

ONION (*Allium cepa*, 12 cultivars)
Center rot; *Pantoea agglomerans*
Slippery skin; *Burkholderia gladioli* pv. *alliicola*

L. J. du Toit, M. L. Derie, B. Gundersen, Washington State
University Mount Vernon NWREC, Mount Vernon, WA 98273; and
T. D. Waters and J. Darner, Washington State University Benton &
Franklin Counties Extension, Pasco, WA 99301.

Susceptibility of 12 onion cultivars to bacterial leaf blight and bulb rot in Pasco, WA, 2022-23.

A field trial was planted on 29 Mar 21 at the Washington State University Pasco Vegetable Extension Farm, using pelleted seed of 12 onion cultivars (210,000 seeds/A), to evaluate their susceptibility to bacterial leaf blight and bacterial bulb rot caused by *Pantoea agglomerans* and *Burkholderia gladioli* pv. *alliicola* in storage bulb crops grown with overhead irrigation in the Columbia Basin of Washington and Oregon. The trial was a split-split plot, randomized complete block design with five replications of a nested treatment design: two inoculation treatments (inoculated or not inoculated) were applied to main plots, four onion maturity groups (MG) were applied to split plots, and three onion cultivars nested within each MG were planted in split-split plots. Each split-split plot was a 34-in.-wide bed (2 double-rows of onion) x 15 ft long, including 5 ft of bed as a buffer between adjacent plots. Cultivars in MG 1, 2, 3, and 4 ranged from 103-107, 112-115, 117-118, and 119-125 days to maturity, respectively. Plants were irrigated using sprinklers so that irrigation could be terminated when plants in each MG reached ~50% tops down (8, 15, 22, and 29 Aug for MG 1 to 4, respectively), and to minimize inter-plot interference from irrigation. To avoid confounding plant maturity with time of inoculation, inoculum consisting of an equal ratio of the two pathogens, produced as overnight shake cultures in nutrient broth yeast extract medium and diluted to 10⁸ CFU/ml in 0.0125M phosphate buffer plus 0.01% Tween 20, was applied to relevant main plots when plants in a MG reached 5% and 50% tops down: 21 Jul and 4 Aug for MG 1, 28 Jul and 11 Aug for MG 2, 4 and 18 Aug for MG 3, and 11 and 25 Aug for MG 4, respectively. Inoculum was applied in the evening with a CO₂-pressurized backpack sprayer and 3-nozzle boom (XR8003 tips, 34.65 gpa, 20 psi), shortly after irrigating split plots with 0.12 in. water to favor bacterial infection. Plots in each MG continued to be irrigated briefly in the late afternoon every other day from mid-Jul until a week after the final inoculation to favor bacterial disease development. The trial was otherwise managed with typical practices for the region. Plots in each MG were rated four times at weekly intervals for incidence (percentage of plants with symptoms) and severity of bacterial leaf blight (percentage of canopy with symptoms), starting 5 days after the first inoculation. Plots were rated for percentage tops down on 25 Jul. and 2 and 9 Aug. Plants were undercut on 16, 24, and 31 Aug, and 7 Sep for plots in MG 1 to 4, respectively. Bulbs in a 5-ft section/split-split plot were topped and harvested manually on 26 Aug, and 12, 22, and 27 Sep for MG 1 to 4, respectively. Bulbs were sorted into those culled because of external symptoms of bacterial rot, those culled for other reasons (split bulbs, green shoulders, double-bulbs, or bolted), and marketable bulbs. Marketable bulbs were sized (pre-pack, medium, jumbo, and colossal), counted, and weighed by size to calculate marketable yield (t/A). Marketable bulbs were placed in a commercial storage facility (40°F, 70% relative humidity) for 5 months. On 2 Feb 23, bulbs were cut vertically and rated for incidence (%) of bulbs with bacterial rot and severity of bacterial rot (% of cut surface area of each bulb with symptoms). Data were subjected to analyses of variance (ANOVAs) and means comparisons using Fisher's protected least significant difference (LSD). The project was funded by Specialty Crops Research Initiative Award 2019-51181-30013 of the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture.

The range in maturity of cultivars within MG reflected the percentage tops down on 9 Aug: 87.0, 60.3, and 34.0% for MG 1 to 3, respectively (Table 1); accidental mechanical injury precluded tops down ratings of MG 4 plots. Inoculation increased the percentage tops down to 62.4% vs. 58.4% for non-inoculated plots. There were also significant differences in tops down ratings among cultivars within MGs, with greatest differences among cultivars in MG 3 (13.0 to 62.0%). Similar trends were observed when results were analyzed separately for inoculated vs. non-inoculated plots (Table 2). Bacterial leaf blight was observed less than a week after the first inoculation and increased in severity thereafter. Two weeks after inoculation, 85.3% of plants in inoculated plots had symptoms vs. 22.5% in non-inoculated plots, with a severity of 47.2 vs. 9.9%, respectively (Table 1). The incidence of symptomatic plants was greater for cultivars in MG 4 (71.7%) than MGs 3 (54.7%) and 2 (48.0%), and least for MG 1 (41.3%). Similarly for severity ratings. However, incidence and severity of bacterial leaf blight differed significantly among cultivars within MGs 3 and 4, when averaged over inoculated and non-inoculated plots (Table 1). In inoculated plots, bacterial leaf blight was so prevalent that only MG 1 plots had less incidence, with no significant effect of cultivars nested in MGs for foliar incidence, only severity (Table 2). In non-inoculated plots, the incidence of foliar disease increased from MG 1 to 4, and only MGs 3 and 4 had significant differences among cultivars. Inoculations reduced marketable bulb yield by 14.9 t/A, largely as a result of an 11.9 t/A increase in weight of bulbs culled because of bacterial rot; and increased the incidence and severity of bacterial bulb rot at harvest and after 5 months in storage. An average of 50.5% of bulbs was lost to bacterial rot (harvest + storage) in inoculated plots vs. 12.0% of bulbs in non-inoculated plots (Table 1). MG 3 cultivars had greater marketable yields than those in MGs 1 and 2. Yields also differed among cultivars within MGs. Legend and XP0188-16000 in MG 3 had the highest yields (>40 t/A), followed by Anillo in MG 3 and Hamilton, Crockett, and Joaquin in MG 4. Frontier (MG 1) had the lowest yield (16.6 t/A), followed by the other two cultivars in MG 1 and those in MG 2. In inoculated plots, marketable yield results showed a similar trend (Table 2), with highest yields in MGs 3 and 4 (Table 2), and a significant effect of cultivars nested in MGs. In non-inoculated plots, XP0188-16000 (MG 3) had the highest yield (53.6 t/A), followed by Legend and Anillo (MG 3) plus all three cultivars in MG 4, and Calibra (MG 2) and SV0106-NG (MG 1). The yield of bacterial culls at harvest and the incidence of bulbs with bacterial rot did not differ among MGs but differed among cultivars in MGs (Tables 1 and 2). In contrast, the incidence of bacterial bulb rot after 5 months in storage was greater for MGs 3 (10.4%) and 4 (11.7%) vs. 1 (7.5%) and 2 (8.6%). The total incidence of bacterial bulb rot (harvest + storage) also did not differ among MGs but was affected by cultivars in MGs in both inoculated and non-inoculated plots (Tables 1 and 2). Legend (MG 3) had the least bulb rot (10.5%), followed by Traverse (MG 1, 22.7%), XP0188-16000 (MG 3, 24.8%), and Crockett (MG 4, 29.6%). Joaquin (MG 4) had the most bulb rot (46.1%), followed by seven cultivars spread across all four MGs (between 30.0 and 39.2% bulb rot). In inoculated plots, Legend again had the least total bulb rot (18.5%), while the other 11 cultivars averaged 40.7 to 70.4% bulb rot. In non-inoculated plots, six cultivars had <10% total bulb rot (Traverse and SV0106-NG in MG 1, Tamara and Calibra in MG 2, and Legend and XP0188-16000 in MG 3). The three cultivars in MG 4 had the most bulb rot (Crockett with 18.4%, Hamilton with 23.5%, and Joaquin with 28.7%). In summary, timing inoculations based on cultivar maturity facilitated screening onion cultivars for susceptibility to bacterial infection. Including both inoculated and non-inoculated plots also enabled screening of cultivars at different levels of disease pressure. However, accidental, late season mechanical injury to the tops of MG 4 cultivars could have increased the risk of neck and bulb infections in those plots.

Table 1.

Main plot, split plot, and split-split plot treatments	Tops down on 9 Aug (%)	Bacterial leaf blight 2 weeks after inoculation ^z		Bulb yield at harvest (t/A)		Bulbs culled at harvest from bacterial rot		Bacterial bulb rot 5 months after storage		Bacterial bulb rot incidence at harvest + storage (%)
		Incidence (%) of plants)	Severity (% of canopy)	Marketable bulbs	Bacterial culls	Incidence (% of bulbs)	Severity per bulb (%)	Incidence of bulbs (%)	Severity per bulb (%)	
Main plots										
Inoculated	62.4 a ^y	85.3 a	47.2 a	25.0 b	14.5 a	37.6 a	48.6 a	12.9 a	12.3 a	50.5 a
Non-inoculated	58.4 b	22.5 b	9.9 b	39.9 a	2.6 b	5.8 b	14.4 b	6.2 b	3.4 b	12.0 b
LSD	Rank ^x	Rank	Rank	3.7	2.5	Rank	4.7	Rank	Rank	Rank
<i>P</i> value	0.0109	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
Split plots										
MG 1	87.0 a	41.3 c	23.6 c	25.3 b	8.7	25.9	26.0 b	7.5 b	7.2	33.4
MG 2	60.3 b	48.0 b	25.9 bc	28.0 b	8.4	23.3	37.7 a	8.6 b	7.1	31.9
MG 3	34.0 c	54.7 b	29.2 b	40.7 a	6.1	12.7	27.6 b	10.4 ab	7.8	23.1
MG 4	----- ^w	71.7 a	35.6 a	35.3 ab	11.2	25.4	35.7 a	11.7 a	9.2	37.1
LSD	Rank	Rank	Rank	5.2	3.5	Rank	6.7	Rank	Rank	Rank
<i>P</i> value	0.0001	0.0001	0.0006	0.0390	0.5279	0.2908	0.0012	0.0099	0.0627	0.2532
Split-split plots (cultivars nested in MG)										
MG 1										
Frontier	84.5 b	45.0 bc	25.3 bcd	16.6 d	7.2 def	29.5 abc	30.1 c	8.8 b-e	5.8 bc	38.3 abc
SV0106-NG	85.0 b	41.0 bc	27.0 bcd	29.9 bc	13.4 abc	34.0 ab	33.4 bc	5.2 de	10.2 b	39.2 abc
Traverse	91.5 a	38.0 c	18.6 d	29.4 bc	5.5 def	14.2 de	14.4 d	8.5 cde	5.7 bc	22.7 de
MG 2										
Tamara	49.5 d	47.0 b	27.7 b	25.9 cd	7.3 b-e	23.7 a-e	33.2 bc	7.4 cde	7.5 b	31.1 bcd
Talon	61.0 c	47.0 b	25.9 b	26.9 cd	6.6 c-f	20.2 a-d	45.5 a	9.8 bcd	5.9 b	30.0 bcd
Calibra	70.5 c	50.0 b	24.3 bcd	31.6 bc	11.6 a-e	26.2 a-d	34.2 bc	8.5 b-e	8.0 b	34.7 bcd
MG 3										
Legend	62.0 c	43.0 bc	16.1 cd	43.0 a	2.9 ef	5.6 e	14.4 d	4.9 e	2.9 c	10.5 e
XP0188-16000	27.0 e	45.0 bc	23.6 bcd	44.0 a	7.5 bcd	14.0 cd	30.4 c	10.8 b-e	8.0 b	24.8 cd
Anillo	13.0 f	76.0 a	48.0 a	35.2 bc	7.9 bcd	18.6 a-d	37.9 abc	15.3 a	12.6 a	33.9 bc
MG 4										
Hamilton	----- ^w	79.0 a	39.2 a	35.7 abc	9.1 b-e	23.7 a-d	31.0 c	12.0 abc	6.7 b	35.7 bc
Crockett	----- ^w	88.0 a	44.7 a	35.1 bc	7.8 b-e	17.7 b-e	33.1 bc	11.9 abc	6.9 b	29.6 bcd
Joaquin	----- ^w	48.0 bc	22.8 bc	35.1 bc	16.7 a	34.8 a	42.9 ab	11.3 abc	14.0 a	46.1 a
LSD	Rank	Rank	Rank	9.0	6.1	Rank	11.6	Rank	Rank	Rank
<i>P</i> value	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0113	0.0003	0.0001

^z 2 weeks post-inoculation rating for bacterial leaf blight = 18, 24, and 31 Aug, and 6 Sep for cultivars in MG 1 to 4, respectively.

^y Within main plot, split plot, and split-split plot treatments, means in a column followed by the same letter are not significantly different based on Fisher's protected least significant difference (LSD, $P < 0.05$). If the ANOVA F-test was not significant, means separation letters are not shown.

^x Rank = data subjected to Friedman's non-parametric rank test. Original means are shown but means separation is based on transformed data.

^w Ratings for tops down were not taken due to mechanical damage to foliage in plots for MG 4.

Table 2.

Inoculated plots	Tops down on 9 Aug (%)	Bacterial leaf blight 2 weeks after inoculation ^z		Bulb yield at harvest (t/A)		Bulbs culled at harvest from bacterial rot		Bacterial bulb rot after 5 months in storage		Bacterial bulb rot incidence at harvest + storage (%)
		Incidence (% of plants)	Severity (% of canopy)	Marketable bulbs	Bacterial culls	Incidence (% of bulbs)	Severity per bulb (%)	Incidence of bulbs (%)	Severity per bulb (%)	
Split plots										
MG 1	90.7 a ^y	78.0 b	46.0	16.6 c	16.4	48.8	42.8 b	10.9	12.2	59.7
MG 2	63.3 b	86.7 a	48.3	19.6 bc	15.3	42.7	59.3 a	11.2	11.1	53.9
MG 3	33.3 c	85.3 ab	47.2	34.8 a	10.8	22.7	43.0 b	14.9	12.1	37.6
MG 4	----- ^x	91.3 a	47.4	29.0 ab	15.6	36.2	49.4 b	14.5	13.8	50.7
LSD	Rank ^w	Rank	7.8	Rank	Rank	Rank	8.4	4.4	Rank	Rank
<i>P</i> value	0.0001	0.0357	0.9607	0.0039	0.5251	0.0911	0.0004	0.1394	0.5694	0.2176
Split-split plots (cultivars nested in MG)										
MG 1										
Frontier	89.0 a	84.0	50.2 b	9.9 f	13.7 abc	56.4 ab	47.4 b	8.8	8.8 bcd	65.2 ab
SV0106-NG	90.0 a	80.0	53.8 ab	16.7 def	24.4 a	62.4 a	53.3 ab	8.0	16.6 abc	70.4 ab
Traverse	93.0 a	70.0	33.9 cd	23.3 cde	10.9 cd	27.7 c-f	27.8 c	15.9	11.2 bcd	43.6 cde
MG 2										
Tamara	53.0 cd	84.0	50.2 b	16.3 ef	14.1 abc	46.5 abc	62.4 a	12.0	13.5 abc	58.5 a-d
Talon	62.0 bc	88.0	50.0 b	20.5 c-f	11.4 cd	35.6 b-e	62.6 a	9.1	7.1 cd	44.7 b-e
Calibra	75.0 b	88.0	44.6 bc	22.1 c-f	20.3 ab	45.9 abc	52.9 ab	12.5	12.6 abc	58.4 a-d
MG 3										
Legend	56.0 c	78.0	30.1 d	41.9 a	5.3 d	10.5 f	27.2 c	8.0	4.3 d	18.5 f
XP0188-16000	30.0 de	82.0	44.7 bc	34.4 ab	13.1 abc	25.3 cde	47.9 b	18.5	15.0 abc	43.8 a-d
Anillo	14.0 e	96.0	66.8 a	28.0 bcd	13.9 abc	32.4 a-d	53.9 ab	18.1	16.9 ab	50.5 a-d
MG 4										
Hamilton	----- ^x	98.0	52.4 b	30.3 bc	12.6 bcd	32.5 a-d	44.5 b	15.5	10.8 bcd	48.0 a-d
Crockett	----- ^x	92.0	48.1 b	30.1 abc	10.9 cd	26.4 def	47.1 b	14.3	9.8 bcd	40.7 def
Joaquin	----- ^x	84.0	41.7 bcd	26.4 b-e	23.4 a	49.6 abc	56.6 ab	13.8	20.8 a	63.4 abc
LSD	Rank	Rank	13.5	Rank	Rank	Rank	14.6	7.6	Rank	Rank
<i>P</i> value	0.0012	0.0586	0.0001	0.0191	0.0002	0.0001	0.0003	0.0585	0.0152	0.0004
Non-inoculated plots										
Split plots										
MG 1	83.3 a	4.7 c	1.2 c	33.9	1.1	2.9	9.1	4.1	2.3	7.0
MG 2	57.3 b	9.3 bc	3.6 c	37.0	0.9	2.5	14.7	5.9	3.2	8.4
MG 3	34.7 c	24.0 b	11.2 b	46.7	1.4	2.7	12.1	5.8	3.6	8.5
MG 4	----- ^x	52.0 a	23.7 a	41.7	6.8	14.7	21.9	8.9	4.6	23.6
LSD	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	9.8	3.7	2.9	9.0
<i>P</i> value	0.0002	0.0001	0.0001	0.0867	0.0863	0.0965	0.0657	0.2633	0.6091	0.1298
Split-split plots (cultivars nested in MG)										
MG 1										
Frontier	80.0 bc	6.0 c	0.3 b	23.3 f	0.7	2.7	12.8 abc	8.9 abc	2.8 bc	11.6 a-d
SV0106-NG	80.0 bc	2.0 c	0.1 b	43.1 abc	2.4	5.6	13.5 abc	2.4 de	3.8 abc	8.0 b-e
Traverse	90.0 a	6.0 c	3.3 b	35.5 c-e	0.1	0.6	1.0 c	1.1 e	0.3 c	1.7 efg
MG 2										
Tamara	46.0 ef	10.0 c	5.1 b	35.6 bcd	0.4	0.9	4.0 bc	2.8 cde	1.4 c	3.7 d-g
Talon	60.0 de	6.0 c	1.7 b	33.2 def	1.7	4.8	28.4 a	10.5 a	4.7 abc	15.3 a-d
Calibra	66.0 cd	12.0 c	4.0 b	43.4 abc	0.6	1.6	10.8 abc	4.5 b-e	3.5 abc	6.1 c-f
MG 3										
Legend	68.0 bcd	8.0 c	2.0 b	44.1 bcd	0.4	0.7	1.6 c	1.8 e	1.4 c	2.5 c-g
XP0188-16000	24.0 fg	8.0 c	2.4 b	53.6 a	1.8	2.6	12.9 abc	3.1 b-e	1.1 c	5.7 c-g
Anillo	12.0 g	56.0 b	29.2 a	42.3 bcd	1.8	4.8	21.8 a	12.6 a	8.2 a	17.4 a-f
MG 4										
Hamilton	----- ^x	60.0 b	26.0 a	41.1 a-d	5.6	14.9	17.5 abc	8.6 a-d	2.6 bc	23.5 ab
Crockett	----- ^x	84.0 a	41.3 a	40.1 a-d	4.7	9.0	19.1 ab	9.4 ab	4.0 abc	18.4 b-e
Joaquin	----- ^x	12.0 c	3.9 b	43.7 a-d	9.9	20.0	29.3 a	8.7 a-d	7.3 ab	28.7 a
LSD	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	17.0	6.4	5.0	15.6
<i>P</i> value	0.0001	0.0003	0.0003	0.0001	0.0869	0.1040	0.0260	0.0014	0.0238	0.0067

^z 2 weeks post-inoculation rating for bacterial leaf blight = 18, 24, and 31 Aug, and 6 Sep for cultivars in MG 1 to 4, respectively.

^y Within main plot, split plot, and split-split plot treatments, means in a column followed by the same letter are not significantly different based on Fisher's protected least significant difference (LSD, $P < 0.05$). If the ANOVA F-test was not significant, means separation letters are not shown.

^x Foliar ratings for tops down were not taken due to mechanical damage to onion foliage in cultivar maturity group 4.

^w Rank = data subjected to Friedman's non-parametric rank test. Original means are shown but means separation is based on transformed data.