used as a control for presence of *Dickeya* spp. The standard curves prepared by mixing target bacteria and plant extracts were used to determine analytical sensitivity of the novel assay and the real-time assay described by Tian et al. (2020). Fluorescence thresholds for those assays were manually set to 0.1, 0.1, and 0.06 for COX, ECH, and Df_tr assay, respectively. A reaction was interpreted as positive if it produced an amplification curve and a fluorescence signal that exceeded the threshold.

Positive amplification controls and negative amplification controls were included in every real-time PCR experiment for each assay.

2.7 Validation of *D. fangzhongdai* specific real-time PCR assays

2.7.1 Analytical specificity and selectivity

The analytical specificity of the real-time PCR assay was tested *in silico* by Blastn (Altschul et al., 1990) and experimentally by amplification of five target *D. fangzhongdai* strains and 37 nontarget strains, including strains from eight different *Dickeya* genera (Table 2). Selectivity of the assay was tested on relevant plant matrixes, namely plant extracts from orchid plants, potato plants, and apple tree bark scrapings, free of disease symptoms.

2.7.2 Analytical and diagnostic sensitivity

Analytical sensitivity was determined in dilutions of DNA from pure cultures of *D. fangzhongdai* B16 and *D. fangzhongdai* JS5^{*T*}, and diagnostic sensitivity was determined on standard curves of *D. fangzhongdai* B16 in plant extracts of *Phalaenopsis*, potato and apple, and surface water. Each standard curve was analyzed in triplicate. The following control systems were used to assure reliability of results and provide further information on method performance: (i) use of undiluted and diluted (1:10 in molecular grade water) DNA extracts from spiked plant extracts and surface water, and (ii) amplification of plant endogenous sequence as an extraction and amplification control (COX) (Weller et al., 2000; Mumford et al., 2004).

The limit of detection LOD₉₅ was defined as the target amount giving positive results with 95% confidence and was calculated using drc package in R (Ritz and Strebig, 2016; R Core Team, 2021). The slope (k) of the linear regression line between logarithmic values of cell numbers (independent variable) and Cq values (dependent variable) was used to calculate the amplification efficiency, $E = (10[-1/k])^{-1}$, where a value of one corresponds to 100% amplification efficiency (Pfaffl, 2001). The dynamic range, *i.e.*, the range of concentrations for which Cq values were in linear relationship with logarithms of concentrations, was determined by visually exploring the slope across sections of the Cq values × log concentration plot.

Performance of the developed real-time PCR Df_tr assay was compared to real-time PCR assay described by Tian et al. (2020).

3 Results

3.1 Selection of host plants and niches relevant for *D. fangzhongdai* survey

Dickeya fangzhongdai isolates collected from reports in publications and the GenBank database are shown in **Table 1**. The majority of the species (87%) were reported from Asia. The reported isolates were predominantly isolated from soft rot symptoms on orchids (48%) and taro plants (20%). Six isolates (6%) were reported to be isolated from Asian pear trees, causing bleeding canker disease and 5 isolates (5%) were isolated from water sources. Overall, 80% of isolates were isolated from monocot plants, suggesting that *D. fangzhongdai* might have preference based on cotyledon types. Since *D. fangzhongdai* species description is relatively new, it is very likely that isolates

	Dynamic range (cells/mL) ¹		Linea	lear regression ²		LOD ₉₅ ³		
	From	То	Slope (k)	R ²	E	Log. conc [log(cells/ml)]	Cells/ mL	Residual error
DNA standard c	urve							
D. fangzhongdai B16	10 ⁴	10 ⁷	-3.6	1.00	0.91	3.7	5164	6.22×10^{-02}
D. fangzhongdai JS5 ^T	10 ³	10 ⁷	-3.4	1.00	0.98	2.5	311	7.21×10^{-10}
Spiked plant matrix								
Potato plant	10 ⁴	10 ⁶	-3.3	0.99	1.01	2.5	311	7.21×10^{-10}
Orchids	10 ³	10 ⁷	-3.5	1.00	0.93	2.5	325	3.03×10^{-02}
Apple tree	10 ⁴	10 ⁷	-3.6	1.00	0.91	3.4	2275	3.03×10^{-02}
Spiked water								
Surface water	104	107	-3.0	0.99	1.14	3.6	3776	3.03×10^{-02}

TABLE 4 Performance characteristics of real-time PCR Df_tr assays evaluated on bacterial suspension, spiked plant matrices and spiked surface water.

¹The range of concentrations for which Cq values were in linear relationship with logarithms of concentrations.

²Linear regression of all positive samples of Cq values against logarithmic number of *D. fangzhongdai* cells; k: slope of the determined linear regression line; R2: average square regression coefficient; E: efficiency of amplification calculated from k.

³LOD₉₅: limit of detection was defined as the target amount giving positive results with 95% confidence.

found before the species description were assigned only to *Dickeya* spp. level, as was the case for NCPPB 3274. Therefore, the true list of *D. fangzhongdai* isolates is likely to be far more substantial. For example, it was indicated that *Dickeya* spp. isolates from several host plants described by Suharjo et al. (2014) correspond to *D. fangzhongdai* (Alič et al., 2017a, 2018).

Dickeya fangzhongdai isolates with known whole genome sequence (Table 1) share above 96% average nucleotide identity (ANI) and above 86% coverage, regardless of the geographical origin or host.

Based on the literature search and previous experiences, the survey was focused on plants of agricultural importance (e.g., potato and members of the *Malinae* subtribe) and water samples. The latter give broader environment representation compared to individual plant samples.

3.2 Validation of the real-time PCR Df_tr assay

3.2.1 Analytical specificity and selectivity

The real-time PCR assay Df_tr, targeting a transcriptional regulator containing an amidase domain and an AraC-type DNA-binding HTH domain, was found to be specific for detection of *D. fangzhongdai* species. The assay exhibited 100% inclusivity (5/5 isolates) since all *D. fangzhongdai* isolates were reliably detected regardless of their host or geographical origin. Moreover, no cross reactivity with any of the tested non-target bacteria (37 isolates) was observed, meaning that the test is 100% exclusive to *D. fangzhongdai*.

Lastly, no non-specific amplification was obtained from healthy plant matrices, therefore selectivity of the assay was determined to be 100% on tested matrices, namely potato, orchid, and apple tree.

3.2.2 Analytical sensitivity

Analytical sensitivity was determined on DNA standard curves of two different *D. fangzhongdai* isolates, B16 and JS5^{*T*}, from different environmental niches. The newly developed assay showed high analytical sensitivity (**Table 4**) with LOD₉₅ below 10^4 cells/mL of plant extracts in all three matrices. The performance characteristics of the real-time PCR Df_tr assay were very similar to the real-time PCR described by Tian et al. (2020) (**Supplementary Table 4**). Both assays gave almost identical results tested on DNA standard curves.

3.2.3 Diagnostic sensitivity

Diagnostic sensitivity was determined on spiked plant matrices and surface water. No inhibition of amplification could be observed in any of the matrices tested; however, the sensitivity of the assay varied from matrix to matrix, suggesting a matrix effect on DNA extraction procedure (Figure 1). Of all the plant matrices tested, sensitivity was most affected by the apple tree matrix, with an LOD₉₅ of 2,275 cells/mL (Supplementary Figure 1) compared to potato and orchid matrices with LOD₉₅ in the range of 311 -325 cell/mL of sample. The diagnostic sensitivity of the assay was slightly lower in surface water than in plant matrices. The LOD₉₅ was of 3,776 cells/mL of sample (Supplementary Figure 1). However, the performance characteristics of the matrices tested were not significantly different (Table 4). The Cq values were consistently below 37 at the detection limit where all parallel reactions were positive for all samples tested. Inter-run repeatability was high for all the samples and matrices tested, with coefficients of variation of Cq values below 7% within the dynamic range. The performance characteristics of the real-time PCR Df_tr assay were better compared to performance characteristics of the realtime PCR described by Tian et al. (2020) in all spiked matrices (Supplementary Table 4).

The greatest difference in sensitivity between assays was observed in the plant matrices. The LOD₉₅ of the Df_tr assay was 311 and 325 cells/mL, compared to the real-time PCR described



Logarithmic amplification curves of *D. fangzhongdai* DNA extracted from spiked plant matrices and spiked surface water for the novel real-time PCR assay Df_tr (A) and assay described by Tian et al. (2020) (B). The curves show bacterial standard curves prepared in potato matrix (green curves), in apple matrix (orange curves), in orchid matrix (blue curves) and in surface water (gray curves). The threshold line for the real-time PCR assay Df_tr is shown in orange and for Tian et al. (2020) in red.

by Tian et al. (2020), which had LOD₉₅ of 2,275 and 2,438 cells/mL, for potato and orchid matrices, respectively. Nonetheless, the difference in sensitivity was less pronounced for the apple tree matrix (LOD₉₅ of 2,275 for the Df_tr assay and 3,776 for the real-time PCR described by Tian et al. (2020). A similar difference in sensitivity was observed in surface water. The Df_tr assay showed higher sensitivity, with LOD₉₅ of 3,776 cells/mL than the real-time PCR described by Tian et al. (2020) with LOD₉₅ of 15,241 cells/mL (**Figure 2**). Overall, the sensitivity of Df_tr assay was better than the real-time PCR described by Tian et al. (2020) in plant matrices and surface water (**Figure 2**). In addition, fluorescence (Δ Rn; **Figure 1**) was consistently higher in the Df_tr assay compared to real-time PCR described by Tian et al. (2020).

No false positives were observed for Df_{tr} . As expected, only samples with a bacterial concentration below LOD_{95} gave false negative results when compared with their known health status (Table 5). Accuracy of the test based on spiked samples was 79% and diagnostic sensitivity 76%.

Samples of potato plants and tubers, and samples of *Malinae* trees were tested for a general presence of *Dickeya* spp. and *D. fangzhongdai* strains. The retrospective assay did not confirm the presence of *D. fangzhongdai* in any of the tested plant samples. However, 12% (16/130 samples) of tested samples with soft rot symptoms were positive using a non-specific *Dickeya* spp. real-time assay (Pritchard et al., 2013b), indicating the presence of other *Dickeya* species in potato. Similarly, no *D. fangzhongdai*



TABLE 5 Contingency table for real-time PCR Df_tr calculated on

		Known status				
		Infected	Non- infected	Total		
Result of test	pos	TP ^a	FP ^b	TP + FP		
		16.0	0.0	16.0		
	neg	FN ^c	TN ^d	FN + TN		
		5.0	3.0	8.0		
	total	TP + FN	FP + TN	Ne		
		21.0	3.0	24.0		

If a sample was spiked with *D. fangzhongdai* B16 suspension, its health status was considered "infected" even if the concentration was below the expected LOD. The table combines the results for all 3 tested plant matrices. ^aTrue positive; ^bFalse positive; ^cFalse negative; ^dTrue negative; ^eTotal sample count.

nor other *Dickeya* spp. were detected in any of the samples of *Malinae* members. The *Malinae* samples were collected from trees that are of economic importance in the Slovenian environment, therefore the majority of the samples represent the genera *Pyrus* and *Malus*. The general presence of *Dickeya* spp. was confirmed

in samples of surface water using real-time PCR. *Dickeya* spp. were detected in 70% (35 out of 50) surface water samples in low concentrations ($32 \le Cq \le 39$). In 6 of these samples, we also detected *D. fangzhongdai*, in 4 samples from August 2018 and 2 samples from August 2021. In all samples, concentrations were relatively low ($34 \le Cq \le 38$; Figure 3), close to the limit of detection of the assay (LOD₉₅ of 3,776 cells/mL of sample water extract; Figure 2). The sample was considered positive if at least one reaction produced a signal above threshold and a characteristic amplification curve was present.

Positive water samples were from different freshwater sources and of different types (**Table 6**). The samples were collected from different parts of Slovenia, but most samples had slightly acidic pH of 6 (4 of 6 samples). The temperature of the water ranged from 17° C to 28.5°C, measured at the sampling site.

4 Discussion

In this study, a real-time PCR assay was developed for specific detection of *D. fangzhongdai*, along with its validation in matrices of orchids, potatoes, and *Malinae* members. The assay

spiked plant samples.



TABLE 6 Metadata of the water samples positive presence of Dickeya spp. (real-time PCR ECH) and D. fangzhongdai (real-time PCR Df_tr).

Sampling location, Year	Type of surface water	рН	Water temperature [°C]
Manče, 2021	Spring	7.0	19.0
Dobruška vas, 2021	River	6.0	18.0
Gradišče, 2018	Lake	6.0	27.0
Radehova, 2018	Lake	6.5	28.5
Vanganel, 2018	Stream	6.0	17.0
Ajdovščina, 2018	Stream	6.0	24.0

was used in a retrospective survey of relevant ecological niches in Slovene environments.

Designed assay exhibited very good performance characteristics in the validation, which proves its suitability for the detection of *D. fangzhongdai* with 100% inclusivity and exclusivity and good analytical and diagnostic sensitivity. Diagnostic sensitivity of the test ranged from 1 to 10 cells per reaction (LOD₉₅), showing that the sensitivity of the assays is close or equal to the theoretical sensitivity of the method (Kralik and Ricchi, 2017). No inhibition of the real-time PCR reaction could be observed in any of the tested plant matrices and the reaction efficiency was close to optimal. Compared to the real-time assay described by Tian et al. (2020), the new test exhibited better diagnostic sensitivity in samples that contained plant matrices, showing better suitability for diagnostic purposes.

Dickeya fangzhongdai is the first known member of Dickeya spp. that causes disease not only on herbaceous plants, but also on trees. The majority of Dickeya fangzhongdai isolates originate from Asia, and few occurrences of D. fangzhongdai have been reported in Europe or America. This species has not yet been found to be associated with any significant plant disease in Europe's open environment. It has been isolated from asymptomatic potato tubers in the Netherlands, but never from symptomatic plants in farmers' fields in Europe (van der Wolf et al., 2022). Water sources seem to be an alternative habitat for Dickeya spp., as three species, namely D. aquatica, D. undicola and D. lacustris, are limited to water habitats and many others, including D. fangzhongdai, were also isolated from various water sources (Pritchard et al., 2013a; Parkinson et al., 2014; Alič et al., 2018; Hugouvieux-Cotte-Pattat et al., 2019; Oulghazi et al., 2019). Furthermore, presence of D. fangzhongdai was indirectly confirmed in wastewaters in Slovenia by isolation of D. fangzhongdai specific bacteriophages (Alič et al., 2017b). The results of the screening test performed in this study correspond with the described findings. However, the importance of water as an ecological niche is not yet understood. It is not known whether water presents a transmission source or only transient ecological niche that the bacteria is able to persist in. Nevertheless, virulence genes and genes involved in virulence regulation are also conserved in isolates from water (Alič et al., 2019).

In the screening test of potato plants and tubers with and without soft rot symptoms, and trees from the Malinae subtribe, D. fangzhongdai could not be detected in the tested samples. In Asian pear trees, bark tissue has been shown to be affected by D. fangzhongdai, therefore vascular tissue from twigs was selected as sample material for Malinae samples (Tian et al., 2016; Chen et al., 2020). However, it is not known which tissue would be most suitable for testing asymptomatic trees for the presence of D. fangzhongdai. Sixty-five of the surface water samples tested in this study were positive for presence of Dickeya spp., and 11% of those samples also contained D. fangzhongdai. D. fangzhongdai was present at low concentration, and the limit of detection (LOD₉₅) of the assay in surface water is 3,776 cells/mL sample water extract. Other Dickeya spp. was detected in some potato samples with soft rot symptoms, however its prevalence is approximately 5 times lower compared to water samples. Based on the results, Dickeya spp. including D. fangzhongdai have not yet entered the agricultural environment but is present at low concentrations in some water sources in Slovenia.

Repeated reports of D. fangzhongdai outbreaks in Asia indicate that the pathogen is posing a threat to cultivation of various crops, ornamental plants and trees (Tian et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2018; Jaffar et al., 2019; Shen et al., 2019; Tsai et al., 2019; Balamurugan et al., 2020; Choi et al., 2021; Huang et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2021). There have been no reports of D. fangzhongdai outbreaks or infections of plants in the open environment in Europe, however due to lack of specific testing for D. fangzhongdai species, isolates can be overlooked or assigned to Dickeya spp. The newly developed real-time PCR is reliable, sensitive and adequately validated, and therefore a suitable detection test for D. fangzhongdai detection, identification, and monitoring. Based on the results of the retrospective survey, D. fangzhongdai seems to be present in some water sources in Slovene environment. Presence of D. fangzhongdai was not confirmed in any tested plant species, however, its persistence cannot be excluded from hosts that were not included in this study. Specific testing for D. fangzhongdai presence and accordingly implementing preventive measures, is currently the only mechanism to prevent establishment of the species in new environments and environments in which the species had been sporadically detected.

Since the beginning of the 21st century the most detrimental *Dickeya* spp. for in European agriculture was *D. solani*. In 2012 it was listed among the 10 most important bacterial pathogens because of its sudden clonal spread and impact on the potato industry under higher temperatures (Mansfield et al., 2012). The pathogen was first isolated in 2005 and then in 2009 (Sławiak et al., 2009) but was recognized as a species only in 2014 (van der Wolf et al., 2014). However, in more recent studies it was shown that *D. solani* was present in potato more than a decade before the first reported outbreak. The early strains are genetically very close to the epidemic clones isolated during the 2000s outbreaks. Potentially aggressive *D. solani* strains in potato seeds were already present in the last century (Pédron et al., 2021), therefore it does not seem that genetics played an exclusive role in promoting pathogenicity, but rather an additional factor to the

environmental conditions. Based on the reports, *D. fangzhongdai* seems to be as or even more aggressive than *D. solani* (Alič et al., 2017a; van der Wolf et al., 2022). Even if there is currently no association of *D. fangzhongdai* with any host in the open European environment, it is highly likely that the pathogen will not have a problem finding a host in favorable environmental conditions. Previous experience with *D. solani* showed that sporadic detection of such an aggressive pathogen in the environment might be a warning sign supporting the need for specific surveying of *D. fangzhongdai*.

Data availability statement

The datasets presented in this study can be found in online repositories. The names of the repository/repositories and accession number(s) can be found in the article/Supplementary material.

Author contributions

TD and ŠA: conceptualization, methodology, validation, and funding acquisition. ŠA and KB: formal analysis, investigation, and data curation. ŠA, KB, and TD: resources. ŠA: writing original draft preparation and visualization. TD: writing review and editing, supervision, and project administration. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This study was financed by the Slovenian Research and Innovation Agency (contract numbers: P4-0165 and Z1-3190) and by the Euphresco Phytosanitary ERA-NET project on taxonomy and epidemiology of *Pectobacterium* and *Dickeya* spp. in Europe, North America, and South Africa (2020-F-336). The plant material used in this study was collected by the Administration of the Republic of Slovenia for Food Safety, Veterinary and Plant Protection, of the Ministry of Agriculture and Environment and Phytosanitary Inspectorate.

Acknowledgments

We thank Prof. Ian Toth and Dr. Sonia Humphries of the James Hutton Institute for the *Dickeya* sp. MK7 strain; Dr. Manca Pirc, Neža Turnšek, Lidija Matičič, Špela Prijatelj Novak, and Aleš Blatnik of the NIB for diagnostic samples preparation and technical assistance, and Dr. Carissa Robyn Bleker for critical reading and English language editing.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated

References

Alič, Š., Dermastia, M., Burger, J., Dickinson, M., Pietersen, G., Pietersen, G., et al. (2022). Genome-informed design of a LAMP assay for the specific setection of the strain of 'Candidatus Phytoplasma asteris' phytoplasma occurring in grapevines in South Africa. Plant Dis. 106, 2927–2939. doi: 10.1094/PDIS-10-21-2312-RE

Alič, Š., Naglič, T., Tušek-Žnidarič, M., Peterka, M., Ravnikar, M., and Dreo, T. (2017a). Putative new species of the genus *Dickeya* as major soft rot pathogens in *Phalaenopsis* orchid production. *Plant Pathol.* 66, 1357–1368. doi: 10.1111/ppa.12677

Alič, Š., Naglič, T., Tušek-Žnidarič, M., Ravnikar, M., Rački, N., Peterka, M., et al. (2017b). Newly Isolated bacteriophages from the *Podoviridae*, *Siphoviridae*, and *Myoviridae* families have variable effects on putative novel *Dickeya* spp. *Front. Microbiol.* 8:1870. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2017.01870

Alič, Š., Pédron, J., Dreo, T., and Van Gijsegem, F. (2019). Genomic characterisation of the new *Dickeya fangzhongdai* species regrouping plant pathogens and environmental isolates. *BMC Genomics* 20:34. doi: 10.1186/s12864-018-5332-3

Alič, Š., Van Gijsegem, F., Pédron, J., Ravnikar, M., and Dreo, T. (2018). Diversity within the novel *Dickeya fangzhongdai* sp., isolated from infected orchids, water and pears. *Plant Pathol.* 67, 1612–1620. doi: 10.1111/ppa.12866

Altschul, S. F., Gish, W., Miller, W., Myers, E. W., and Lipman, D. J. (1990). Basic local alignment search tool. *J. Mol. Biol.* 215, 403–410. doi: 10.1016/S0022-2836(05) 80360-2

Asselin, J. E., Karp, M., Rychlik, P., Daughtrey, M., Filiatrault, M., and Stodghill, P. (2022). Genomic Comparison of Dickeya fangzhongdai Strains Isolated from Different Hosts and Pathogenicity in Onion (Allium cepa) Bulbs. Bethesda, MD: GenBank Direct Submission. s

Balamurugan, A., Kumar, A., Sakthivel, K., Ashajyothi, M., Sahu, K. P., and Karthikeyan, M. (2020). Characterization of *Dickeya fangzhongdai* causing bacterial soft rot disease on *Dendrobium nobile* in India. *Eur. J. Plant Pathol.* 158, 773–780.

Chan, K. G. (2014). *Dickeya fangzhongdai strain ND14b chromosome*. Bethesda, MD: GenBank Direct Submission.

Chan, K. G., and Tan, W. S. (2014). *Genome sequence of Dickeya solani M005*. Bethesda, MD: GenBank Direct Submission.

Chen, B., Tian, Y., Zhao, Y., Wang, J., Xu, Z., Li, X., et al. (2020). Bleeding canker of pears caused by *Dickeya fangzhongdai*: symptoms, etiology and biology. *J. Integr. Agric.* 19, 889–897. doi: 10.1016/S2095-3119(19)62882-0

Cheng, Y., Yan, Z., Gao, C., Yu, Y., Li, Z., Zen, L., et al. (2017). Complete genome sequence of the emerging pathogen for Southern Economic Crops, Dickeya Secpp 1600. Changsha: Institute of Bast Fiber Crops and Center of Southern Economic CropsGenBank Direct Submission.

Chi, N. M., Anh, D. T. K., Hung, T. X., Nhung, N. P., BaO, H. Q., Toan, D. V., et al. (2022). Soft rot disease caused by *Dickeya fangzhongdai* in epiphytic orchids in Vietnam. *Can. J. Plant Pathol.* 44, 386–399. doi: 10.1080/07060661.2021.1998226

Choi, E. D., Kim, Y., Lee, Y., Jeong, M.-H., Kim, K. H., Song, J. H., et al. (2021). First report of bleeding canker of pear tree trunks caused by *Dickeya fangzhongdai* in Korea. *Plant Dis.* 105, 2238. doi: 10.1094/PDIS-09-20-1948-PDN

DeLude, A., Wells, R., Boomla, S., Chuang, S.-C., Urena, F., Shipman, A., et al. (2022). Loop-mediated isothermal amplification (LAMP) assay for specific and rapid detection of *Dickeya fangzhongdai* targeting a unique genomic region. *Sci. Rep.* 12:19193. doi: 10.1038/s41598-022-22023-4

Dobhal, S., Boluk, G., Babler, B., Stulberg, M. J., Rascoe, J., Nakhla, M. K., et al. (2020). Comparative genomics reveals signature regions used to develop a robust and sensitive multiplex TaqMan real-time qPCR assay to detect the genus *Dickeya* and *Dickeya dianthicola. J. Appl. Microbiol.* 128, 1703–1719. doi: 10.1111/jam.14579

EU (1993). Council directive 93/85 of 4 October 1993 on the control of potato ring rot. Official J. Eur. Union L259, 1–25.

organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Supplementary material

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmicb.2023. 1249955/full#supplementary-material

European and Mediterranean Plant Protection organization (2021). PM 7/98 (5) Specific requirements for laboratories preparing accreditation for a plant pest diagnostic activity. *EPPO Bull.* 51, 468–498. doi: 10.1111/epp. 12780

Fujikawa, T., Hatomi, H., and Ota, N. (2020). Draft genome sequences of seven strains of *Dickeya dadantii*, a quick decline-causing pathogen in fruit zrees, isolated in Japan. *Microbiol. Resour. Announc.* 9:e00609-20. doi: 10.1128/MRA. 00609-20

Hinsley, A., de Boer, H. J., Fay, M. F., Gale, S. W., Gardiner, L. M., Gunasekara, R. S., et al. (2018). A review of the trade in orchids and its implications for conservation. *Bot. J. Linn. Soc.* 186, 435–455. doi: 10.1093/botlinnean/box083

Huang, C. J., Lin, P. R., and Ting, C. L. (2020). Bacterial soft rot of taro in Taiwan. Bethesda, MD: GenBank Direct Submission.

Huang, S., Chen, Z., Hu, M., Xue, Y., Liao, L., and Zhang, L. (2021). First report of bacterial soft rot disease on taro caused by *Dickeya fangzhongdai* in China. *Plant Dis.* 105:3737. doi: 10.1094/PDIS-10-20-2225-PDN

Hugouvieux-Cotte-Pattat, N., Jacot-des-Combes, C., and Briolay, J. (2019). Dickeya lacustris sp. nov., a water-living pectinolytic bacterium isolated from lakes in France. Int. J. Syst. Evol. Microbiol. 69, 721–726. doi: 10.1099/ijsem.0.003208

Hugouvieux-Cotte-Pattat, N., Royer, M., Gueguen, E., Le Guen, P., Süssmuth, R. D., Reverchon, S., et al. (2022). Specificity and genetic polymorphism in the Vfm quorum sensing system of plant pathogenic bacteria of the genus *Dickeya. Environ. Microbiol.* 24, 1467–1483. doi: 10.1111/1462-2920.15889

Jaffar, N. S., Osman, M. S., and Koyube, M. N. K. (2019). New bacterial fruit rot disease of jackfruit caused by *Dickeya fangzhongdai* in Malaysia. *Malays. J. Microbiol.* 15, 214–219. doi: 10.21161/mjm.191547

Khandeparker, D. L., and Eswaran, R. (2018). Dickeya fangzhongdai strain GR29 16S ribosomal RNA gene. Bethesda, MD: GenBank Direct Submission.

Kralik, P., and Ricchi, M. (2017). A basic guide to real-time PCR in microbial diagnostics: definitions, parameters, and everything. *Front. Microbiol.* 8:108. doi: 10. 3389/fmicb.2017.00108

Liu, D. (2020). First report of Dickeya fangzhongdai causing soft rot of belamcandae Rhizoma in China State. Bethesda, MD: GenBank Direct Submission.

Ma, X., Bonasera, J. M., Asselin, J. A. E., Beer, S. V., and Swingle, B. (2020). First report of *Dickeya fangzhongdai* causing soft rot of onion in New York state. *Plant Dis*. 104:1251. doi: 10.1094/PDIS-09-19-1940-PDN

Mansfield, J., Genin, S., Magori, S., Citovsky, V., Sriariyanum, M., Ronald, P., et al. (2012). Top 10 plant pathogenic bacteria in molecular plant pathology: top 10 plant pathogenic bacteria. *Mol. Plant Pathol.* 13, 614–629. doi: 10.1111/j.1364-3703.2012. 00804.x

Mumford, R. A., Skelton, A. L., Boonham, N., Posthuma, K. I., Kirby, M. J., and Adams, A. N. (2004). The improved detection of strawberry crinkle virus using realtime RT-PCR (TAQMAN[®]-). *Acta Hortic*. 656, 81–86. doi: 10.17660/ActaHortic.2004. 656.11

Ogoshi, C., Monteiro, F. P., Becker, W. F., Kvitschal, M. V., Cardoza, Y. F., Zanin, J. G., et al. (2019). First report of *Dickeya dadantii* causing a new disease of apple trees in Brazil. *New Dis. Rep.* 39:8. doi: 10.5197/j.2044-0588.2019.039.008

Oulghazi, S., Pédron, J., Cigna, J., Lau, Y. Y., Moumni, M., Van Gijsegem, F., et al. (2019). *Dickeya undicola* sp. nov., a novel species for pectinolytic isolates from surface waters in Europe and Asia. *Int. J. Syst. Evol. Microbiol.* 69, 2440–2444. doi: 10.1099/ijsem.0.003497

Pan, L. (2021). Dickeya fangzhongdai strain Onc5 chromosome. Bethesda, MD: GenBank Direct Submission.

Parkinson, N., DeVos, P., Pirhonen, M., and Elphinstone, J. (2014). *Dickeya aquatica* sp. nov., isolated from waterways. *Int. J. Syst. Evol. Microbiol.* 64, 2264–2266. doi: 10.1099/ijs.0.058693-0

Parkinson, N., Stead, D., Bew, J., Heeney, J., Tsror (Lahkim), L., and Elphinstone, J. (2009). *Dickeya* species relatedness and clade structure determined by comparison of recA sequences. *Int. J. Syst. Evol. Microbiol.* 59, 2388–2393. doi: 10.1099/ijs.0.009258-0

Pédron, J., Schaerer, S., Kellenberger, I., and Van Gijsegem, F. (2021). early emergence of *Dickeya solani* revealed by analysis of *Dickeya* diversity of potato blackleg and soft rot causing pathogens in Switzerland. *Microorganisms* 9:1187. doi: 10.3390/ microorganisms9061187

Pfaffl, M. W. (2001). A new mathematical model for relative quantification in real-time RT-PCR. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 29:e45. doi: 10.1093/nar/29.9.e45

Pirc, M., Ravnikar, M., Tomlinson, J., and Dreo, T. (2009). Improved fireblight diagnostics using quantitative real-time PCR detection of *Erwinia amylovora* chromosomal DNA. *Plant Pathol.* 58, 872–881. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-3059.2009.02083.x

Pritchard, L., Humphris, S., Saddler, G. S., Elphinstone, J. G., Pirhonen, M., and Toth, I. K. (2013a). Draft genome sequences of 17 isolates of the plant pathogenic bacterium *Dickeya. Genome Announc.* 1:e00978-13. doi: 10.1128/genomeA.00978-13

Pritchard, L., Humphris, S., Saddler, G. S., Parkinson, N. M., Bertrand, V., Elphinstone, J. G., et al. (2013b). Detection of phytopathogens of the genus *Dickeya* using a PCR primer prediction pipeline for draft bacterial genome sequences: *Dickeya* diagnostics from draft bacterial genome sequences. *Plant Pathol.* 62, 587–596. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-3059.2012.02678.x

R Core Team (2021). *R: a language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.

Richter, M., Rosselló-Móra, R., Oliver Glöckner, F., and Peplies, J. (2016). JSpeciesWS: a web server for prokaryotic species circumscription based on pairwise genome comparison. *Bioinformatics* 32, 929–931.

Ritz, C., and Strebig, J. C. (2016). *Analysis of dose-response curves*. Available online at: https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/drc/drc.pdf (accessed September 4, 2019).

Rodriguez-R, L. M., and Konstantinidis, K. T. (2014). Bypassing cultivation to identify bacterial species: culture-independent genomic approaches identify credibly distinct clusters, avoid cultivation bias, and provide true insights into microbial species. *Microbe Mag.* 9, 111–118. doi: 10.1128/microbe.9.111.1

Sayers, E. W., Bolton, E. E., Brister, J. R., Canese, K., Chan, J., Comeau, D. C., et al. (2022). Database resources from the National Center for Biotechnology Information. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 50, D20-D26. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkab1112

Schaad, N. W., Jones, J. B., and Chun, W. (2001). *Laboratory guide for identification ofplant pathogenic bacteria*, 3rd Edn. St. Paul, MN: American Phytopathological Society Press.

Shen, Y., Lv, W. G., Du, Y. H., Zhang, Y. X., and Li, H. P. (2019). First report of *Dickeya fangzhongdai* causing soft rot of *Phalaenopsis aphrodite* in China. *Plant Dis.* 103, 2665–2665. doi: 10.1094/PDIS-01-19-0234-PDN

Sławiak, M., Łojkowska, E., and van der Wolf, J. M. (2009). First report of bacterial soft rot on potato caused by *Dickeya* sp. (syn. *Erwinia chrysanthemi*) in Poland. *Plant Pathol.* 58, 794–794. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-3059.2009.02028.x

Suharjo, R., Sawada, H., and Takikawa, Y. (2014). Phylogenetic study of Japanese *Dickeya* spp. and development of new rapid identification methods using PCR–RFLP. *J. Gen. Plant Pathol.* 80, 237–254. doi: 10.1007/s10327-014-0511-9

Thomsen, M. C. F., Hasman, H., Westh, H., Kaya, H., and Lund, O. (2017). RUCS: rapid identification of PCR primers for unique core sequences. *Bioinformatics* 33, 3917–3921. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btx526

Tian, Y., Zhao, Y., Chen, B., Chen, S., Zeng, R., Hu, B., et al. (2020). Real-time PCR assay for detection of *Dickeya fangzhongdai* causing bleeding canker of pear disease in China. *J. Integr. Agric.* 19, 898–905. doi: 10.1016/S2095-3119(19)62881-9

Tian, Y., Zhao, Y., Yuan, X., Yi, J., Fan, J., Xu, Z., et al. (2016). *Dickeya fangzhongdai* sp. nov., a plant-pathogenic bacterium isolated from pear trees (*Pyrus pyrifolia*). *Int. J. Syst. Evol. Microbiol.* 66, 2831–2835. doi: 10.1099/ijsem.0.001060

Toth, I. K., van der Wolf, J. M., Saddler, G., Lojkowska, E., Hélias, V., Pirhonen, M., et al. (2011). *Dickeya* species: an emerging problem for potato production in Europe: *Dickeya* spp. on potato in Europe. *Plant Pathol.* 60, 385–399. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-3059. 2011.02427.x

Tsai, W.-A., Lin, P.-R., and Huang, C.-J. (2019). First report of *Dickeya fangzhongdai* causing soft rot disease of Welsh onion in Taiwan. *J. Plant Pathol.* 101, 797–798. doi: 10.1007/s42161-019-00264-z

van der Wolf, J. M., Nijhuis, E. H., Kowalewska, M. J., Saddler, G. S., Parkinson, N., Elphinstone, J. G., et al. (2014). *Dickeya solani* sp. nov., a pectinolytic plant-pathogenic bacterium isolated from potato (*Solanum tuberosum*). *Int. J. Syst. Evol. Microbiol.* 64, 768–774. doi: 10.1099/ijs.0.0529244-0

van der Wolf, J., Krijger, M., Mendes, O., Kurm, V., and Gros, J. (2022). Natural infections of potato plants grown from Minitubers with blackleg-causing soft rot *Pectobacteriaceae*. *Microorganisms* 10:2504. doi: 10.3390/microorganisms1012 2504

Wang, F., Tang, T., Mao, T., Guo, J., Guo, X., Duan, Y., et al. (2021). Occurrence of *Dickeya fangzhongdai* causing soft rot of Banxia (*Pinellia ternata*) in China. *Plant Dis.* 105:3288. doi: 10.1094/PDIS-01-21-0030-PDN

Wei, X., Deng, W., and Chu, C. (2021). Phylogenetic and phenotypic analyses on *Dickeya* spp. isolated from different host plants in Taiwan. *J. Phytopathol.* 169, 678–691. doi: 10.1111/jph.13038

Weller, S. A., Elphinstone, J. G., Smith, N. C., Boonham, N., and Stead, D. E. (2000). Detection of *Ralstonia solanacearum* strains with a quantitative multiplex real-time fluorogenic PCR (TaqMan) Assay. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 66, 2853–2858. doi: 10.1128/AEM.66.7.2853-2858.2000

Yang, D., Du, C. J., Ye, Y. F., Pan, L. F., Zhang, J., and Fu, G. (2022). First report of *Dickeya fangzhongdai* causing peduncle soft rot of banana in China. *Plant Dis.* 106:1980. doi: 10.1094/PDIS-11-21-2513-PDN

Zhang, J., Hu, J., Shen, H., Zhang, Y., Sun, D., Pu, X., et al. (2018). Genomic analysis of the *Phalaenopsis* pathogen *Dickeya* sp. PA1, representing the emerging species *Dickeya fangzhongdai*. *BMC Genomics* 19:782. doi: 10.1186/s12864-018-5154-3

Zhou, A., Nie, J., Tian, Y., Chuan, J., Hu, B., Zou, J., et al. (2021). First report of *Dickeya fangzhongdai* causing soft rot in orchid in Canada. *Plant Dis.* 105:4149. doi: 10.1094/PDIS-04-21-0771-PDN