# Nutritional Similarity in Carbon Source Utilization of *Erwinia amylovora* and Its Potential Biocontrol Agents

# Recep KOTAN\* Fikrettin SAHİN\*\* Arzu GÖRMEZ\*

- \* Atatürk University, Faculty of Agriculture, Department of Plant Protection, TR-25240 Erzurum-Turkey
- Correspondence to: rkotan@atauni.edu.tr
- \*\* Yeditepe University, Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, Department of Genetic and Bioengineering, TR-34755 Istanbul, Turkey

#### ABSTRACT

Total 206 bacterial strains belonged to 35 different genera, were isolated from pome fruits, and tested for antagonistic activity against Erwinia amylovora strains causing fire blight on pome fruits under *in-vitro* and *in-vivo* conditions. Sixty two of the test strains were selected as potential biocontrol agents, which displayed antagonistic activity against Erwinia amylovora strains in in-vitro condition. The antagonistic activities of the pre-selected strains alone and in combinations were further tested in invivo tests using one year-old Golden delicious apples twigs. The results suggested that 21 strains and their six different combinations had potential to be used as biocontrol agents for management of fire blight. The most successful results obtained from four Pantoea agglomerans, one Enterobacter intermedius, one Pseudomonas putida strains and six different combinations of the bacterial strains tested. Nutritional similarity was determined by using sole carbon source utilization profiles (BIOLOG, Hayward, CA) between biocontrol agents and pathogen. This study indicated that there is a strong correlation in nutritional profile of pathogen of fire blight and potential biocontrol agents selected. Therefore, this is the first study providing evidence that nutritional similarity between pathogen and biocontrol agents may be one of the important factors and needs to be used for effective disease management programs.

Key words: Antibiosis, BIOLOG, biological control, *Erwinia amylovora*, fire blight, MIS, *Pantoea agglomerans* 

### **INTRODUCTION**

Fire blight, caused by *Erwinia amylovora* (Burrill, Winslow et al.), is a common and very serious bacterial disease limiting the production of pear, apple, and other pome fruits and other members of the family of Rosaceae in many parts of the world (Van der Zwet and Keil 1979). Characteristic symptoms of the disease are wilting and water soaking and eventual necrosis of affected tissues. Disease severity is dependent on the susceptibility of the host, the aggressiveness of the pathogen, and the environment (Demir and Gündogdu 1993). Fire blight was the first recorded Turkey in some pear orchards of central and western part of Anatolia in 1985 (Oktem and Benlioglu 1988) and also in Denizli, Aydın and İzmir provinces in 1986 (Demir and Gündogdu 1991). It

is now distributed practically in most of the pear, quince and apple growing regions of Turkey (Momol et al. 1991; Momol and Yegen 1993; Kotan 2002; Kotan et al. 2006).

Cultural management of the host, removing and destroying infected tissue from trees and pruning infected branches plays an important role in the severity of disease (Momol et al. 1991). Chemical control programs have focused on the suppression of E. amylovora on floral parts through the use of antibiotics (Pusey 1997). However, the high costs of chemical control, failures in chemical control due to resistance development, and lack of other effective control measures have, therefore, generated considerable interest in biological control of fire blight (Loper et al. 1991; Saygılı and Ustün 1996). Previous studies have reported the presence of some bacterial species releasing antimicrobial compounds which inhibite growth of E. amylovora (Wodzinski and Paulin 1994; Lindow et al. 1996; Pusev 1997; Nuclo et al. 1998; Pusev 1999; Johnson et al. 2000; Mercier and Lindow 2001; Wright et al. 2001; Jock et al. 2002; Pusey 2002; Stockwell et al. 2002; Ozaktan and Bora 2003; Johnson et al. 2004; Broggini et al. 2005). The first commercial biological control product for fire blight, Blight Ban (Plant Health Technologies, Boise, Idaho), went on the market Pf-A506, which competes with the fire blight bacterium for nutrients or blossoms, keeping the numbers of Erwinia low enough to avoid severe infection (Lindow et al. 1996).

Biological control of phytopathogens is known to be achieved by four different mechanisms including antibiosis, competition, hyperparatism and induced resistance (Janisiewicz and Korsten 2002). Most biocontrol agents apply only one of these four mechanisms; however, some may employ more than one. Those mechanisms are direct competition with the target organism, antibiosis, predation or parasitism of the target organism and induced resistance of the host plant (Cook and Baker 1983). Competition for nutrients and space can be an effective mechanism of biological control. However, these mechanisms of biological control have been difficult to study because no method has been available to determine the significance of each of the components of competition (Dianese et al. 2003).

It is well known that there is a great deal of specificity among pathogen, host, and biological control agents (Poppe et al. 2003). The specificity may be explained many factors, one of which is nutritional similarity between pathogen and biocontrol agents. However, there have been no attempts to study nutritional similarity between *E. amylovora* and its biocontrol agents so far.

Therefore, the aims of this study were to evaluate the nonpathogenic bacterial strains isolated from pome fruits for biological control of *E. amylovora*, and to determine nutritional similarity between *E. amylovora* and potential biocontrol agents by using sole carbon source utilization profiles.

#### **MATERIALS and METHODS**

#### Candidate antagonistic bacterial Strains used for testing

Total 206 nonpathogenic bacterial strains belonged to 35 different genera were used in this study (Table 1). The bacteria had been isolated originally from aerial part of

pome fruits from different locations in eastern Anatolia region of Turkey. All bacterial strains had been identified according to fatty acid methyl ester profile by using the MIDI system (Microbial Identification System, Inc., Newark, DE, version 5.0) (Roy 1988; Paisley 1995). Pathogenicity of all potential biocontrol bacterial strains has been determined in a previous study on the basis of hypersensitivity test on tobacco plants and inoculation on apple twigs cv. Golden delicious. All of them were not pathogen. But, the bacterium *E. amylovora* Strain RK-228 was determined to be pathogen on apple and pear (Kotan 2002). All strains were stored at - 80°C in 15% glycerol and Luria Broth (LB) for using further studies.

Table 1. Antagonistic activity of biocontrol bacterial strains against E. amylovora in in-vitro condition

Bacterial genus <sup>a</sup>	NTS -	In-vitro test results <sup>b</sup>				
Bacteriai genus	N15 -	-	+	++	+++	
Pantoea spp.	32	15	7	4	6	
Bacillus spp.	31	22	7	2	0	
Enterobacter spp.	23	13	8	2	0	
Alcaligenes spp.	17	7	5	2	3	
Serratia spp.	12	9	3	0	0	
Leclercia spp.	11	8	3	0	0	
Agrobacterium spp	9	9	0	0	0	
Burkholderia spp.	8	8	0	0	0	
Klebsiella spp.	8	6	2	0	0	
Acinetobacter spp.	7	5	2	0	0	
Erwinia spp.	7	5	0	2	0	
Pseudomonas spp.	7	6	1	0	0	
Curtobacterium spp.	4	4	0	0	0	
Actinomadura spp.	3	3	0	0	0	
Chryseobacterium spp.	2	2	0	0	0	
Citrobacter spp.	2	2	0	0	0	
Kocuria spp.	2	2	0	0	0	
Plesiomonas spp.	2	2	0	0	0	
Ralstonia spp.	2	2	0	0	0	
Vibrio spp.	2	2	0	0	0	
Aerococcus spp.	1	1	0	0	0	
Brevibacillus spp.	1	1	0	0	0	
Brevibacterium spp.	1	1	0	0	0	
Brevundimonas spp.	1	1	0	0	0	
Chromobacterium spp.	1	0	1	0	0	
Escherichia spp.	1	1	0	0	0	
Methylobacterium spp.	1	1	0	0	0	
Micrococcus spp.	1	1	0	0	0	
Neisseria spp.	1	1	0	0	0	
Pediococcus spp.	1	1	0	0	0	
Photobacterium spp.	1	1	0	0	0	
Proteus spp.	1	1	0	0	0	
Salmonella spp.	1	0	1	0	0	
Sphingomonas spp.	1	1	0	0	0	
Yersinia spp.	1	0	1	0	0	
Number of total strains	206	144	43	11	9	

<sup>a</sup> Source is Kotan (2002) and Kotan et al. (2005)

<sup>b</sup>-: no inhibition zone, +: 5-29 mm (weak inhibition zone), ++: 30-49 mm (moderate inhibition zone) and +++ :> 50 mm (strong inhibition zone), and all tests were repeated three times per week to three replicate for each bacterial strains

NTS: Number of tested strains

#### In-vitro antagonistic activity on Petri dishes

The nonpathogenic bacteria were tested for antagonistic activity against E. amylovora Strain RK-228 that was determined to be pathogen on apple and pear (Kotan et al. 2005). Standard medium Sensitive Agar (SA) was used all in-vitro Petri assays. The well diffusion assay described by Schilinger and Lucke (1989) was used with a minor modification that included by spreading 100  $\mu$ l of suspension of 10<sup>8</sup> cfu/ml<sup>-1</sup> of the pathogen on whole SA plates (95 mm diameter) surface and streaked 20  $\mu$ l of suspension of 10<sup>8</sup> cfu/ml<sup>-1</sup> of antagonistic bacteria with a sterile swap as single line the middle of the plates. The inoculated plates were incubated at 26-27°C for 7 days. The antagonistic activity was determined by measuring inhibitory zones (mm) around single line of the antagonistic bacteria. Data were the combined means from three separate experiments which were repeated for each strain. The ratings used were modified from Lee and Hwang (2002). The mean of inhibition zones was given in Table 1 as; -: no inhibition zone, +: 5-29 mm (weak inhibition zone), ++: 30-49 mm (moderate inhibition zone) and +++: > 50 mm (strong inhibition zone). Total 62 strains were selected as potential biocontrol agents based on the result of *in-vitro* tests and further tested in-vivo assay.

#### In-vivo assays on shoots

*In-vivo* assay, sixty-three antagonistic strains selected in in-vitro assay was tested for in-vivo assay alone or six different combinations of 10 strains (Pantoea agglomerans Strain RK-79, 80, 84 and 160, Alcaligenes piechaudii Strain RK-105 and 156, Leclercia adecarboxylata Strain RK-164, Bacillus pumilus Strain RK-103, Curtobacterium flaccumfaciens Strain RK-114 and Pseudomonas putida Strain RK-142). The combinations consisted of A (A. piechaudii strain RK-105 and RK-156), B (P. agglomerans strain RK-79 and L. adecarboxylata RK-164), C (A. piechaudii strain RK-156 and B. pumilus RK-103), D (P. agglomerans strain RK-80 and RK-84), E (P. agglomerans strain RK-160 and P. putida RK-142) and F (A. piechaudii strain RK-105, B. pumilus RK-103, C. flaccumfaciens RK-114, L. adecarboxylata RK-164, RK-P. agglomerans 79 and P. putida RK-142). An in-vivo test described by Moragrega et al. (2003) was used with a minor modification. One year-old Golden delicious apples twigs (15-20 cm length) were inoculated with 10<sup>8</sup> cfu/ml<sup>-1</sup> suspensions of pathogen and antagonistic bacterial cultures grown on nutrient broth (NB) for 24-48 h on rotary shakers under 130 rpm at 26-27 °C. Absorbance of bacterial suspension was measured spectrophotometrically at 600 nm and appropriately diluted to  $10^8$  cfu/ml<sup>-1</sup> with sterilized water. Each of apple twigs was sprayed by 200 ml of the pathogen and biocontrol bacterial suspensions, which were diluted 1/1 ratio. It was used the only pathogen suspension and sterile distillated water as positive and negative control, respectively. The inoculated twigs separately put in flasks were full with water and incubated in polyethylene bags at room temperature for 3 days and maintained on the greenhouse bench after which the bags were removed. Development of typical bacterial fire blight symptoms were observed on leaves of inoculated twigs after incubation 20 days. Results were evaluated by based on 1-5 scales (1 = no symptom on leaves, 2 = 1-25% disease of leaves, 3=26-50% disease of leaves, 4=51-75% disease of leaves and 5=76-100% disease of

leaves) (Braun-Kiewnick et al. 1997). This test was repeated at least three times for each biocontrol strain.

#### Statistical analyses

*In-vivo* data were analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences, Windows 9.9) Statistical Analysis System. Analysis of variance (Duncan Multiple Range Test at p<0.05) was used for data analysis.

# Determination of similarity in carbon source utilization profiles between the potential biocontrol agents and *E. amylovora*

Biolog GN and GP micro titer plates (Biolog, Inc., Hayward, CA) were used in this study. One or two days before the inoculation of Biolog plates, pathogen and potential biocontrol bacterial strains were streaked on TSA or BUG agar plates. Each well of biolog GN2 or GP2 micro titer plates (Biolog, Inc. Hayward, CA) was inoculated with 125  $\mu$ l of the bacterial suspension respectively adjusted to the appropriate density (10<sup>8</sup> cfu/ml) and incubated at 27°C for 24 and 48 h. The development of color was automatically recorded using a micro plate reader with a 590 nm wavelength filter. This system relies on the potential utilization of 95 substrates in a micro titer plate by bacteria. Color development in each well reflected the ability of the bacteria to utilize that specific carbon source. Similarity in carbon source utilization between bioagents and pathogen was estimated by using carbon utilization data on the Biolog GN and GP profiles with the formulae NSI <sub>Biolog</sub><sup>=</sup> the number of compounds used by both the biocontrol bacteria and pathogen/the number of compounds used by pathogen (Wilson and Lindow 1994). The results were given in Table 3, 4.

#### RESULTS

According to *in-vitro* test results, only 63 of the 206 strains (30.58%) were found with an inhibitory activity against *E amylovora* (Table 1). Of which was 27.41% *Pantoea* sp., 16.12% *Alcaligenes* sp. and *Enterobacter* sp., 14.51% *Bacillus* sp. and 24.19% others belong to 9 different genus (*Acinetobacter* sp., *Chromobacterium* sp., *Erwinia* sp., *Klepsiella* sp., *Leclercia* sp., *Pseudomonas* sp., *Serratia* sp., *Salmonella* sp. and *Yersinia* sp.). The other 144 strains significantly did not have significant inhibitory activity against *E. amylovora*.

The *in-vivo* tests results, given in Table 2, demonstrated that twenty one bacterial strains belonging to 10 different species (*Alcaligenes* sp., *Bacillus* sp., *Chromobacterium* sp., *Curtobacterium* sp., *Enterobacter* sp., *Erwinia* sp., *Leclercia* sp., *Pantoea* sp., *Pseudomonas* sp.) and in six different combinations of some strains were found effective antagonist under *in-vivo* conditions. All of them significantly reduced disease severity compared with the positive control (treated with pathogen only). The remaining forty two strains belonging to 10 different species (*Acinetobacter* sp., *Alcaligenes* sp., *Bacillus* sp., *Enterobacter* sp., *Klepsiella* sp., *Leclercia* sp., *Pantoea* sp., *Salmonella* sp., *Serratia* sp. and *Yersinia* sp.) were not found effective antagonist under *in-vivo* conditions.

Table 2.	Disease severity results on one year old apple shoots in <i>in-vivo</i> condition, and nutritional similarity
	in carbon source utilization between biocontol bacterial strains and pathogen

The other 41 different strains5.00 aNBacillus pumilusRK-1033.66 b0.5Chromobacterium violaceumRK-1653.66 b1.0Pantoea agglomeransRK-1133.66 b0.5Erwinia rhaponticiRK-135 <sup>b</sup> 3.00 bc1.0Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-1362.66 cd0.5Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-1572.33 cd1.0Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-1582.33 cd1.0Laclercia adecarboxylataRK-1632.33 cd0.5Laclercia adecarboxylataRK-1642.66 cd0.7Pantoea agglomeransRK-922.33 cd0.8Laclercia adecarboxylataRK-1642.66 cd0.7Pantoea agglomeransRK-1542.00 de1.0Pantoea agglomeransRK-1542.00 de1.0Pantoea agglomeransRK-1692.00 de0.8Pantoea agglomeransRK-1542.00 de0.5Pantoea agglomeransRK-1691.33 ef0.5Pantoea agglomeransRK-1231.33 ef0.5Pantoea agglomeransRK-1231.33 ef0.5Pantoea agglomeransRK-1231.33 ef0.5Pantoea agglomeransRK-1231.33 ef0.5Pantoea agglomeransRK-1421.33 ef0.5Pantoea agglomeransRK-191.00 fNCombination E1.33 ef0.50.5Combination A1.00 f0.50.5Combination A1.00 f<	Nutritional similarity (%) <sup>b</sup>		
Bacillus pumilus         RK-103         3.66 b         0.5           Chromobacterium violaceum         RK-165         3.66 b         1.0           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-113         3.66 b         0.5           Erwinia rhapontici         RK-135 <sup>b</sup> 3.00 bc         1.0           Alcaligenes piechaudii         RK-136         2.66 cd         0.5           Alcaligenes piechaudii         RK-157         2.33 cd         1.0           Alcaligenes piechaudii         RK-163         2.33 cd         0.5           Laclercia adecarboxylata         RK-163         2.33 cd         0.5           Laclercia adecarboxylata         RK-164         2.66 cd         0.7           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-92         2.33 cd         0.8           Alcaligenes piechaudii         RK-137 <sup>b</sup> 2.33 cd         0.8           Laclercia adecarboxylata         RK-164         2.66 cd         0.7           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-114 <sup>b</sup> 2.66 cd         0.8           Curtobacterium flaccumfaciens         RK-154         2.00 de         0.8           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-169         2.00 de         0.8           Enterobacter intermedius         RK-123         1.33 ef <t< td=""><td>١D</td></t<>	١D		
Chromobacterium violaceum         RK-165         3.66 b         1.0           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-113         3.66 b         0.9           Erwinia rhapontici         RK-135 <sup>b</sup> 3.00 bc         1.0           Alcaligenes piechaudii         RK-136         2.66 cd         0.9           Alcaligenes piechaudii         RK-157         2.33 cd         1.0           Alcaligenes piechaudii         RK-163         2.33 cd         1.0           Erwinia chrysanthemi         RK-67         2.33 cd         0.9           Laclercia adecarboxylata         RK-163         2.33 cd         0.7           Laclercia adecarboxylata         RK-164         2.66 cd         0.7           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-92         2.33 cd         0.8           Alcaligenes piechaudii         RK-137 <sup>b</sup> 2.33 cd         0.8           Alcaligenes piechaudii         RK-164         2.66 cd         0.7           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-114 <sup>b</sup> 2.66 cd         0.8           Curtobacterium flaccumfaciens         RK-114 <sup>b</sup> 2.00 de         0.8           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-123         1.33 ef         0.9           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-123         1.33 ef <t< td=""><td>T</td></t<>	T		
Pantoea agglomeransRK-113 $3.66$ b $0.5$ Erwinia rhaponticiRK-135 <sup>b</sup> $3.00$ bc $1.0$ Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-136 $2.66$ cd $0.5$ Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-157 $2.33$ cd $1.0$ Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-158 $2.33$ cd $1.0$ Erwinia chrysanthemiRK-67 $2.33$ cd $0.5$ Laclercia adecarboxylataRK-163 $2.33$ cd $0.5$ Laclercia adecarboxylataRK-164 $2.66$ cd $0.5$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-92 $2.33$ cd $0.6$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-114 <sup>b</sup> $2.66$ cd $0.5$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-169 $2.00$ de $0.6$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-169 $2.00$ de $0.6$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-123 $1.33$ ef $0.5$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-80 $1.33$ ef $0.5$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-79 $1.00$ f $1.00$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-84 $1.00$ f $0.5$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-84 $1.00$ f $0.5$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-91 $0.5$ $0.5$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-91 $0.5$ $0.5$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-91 $0.5$ $0.5$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-91 $0.5$ $0.5$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-91 $0.5$ $0.5$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-91 $0.5$ $0.5$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-91 $0.5$ $0.5$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-9	.54		
Erwinia rhaponticiRK-135b $3.00 \text{ bc}$ $1.00$ Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-136 $2.66 \text{ cd}$ $0.5$ Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-157 $2.33 \text{ cd}$ $1.00$ Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-158 $2.33 \text{ cd}$ $1.00 \text{ ft}$ Erwinia chrysanthemiRK-67 $2.33 \text{ cd}$ $0.5$ Laclercia adecarboxylataRK-163 $2.33 \text{ cd}$ $0.5$ Laclercia adecarboxylataRK-164 $2.66 \text{ cd}$ $0.7$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-92 $2.33 \text{ cd}$ $0.8$ Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-137b $2.33 \text{ cd}$ $0.8$ Curtobacterium flaccumfaciensRK-114b $2.66 \text{ cd}$ $0.5$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-169 $2.00 \text{ de}$ $0.6$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-169 $2.00 \text{ de}$ $0.6$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-169 $2.00 \text{ de}$ $0.6$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-123 $1.33 \text{ ef}$ $0.5$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-123 $1.33 \text{ ef}$ $0.5$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-142 $1.33 \text{ ef}$ $0.5$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-142 $1.33 \text{ ef}$ $0.5$ Pantoea agglomeransRK-191 $1.00 \text{ f}$ $1.00 \text{ f}$ Negative control (water) $1.00 \text{ f}$ $0.5$ Combination B $1.00 \text{ f}$ $0.5$	.00		
Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-1362.66 cd0.5Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-1572.33 cd1.0Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-1582.33 cd1.0Erwinia chrysanthemiRK-672.33 cd0.5Laclercia adecarboxylataRK-1632.33 cd0.7Laclercia adecarboxylataRK-1642.66 cd0.7Pantoea agglomeransRK-922.33 cd0.8Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-137b2.33 cd0.8Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-137b2.33 cd0.8Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-137b2.33 cd0.8Curtobacterium flaccumfaciensRK-114b2.66 cd0.8Pantoea agglomeransRK-1692.00 de1.0Pantoea agglomeransRK-1692.00 de0.8Enterobacter intermediusRK-1231.33 ef0.5Pantoea agglomeransRK-1231.33 ef0.5Pantoea agglomeransRK-1421.33 ef0.5Pantoea agglomeransRK-791.00 f1.0Pantoea agglomeransRK-841.00 f0.5Combination E1.33 ef0.50.5Combination A1.00 f0.50.5Combination B1.00 f0.5Combination B1.00 f0.5	.97		
Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-1572.33 cd1.0Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-1582.33 cd1.0Erwinia chrysanthemiRK-672.33 cd0.5Laclercia adecarboxylataRK-1632.33 cd0.7Laclercia adecarboxylataRK-1642.66 cd0.7Pantoea agglomeransRK-922.33 cd0.8Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-17 <sup>b</sup> 2.33 cd0.8Curtobacterium flaccumfaciensRK-114 <sup>b</sup> 2.66 cd0.8Pantoea agglomeransRK-1542.00 de1.0Pantoea agglomeransRK-1692.00 de0.8Pantoea agglomeransRK-1692.00 de0.8Pantoea agglomeransRK-1692.00 de0.8Pantoea agglomeransRK-1692.00 de0.9Pantoea agglomeransRK-1691.33 ef0.9Pantoea agglomeransRK-1231.33 ef0.9Pantoea agglomeransRK-1421.33 ef0.9Pantoea agglomeransRK-791.00 f1.0Pantoea agglomeransRK-841.00 f0.9Combination E1.33 ef0.90.9Combination B1.00 f0.90.9Combination B1.00 f0.8Combination B1.00 f0.8	.00		
Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-1582.33 cd1.0Erwinia chrysanthemiRK-672.33 cd0.5Laclercia adecarboxylataRK-1632.33 cd0.7Laclercia adecarboxylataRK-1642.66 cd0.7Pantoea agglomeransRK-922.33 cd0.8Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-137b2.33 cd0.8Curtobacterium flaccumfaciensRK-114b2.66 cd0.8Pantoea agglomeransRK-1542.00 de1.0Pantoea agglomeransRK-1692.00 de0.8Pantoea agglomeransRK-1692.00 de0.8Pantoea agglomeransRK-1692.00 de0.8Pantoea agglomeransRK-1692.00 de0.8Pantoea agglomeransRK-1691.33 ef0.9Pantoea agglomeransRK-1231.33 ef0.9Pantoea agglomeransRK-1421.33 ef0.9Pantoea agglomeransRK-791.00 f1.0Pantoea agglomeransRK-841.00 f0.9Combination E1.33 ef0.90.9Combination B1.00 f0.90.9	.91		
Erwinia chrysanthemiRK-672.33 cd0.95Laclercia adecarboxylataRK-1632.33 cd0.75Laclercia adecarboxylataRK-1642.66 cd0.75Pantoea agglomeransRK-922.33 cd0.85Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-137b2.33 cd0.85Curtobacterium flaccumfaciensRK-114b2.66 cd0.85Pantoea agglomeransRK-1542.00 de1.05Pantoea agglomeransRK-1692.00 de0.85Pantoea agglomeransRK-1692.00 de0.85Pantoea agglomeransRK-1692.00 de0.85Pantoea agglomeransRK-1691.03 ef0.95Pantoea agglomeransRK-1231.33 ef0.95Pantoea agglomeransRK-1421.33 ef0.95Pantoea agglomeransRK-791.00 f1.05Pantoea agglomeransRK-841.00 f0.95Combination E1.33 ef0.95Combination B1.00 f0.95	.00		
Laclercia adecarboxylataRK-1632.33 cd0.7Laclercia adecarboxylataRK-1642.66 cd0.7Pantoea agglomeransRK-922.33 cd0.8Alcaligenes piechaudiiRK-137b2.33 cd0.8Curtobacterium flaccumfaciensRK-114b2.66 cd0.8Pantoea agglomeransRK-1422.00 de1.0Pantoea agglomeransRK-1692.00 de0.8Pantoea agglomeransRK-1692.00 de0.8Pantoea agglomeransRK-1692.00 de0.8Pantoea agglomeransRK-1691.33 ef0.7Pantoea agglomeransRK-1231.33 ef0.9Pantoea agglomeransRK-1231.33 ef0.9Pantoea agglomeransRK-1421.33 ef0.9Pantoea agglomeransRK-791.00 f1.0Pantoea agglomeransRK-841.00 f0.9Combination E1.33 ef0.90.9Combination B1.00 f0.90.9Combination B1.00 f0.90.9Combination B1.00 f0.9Combination B1.00 f0.8	.00		
Laclercia adecarboxylata       RK-164       2.66 cd       0.7         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-92       2.33 cd       0.8         Alcaligenes piechaudii       RK-137 <sup>b</sup> 2.33 cd       0.8         Curtobacterium flaccumfaciens       RK-114 <sup>b</sup> 2.66 cd       0.8         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-14 <sup>b</sup> 2.66 cd       0.8         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-14 <sup>b</sup> 2.66 cd       0.8         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-169       2.00 de       1.0         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-169       2.00 de       0.8         Enterobacter intermedius       RK-91       1.33 ef       0.7         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-80       1.33 ef       0.9         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-123       1.33 ef       0.9         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-79       1.00 f       1.0         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-79       1.00 f       0.9         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-84       1.00 f       0.9         Combination E       1.33 ef       0.9       0.9         Combination B       1.00 f       0.9       0.9	.97		
Pantoea agglomerans       RK-92       2.33 cd       0.8         Alcaligenes piechaudii       RK-137 <sup>b</sup> 2.33 cd       0.8         Curtobacterium flaccumfaciens       RK-114 <sup>b</sup> 2.66 cd       0.8         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-14 <sup>b</sup> 2.66 cd       0.8         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-169       2.00 de       1.0         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-169       2.00 de       0.8         Enterobacter intermedius       RK-91       1.33 ef       0.7         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-80       1.33 ef       0.9         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-123       1.33 ef       0.9         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-142       1.33 ef       0.9         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-79       1.00 f       1.0         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-84       1.00 f       0.9         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-84       1.00 f       0.9         Combination E       1.33 ef       0.9       0.9         Combination B       1.00 f       0.9       0.9	.77		
Alcaligenes piechaudii       RK-137 <sup>b</sup> 2.33 cd       0.8         Curtobacterium flaccumfaciens       RK-114 <sup>b</sup> 2.66 cd       0.8         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-154       2.00 de       1.0         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-169       2.00 de       0.8         Enterobacter intermedius       RK-91       1.33 ef       0.7         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-80       1.33 ef       0.7         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-123       1.33 ef       0.9         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-142       1.33 ef       0.9         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-142       1.33 ef       0.9         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-79       1.00 f       1.0         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-79       1.00 f       0.9         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-84       1.00 f       0.9         Combination E       1.33 ef       0.9       0.9         Combination B       1.00 f       0.9       0.9	.74		
Curtobacterium flaccumfaciensRK-114b2.66 cd0.8Pantoea agglomeransRK-1542.00 de1.0Pantoea agglomeransRK-1692.00 de0.8Enterobacter intermediusRK-911.33 ef0.7Pantoea agglomeransRK-801.33 ef0.5Pantoea agglomeransRK-1231.33 ef0.6Pantoea agglomeransRK-1421.33 ef0.6Pantoea agglomeransRK-1421.33 ef0.9Pantoea agglomeransRK-791.00 f1.0Pantoea agglomeransRK-841.00 f1.0Combination E1.33 ef0.90.9Combination B1.00 f0.90.9	.88		
Pantoea agglomerans         RK-154         2.00 de         1.0           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-169         2.00 de         0.8           Enterobacter intermedius         RK-91         1.33 ef         0.7           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-91         1.33 ef         0.7           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-80         1.33 ef         0.7           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-123         1.33 ef         0.9           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-142         1.33 ef         0.9           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-79         1.00 f         1.0           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-79         1.00 f         NN           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-84         1.00 f         0.9           Combination E         1.33 ef         0.9         0.9           Combination B         1.00 f         0.9         0.9	.82		
Pantoea agglomerans       RK-169       2.00 de       0.8         Enterobacter intermedius       RK-91       1.33 ef       0.7         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-80       1.33 ef       0.7         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-123       1.33 ef       0.9         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-142       1.33 ef       0.9         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-79       1.00 f       1.0         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-79       1.00 f       1.0         Pantoea agglomerans       RK-84       1.00 f       0.9         Combination E       1.33 ef       0.9         Combination B       1.00 f       0.9         Combination B       1.00 f       0.9	.85		
Enterobacter intermedius         RK-91         1.33 ef         0.7           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-80         1.33 ef         0.5           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-123         1.33 ef         0.5           Pseudomonas putida         RK-142         1.33 ef         0.5           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-79         1.00 f         1.6           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-79         1.00 f         1.6           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-84         1.00 f         0.5           Combination E         1.33 ef         0.5         0.5           Combination A         1.00 f         0.5         0.5           Combination B         1.00 f         0.5         0.5	.00		
Pantoea agglomerans         RK-80         1.33 ef         0.5           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-123         1.33 ef         1.0           Pseudomonas putida         RK-142         1.33 ef         0.5           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-79         1.00 f         1.0           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-79         1.00 f         1.0           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-84         1.00 f         1.0           Negative control (water)         1.00 f         NN           Combination E         1.33 ef         0.5           Combination B         1.00 f         0.5	.82		
Pantoea agglomerans         RK-123         1.33 ef         1.0           Pseudomonas putida         RK-142         1.33 ef         0.5           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-79         1.00 f         1.0           Pantoea agglomerans         RK-84         1.00 f         1.0           Negative control (water)         1.00 f         NI           Combination E         1.33 ef         0.5           Combination B         1.00 f         0.5	.77		
Pseudomonas putidaRK-1421.33 ef0.5Pantoea agglomeransRK-791.00 f1.0Pantoea agglomeransRK-841.00 f1.0Negative control (water)1.00 fNICombination E1.33 ef0.5Combination A1.00 f0.5Combination B1.00 f0.5	.94		
Pantoea agglomeransRK-791.00 f1.0Pantoea agglomeransRK-841.00 f1.0Negative control (water)1.00 fNICombination E1.33 ef0.9Combination A1.00 f0.9Combination B1.00 f0.8	.00		
Pantoea agglomeransRK-841.00 f1.00Negative control (water)1.00 fNECombination E1.33 ef0.9Combination A1.00 f0.9Combination B1.00 f0.8	.97		
Negative control (water)1.00 fNICombination E1.33 ef0.9Combination A1.00 f0.9Combination B1.00 f0.8	.00		
Combination E1.33 ef0.9Combination A1.00 f0.9Combination B1.00 f0.8	.00		
Combination A         1.00 f         0.9           Combination B         1.00 f         0.8	JD		
Combination B 1.00 f 0.8	.97		
	.96		
(Combination D) = 100 f = 00	.87		
	.97 .76		
	.76 .77		

<sup>a</sup>: Disease severity tests were applied three times per week to three replicate for each bacterial strains. Based on 1-5 scales. Means with the same letter are not significantly different by Duncan multiple range test at p<0.05

<sup>b</sup>: Nutritional similarity was estimated by using carbon utilization data on the Biolog GN2 or GP2 profiles with the formulate NSI <sub>Biolog</sub>= the number of compounds used by both the biocontrol bacteria and pathogen/the number of compounds used by pathogen.

The potential biocontrol strains were as follows; *Pantoea agglomerans* (8 strains), *Alcaligenes piechaudii* (5 strains), *Laclercia adecarboxylata* (2 strains), *Erwinia chrysanthemi, Bacillus pumilus, Enterobacter intermedius, Enterobacter agglomerans, Curtobacterium flaccumfaciens, Chromobacterium violaceum* and *Pseudomonas putida* (1 strain). The most successful results were obtained from six

bacterial strains (*P. agglomerans* RK-79, 80, 84 and 123; *E. intermedius* RK-91 and *P. putida* RK-142) in six different combinations *in-vivo* assays (Table 2) at 10<sup>8</sup> cfu/ml<sup>-1</sup> concentrations. There was no significant difference in disease severity between these six successful combinations and/or the negative control (treated with sterilized water). The remaining 15 strains also reduced disease severity, but they were not as effective as the six bacterial strains fully controlled disease development on shoots.

 Table 3.
 Relationship in carbon utilization of pathogen *E. amylovora* and biocontrol bacterial strains based on GN2 or GP2 Microplate assay

Carbon sources	А	В	С	Carbon sources	А	В	С
L-Arabinose	0.95	1.00	0.93	D-Sorbitol	0.76	0.83	0.73
Formic Acid	0.90	1.00	0.87	á-Ketoglutaric Acid	0.71	0.83	0.67
D,L-Lactic Acid	0.90	1.00	0.87	Glycogen	0.67	1.00	0.53
Bromosuccinic Acid	0.90	1.00	0.87	Succinic Acid Mono- Methil Ester	0.67	0.83	0.60
L-Alanine	0.90	1.00	0.87	L-Alaninamide	0.67	0.83	0.60
L-Alanyl-Glycine	0.90	1.00	0.87	D-Raffinose	0.48	0.50	0.47
L-Aspartic Acid	0.90	1.00	0.87	N-Acetyl-D-Glucosamine	1.00	1.00	1.00
Glycyl-L-Aspartic Acid	0.90	1.00	0.87	D-Galactose	1.00	1.00	1.00
L-Proline	0.90	1.00	0.87	â-Methyl-D-Glucoside	1.00	1.00	1.00
á-D-Glucose-1 Phosphate	0.90	1.00	0.87	Sucrose	1.00	1.00	0.93
D-Fructose	0.86	0.83	0.87	D-Trehalose	1.00	1.00	1.00
D-Psicose	0.86	1.00	0.80	Pyruvic Acid Methil Ester	1.00	1.00	0.93
Glycyl-L-Glutamic Acid	0.86	0.83	0.87	D-Gluconic Acid	1.00	1.00	0.93
Gentiobiose	0.81	0.50	0.93	L-Glutamic Acid	1.00	1.00	1.00
m-Inositol	0.81	1.00	0.73	L-Serine	1.00	1.00	0.93
D-Mannitol	0.81	0.83	0.80	Inosine	1.00	1.00	0.93
Succinic Acid	0.81	1.00	0.73	Glycerol	1.00	0.83	1.00
á-D-Glucose	0.76	0.83	0.73	D-Glucose-6 Phosphate	1.00	1.00	1.00
The average of percentage carbon source					0.85	0.93	0.85

A: % Carbon sources utilized by whole bioagents reduced disease severity *in-vivo* assays and *E. amylovora*, B: The most effective bioagents and *E. amylovora*, C: The less effective bioagents and *E. amylovora* 

Nutritional similarity between bioagents which reduced disease severity in *invivo* assays, and *E. amylovora* (according to carbon source profiles, carbon sources, and the percentage of them utilized by both bioagents and *E. amylovora*, and utilized by only bioagents not *E. amylovora*) were given in Table 2, 3, 4 respectively. The nutritional similarity between the bioagents and *E. amylovora* was among 0.54% - 1.00% (Table 2). The number of the carbon sources utilized by the bioagents and *E. amylovora*, and utilized by only bioagents but not *E. amylovora* were 36, 29 respectively (Table 3, 4). The percentage of the carbon sources utilized by the whole bioagents and *E. amylovora*, the most effective bioagents and *E. amylovora*, the less effective bioagents and *E. amylovora* were 85%, 93% and 85% respectively (Table 3).

The percentage of carbon sources utilized by whole bioagents but not utilized by *E. amylovora*, the most effective bioagents but not *E. amylovora*, the less effective bioagents but not *E. amylovora* were 83%, 87% and 82% respectively (Table 4). This study indicated that there is a strong correlation in nutritional profile of pathogen of fire blight and potential biocontrol agents selected, and carbon sources utilized by the most active bioagents have important role in biocontrol.

 
 Table 4. Relationship in carbon utilization of pathogen *E. amylovora* and biocontrol bacterial strains based on GN2 or GP2 Microplate assay

Carbon sources	А	В	С	Carbon sources	А	В	С
Dextrin	1.00	1.00	1.00	Uridine	0.90	1.00	0.87
Maltose	1.00	1.00	1.00	Thymidine	0.86	1.00	0.80
D-Mannose	1.00	1.00	1.00	Malonic Acid	0.81	0.67	0.87
L-Rhamnose	1.00	1.00	1.00	Quinic Acid	0.81	0.83	0.80
Acetic Acid	1.00	1.00	1.00	Urocanic Acid	0.81	0.83	0.80
Cis-Aconitic Acid	1.00	1.00	1.00	D-Arabitol	0.70	0.50	0.87
D-Galacturonic Acid	1.00	1.00	1.00	L-Omithine	0.67	0.67	0.67
L-Asparagine	1.00	1.00	0.93	ã-Aminobutyric Acid	0.67	0.83	0.60
D-Glucuronic Acid	0.95	1.00	0.93	D-Melibiose	0.62	0.67	0.60
D-Saccharic Acid	0.95	1.00	0.93	Citric Acid	0.62	0.67	0.60
D,L,á-Glycerol Phosphate	0.95	1.00	0.93	Tween 40	0.57	0.67	0.53
Glucuronamide	0.90	0.83	0.93	á-Hydroxybutyric Acid	0.57	0.67	0.53
D-Alanine	0.90	0.83	0.93	Tween 80	0.52	0.83	0.40
L-Histidine	0.90	0.83	0.93	Turanose	0.52	0.83	0.40
D-Serine	0.90	1.00	0.87				
The average of percentage carbon source						0.87	0.82

A: % Carbon sources utilized by whole bioagents reduced disease severity *in-vivo* assays but not *E. amylovora*, B: Utilized by the most effective bioagents but not *E. amylovora*, C: Utilized by the less effective bioagents but not *E. amylovora* 

#### DISCUSSION

There are many microbial pesticides which are formulated for commercial uses, and have been used as a safe and alternative method in controlling of plant diseases (Broggini et al. 2005). But the number of microbial pesticides used against foliar pathogens is fairly less. Many of them have been used against post harvest pathogens or soil borne plant disease. The development of the biocontrol agents will help to decrease the negative effects (residues, resistance and environmental pollution) of chemical pesticides which are commonly and extensively used for plant disease management in agriculture. Fire blight is a major limiting factor in the production of pome fruit. It is most often initiated by epiphytic populations of *Erwinia amylovora* that develop on blossoms (Van der Zwet and Keil 1979). Research on biological control of fire blight has focused mainly on the flower stigma (Pusey 1999). So far, a lot of studies have successfully employed to determine antagonistic bacteria to control fire blight disease

(Johnson et al. 2000; Mercier and Lindow 2001; Wright et al. 2001; Jock et al. 2002; Pusey 2002; Stockwell et al. 2002; Ozaktan and Bora 2003; Broggini et al. 2005). These studies have been generally focused on *P. agglomerans* that is generally known as saprophytic bacteria and are useful for biological struggle. It's known that P. agglomerans produced bacteriocin, inhibited E. amylovora even it effective by competing with pathogenic bacteria place and nutriment (Zeller and Wolf 1996). There are also many studies in literature which supports the suggestion of utilizing the feature of secreting antibiotics of this type of bio agents against leaf spot disease and many after harvest diseases (Colyer and Mount 1984; Janisiewicz and Roitman 1988; Aysan et al. 2003). Wright et al. (2001), states that pantocin A and pantocin B antibiotics which are produced by P. agglomerans strain Eh318 inhibit E. amylovora in-vitro. But, it was a little known that A. piechaudii may be used against rhisosphere and philosopher plant pathogens (Colyer and Mount 1984; Cody et al. 1987; Lindow et al. 1996; Whiteman and Stewart 1998). The whole 8 different combinations showed the high antagonistic activity under in-vivo condition because bacterial formulations which are formed of mixtures of some bacterial strains should have different effect mechanisms. Therefore, applications of mixtures of biocontrol agents should be useful in reducing diseases.

In this study, total 206 bacterial strains which were isolated originally from aerial part of pome fruits from different locations in eastern Anatolia region of Turkey had been tested against *E. amylovora* in *in-vitro* assays, and it was found that the 62 strains had an inhibitory activity. But, only twenty-one strains of them and six different combinations of some strains significantly reduced disease *in-vivo* assays. *In-vitro* and *in-vivo* assays showed that there was a not correlation between strain activity, but *in-vitro* and *in-vivo* assays provide some useful information about the applicability of potential bioagents. The majority of effected strains belonged to *P. agglomerans* (38.09%). But this study is the first report that determined to be effective biocontrol agents such as *A. piechaudii*, *L. adecarboxylata*, *E. chrysanthemi*, *B. pumilus*, *E. intermedius*, *E. agglomerans*, *C. flaccumfaciens*, *C. violaceum* and *P. putida*. For this reason, this study is very important.

In *in-vivo* assays, effective bacterial strains with a high degree of similarity in utilization of carbon sources with the pathogen exhibited a higher degree of suppression of the disease. A significant correlation between similarity in carbon source utilization between antagonistic bacterial strains and the pathogen indicated that similarity in carbon source utilization profiles is a significant characteristic contributing to the biological control efficacy of these bacteria. These results agree with several studies (Janisiewicz et al. 2000; Ji and Wilson 2002; Dianes et al. 2003). Some bacterial strains provided significant disease reductions although the similarity in carbon source utilization was fairly low, and vice versa, indicating that some other biological control phenotypes may have been involved in biological control for some of these strains. In summary, similarity in carbon source utilization profiles between the biocontrol bacteria and *E. amylovora* was correlated with efficacy in control of fire blight *in-vivo* conditions. All the same, I am of the opinion that nutritional similarity index between pathogen and candidate antagonists could be used in an initial *in-vitro* screening for biological control of plant diseases.

study determined to nutritional similarity between effected biocontrol agents and *Erwinia amylovora*. In conclusion, our results show that some bacterial strains have antagonistic activity against *E. amylovora*. These strains can be used as potential biocontrol agents. Future research will be aimed at testing the effect of this isolate under field conditions on naturally infected trees.

#### Acknowledgement

The research was supported by Atatürk University of Turkey with the project number 2002/97.

# ÖZET

# *ERWİNİA AMYLOVORA* İLE POTANSİYEL BİYOAJANLAR ARASINDA KARBON KAYNAKLARININ KULLANIMINDAKİ BENZERLİKLER

Yumuşak çekirdekli meyvelerin toprak üstü kısımlarından 35 farklı cinse ait toplam 206 bakteriyel strain izole edilmiştir. Bu strainlerin antagonistik aktiviteleri, yumuşak çekirdekli meyvelerde ateş yanıklığına sebep olan bakteriyel etmen Erwinia amylovora'ya karşı in-vitro ve in-vivo'da test edilmiştir. İn-vitro şartlarda patojene karşı antagonistik aktivite gösteren strainlerin 62'si potansiyel biyoajan olarak seçilmiştir. Bu strainler ve bazı kombinasyonları bir yıllık Golden delicious elma sürgünleri kulanılarak in-vivo'da test edilmiştir. Sonuçlar test edilen strainlerin 21'i ve bazılarının 6 farklı kombinasyonları ateş yanıklığının kontrolünde potansiyel biyoajan olarak kullanılabileceğini göstermiştir. En başarılı sonuçlar, dört Pantoea agglomerans, bir Enterobacter intermedius, bir Pseudomonas putida straini ve altı farklı kombinasyondan elde edilmiştir. Patojen ve biyoajanlar arasındaki kullandıkları karbon kaynaklarının (BIOLOG, Hayward, CA) benzerlikleri değerlendirilmiştir. Bu çalışma; ateş yanıklığı etmeni ile etkili biyoajanları arasında karbonhidrat profilleri açısından güçlü bir ilişkinin olduğunu göstermesi yanısıra patojen ve biyoajanları arasındaki besin tercihlerinin benzerliğinin etkili hastalık kontrol programlarında önemli faktörlerden birisi olabileceğinin de kanıtıdır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Antibiyosis, ateş yanıklığı, BIOLOG, biyolojik kontrol, Erwinia amylovora, MIS, Pantoea agglomerans, rekabet

# LITERATURE CITED

- AYSAN, Y., A. KARATAS, O. CINAR, 2003: Biological control of bacterial stem rot caused by *Erwinia chrysanthemi* on tomato. Crop Protection 22 (6), 807-811.
- BRAUN-KIEWNICK, A., B. J. JACOBSEN, D. C. SANDS, 1997: Possible biocontrol mechanisms in the *Pseudomonas syringae-Pantoea agglomerans* interaction. Phytopathology 87, 11.

- BROGGINI, G. A. L., B. DUFFY, E. HOLLIGER, H. J. SCHARER, C. GESSLER, A. PATOCCHI, 2005. Detection of the fire blight biocontrol agent *Bacillus subtilis* BD170 (Biopro®) in Swiss apple orchard. European Journal of Plant Pathology 111, 93-100.
- CODY, Y. S., D. C. GROSS, E. L. JR. PROEBSTING, R. A. SPOTTS, 1987: Suppression of ice nucleation-active *Pseudomonas syringae* by antagonistic bacteria in fruit tree orchards and evaluations of frost control. **Phytopathology** 77, 1036-1044.
- COLYER, P. D., M. S. MOUNT, 1984: Bacterization of potatoes with *Pseudomonas putida* and its influence on post harvest soft rot diseases. **Plant Disease 68**, 703-706.
- COOK, R. J., K. F. BAKER, 1983: The nature and practice of biological control of plant pathogens, APS, 539, St Paul, Minn.
- DEMIR, G., M. GUNDOGDU, 1991: Yumuşak çekirdekli meyve ağaçlarında görülen ateş yanıklığı (*Erwinia amylovora* (Burr.) Winslow *et al.*) hastalığı üzerinde araştırmalar. VI. Türkiye Fitopatoloji Kongresi Bildiriler, 7-11 Ekim, İzmir, Türkiye, 299-302.
- DEMIR, G., M. GUNDOGDU, 1993: Fire blight of pome fruit trees in Turkey, Distributions of the disease, and chemical control of blossom infections and susceptibility of some cultivars. Acta Hort. 338: 67-74.
- DIANES, A. C., P. JI, M. WILSON, 2003: Nutritional similarity between leaf-associated nonpathogenic bacteria and the pathogen is not predictive of efficacy in biological control of bacterial spot of tomato. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 69 (6), 3484-3491.
- JANISIEWICZ, W. J., J. ROITMAN, 1988: Biological control of blue mold and gray mold on apple and pear with *Pseudomonas cepacia*. Phytopathology 78, 1697-1700.
- JANISIEWICZ, W. J., L. KORSTEN, 2002: Biological control of post harvest disease of fruits. Annual Review of Phytopathology 40, 411-441.
- JANISIEWICZ, W. J., T. J. TWORKOSKI, C. SHARER, 2000: Characterizing the mechanism of biological control of post harvest diseases on fruits with a simple method to study competition for nutrients. **Phytopathology 90**, 1196-1200.
- JI, P., M. WILSON, 2002: Assessment of the importance of similarity in carbon source utilization profiles between the biological control agent and the pathogen in biological control of bacterial speck of tomato. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 68(9), 4383-4389.
- JOCK, S., B. VÖLKSCH, L. MANSVELT, K. GEIDER, 2002: Characterization of *Bacillus* strains from apple and pear trees in South Africa antagonistic to *Erwinia amylovora*. FEMS Microbiology Letter 211, 247-252.

- JOHNSON, K. B., V. STOCKWELL, T. L. SAWYER, D: SUGAR, 2000: Assessment of environmental factors influencing growth and spread of *Pantoea agglomerans* on and among blossoms of pear and apple. **Phytopathology 90**, 1285-1294.
- JOHNSON, K. B., V. STOCKWELL, T. L. SAWYER, 2004: Adaptation of fire blight forecasting to optimize the use of biological controls. **Plant Disease 88**, 41-48.
- KOTAN, R., 2002: Doğu Anadolu Bölgesi'nde Yetiştirilen Yumuşak Çekirdekli Meyve Ağaçlarından İzole Edilen Patojen ve Saprofitik Bakteriyel Organizmaların Klasik ve Moleküler Metodlar ile Tanısı ve Biyolojik Mücadele İmkanlarının Araştırılması. Atatürk Üniversitesi, Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Bitki Koruma Anabilim Dalı. Doktora Tezi. 217.
- KOTAN, R., F. SAHIN, A. ALA, 2006: Identification and possible pathogenicity of foliar bacterial flora isolated from diseased pome fruits grown in eastern Anatolia region of Turkey by commercial and molecular techniques. Journal of Plant Diseases and Protection 113 (1), 8-13.
- LEE, J. Y., B. K. HWANG, 2002: Diversity of antifungal actinomycetes in various vegetative soils of Korea. Canadian Journal of Microbiology 48, 407-417.
- LINDOW, S. E., G. MCGOURTY, R. ELKINS, 1996: Interactions of antibiotics with *Pseudomonas fluorescens* strain A506 in the control of fire blight and frost injury to pear. **Biological Control 86**, 841-848.
- LOPER, J. E., M. D. HENKELS, R. G. ROBERTS, G. G. GROVE, M. J. WILLETT, T. J. SMITH, 1991: Evaluation of streptomycin, oxytetracycline, and copper resistance of *Erwinia amylovora* isolated from pear orchards in Washington State. Plant Disease 75, 287-290.
- MERCIER, J., S. E. LINDOW, 2001: Field performance of antagonistic bacteria identified in a novel laboratory assay for biological control of fire blight of pear. Biological Control 22, 66-71.
- MOMOL, M. T., O. YEGEN, H. BASIM, K. RUDOLP, M. A. ZACHOWSKI, 1991: Batı Akdenizde *Erwinia amylovora*'nın neden olduğu ateş yanıklığının epidemisi ve mücadelesi. VI. Türkiye Fitopatoloji Kongresi Bildirileri, 7-11 Ekim, İzmir, Türkiye, 301-305.
- MOMOL, M. T., O. YEGEN, 1993: Fire blight in Turkey. Acta Horticulture 338, 37-39.
- MORAGREGA, C., I. LLORENTA, C. MANCEAU, E. MONTESINOS, 2003: Susceptibility of European pear cultivars to *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *syringae* using immature fruit and detached leaf assays. **European Journal of Plant Pathology 109**, 319-326.
- NUCLO, R. L., K. B. JOHNSON, V. O. STOCKWELL, 1998: Secondary colonization of pear blossoms by two bacterial antagonists of fire blight pathogen. Plant **Disease 82,** 661-668.

- OKTEM, Y. E, K. BENLIOGLU, 1988: Studies on fire blight (*Erwinia amylovora* (Burr.) Winslow *et al.*) of pome fruits. **The Journal of Turkish Phytopathology 17 (3)**, 106.
- OZAKTAN, H., T. BORA, 2003: Biological control of fire blight in pear orchards with a formulation of *Pantoea agglomerans* strain *EH 24*. **Brazilian Journal of Microbiology 35**, 224-229.
- OZAKTAN, H., T. BORA, F. VARDAR-SUKAN, S. SUKAN, S. SARGIN, 1999: Studies on determination on antagonistic potential and biopreparation of some bacteria against the fire blight pathogen. Proceedings of the International Workshop on Fire Blight. Acta Horticulture 489, 663-668.
- PAISLEY, R., 1995: MIS whole cell fatty acid analysis by gas chromatography. MIDI, Inc., Newark, DE, 5.
- POPPE, L., VANHOUTTE, S., M. HOFTE, 2003: Modes of action of *Pantoea* agglomerans CPA-2, an antagonist of post harvest pathogens on fruits. European Journal of Plant Pathology 109, 963-973.
- PUSEY, P. L., 1997: Crab apple blossoms as a model for research on biological control of fire blight. **Phytopathology 87,** 1096-1102.
- PUSEY, P. L., 1999: Effect of nectar on microbial antagonists evaluated for use in control of fire blight of pome fruits. **Phytopathology 89**, 39-46.
- PUSEY, P. L., 2002: Biological control agents for fire blight of apple compared under conditions limiting natural dispersal. **Plant Disease 86**, 639-644.
- ROY, M. A., 1988: Use of fatty acids for the identification of phytopathogenic bacteria. **Plant Disease 72,** 460.
- SAYGILI, H., N. USTUN, 1996: Studies on effectiveness of some chemicals to fire blight pathogen (*Erwinia amylovora* Burr. Winslow *et al.*). Acta Horticulture 411, 331-335.
- SCHILLINGER, U., F. LUCKE, 1989: Antibacterial activity of *Lactobacillus* strain isolated from meat. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 55, 1901-1906.
- STOCKWELL, V. O., K. B. JOHNSON, D. SUGAR, J. E. LOPER, 2002: Antibiosis contributes to biological control of fire blight by *Pantoea agglomerans* strain Eh252 in orchards. Phytopathology 92, 1202-1209.
- VAN DER ZWET, T., H. L. KEIL, 1979: Fire Blight-A Bacterial Disease of Rosaceous Plants. U. S. Dep. Agric. Handb., 510, USA.
- WHITEMAN, S. A., A. STEWART, 1998: Suppression of *Botrytis cinerea* sporulation on irradiated grape leaf tissue by the antagonistic bacterium *Serratia liquefaciens*. New Zealand Journal of Crop and Horticultural Science 26, 325-330.

- WILSON, M., S. E. LINDOW, 1994: Ecological similarity and coexistence of epiphytic ice-nucleating (Ice<sup>+</sup>) *Pseudomonas syringae* strains and a non-icenucleating (Ice<sup>+</sup>) biological control agent. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 60, 3128-3137.
- WODZINSKI, R. S., J. P. PAULIN, 1994: Frequency and diversity of antibiotic production by putative *Erwinia herbicola* strains. Journal of Applied Bacteriology 76, 603-607.
- WRIGHT, S. A., C. H. ZUMOFF, L. SCHNEIDER, S. V. BEER, 2001: Pantoea agglomerans strain EH318 produces two antibiotics that inhibit Erwinia amylovora in-vitro. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 67(1), 284-292.
- ZELLER, W., B. WOLF, 1996: Studies on biological control of fire blight. Acta Horticulture 411, 341-345.