



## **PATHOGEN RISK LIST**

(December 2005)

### **Purpose**

Information is provided about the risk of pathogens to develop resistance to fungicides under specific agronomic conditions.

### **Introduction**

Because no scientific criteria are available to accurately determine the risk of a pathogen to develop resistance, our classification is based on experience and reported resistance claims over the last 40 years. Generally, the risk increases when a pathogen undergoes many and short disease cycles per season, the dispersal through spores over time and space is high, sexual recombination is mandatory in the disease cycle and the competitive ability of resistant individual is at least as high as that of the wild type (in the absence of selection pressure). Furthermore, the risk is considered as high when resistance evolved already after few years of product use.

### **Examples to illustrate pathogen risk**

It is quite easy to detect single isolates of a pathogen with reduced sensitivity to a given fungicide but only their frequency over time and space will decide whether product performance will be affected significantly. Therefore, we consider the pathogen risk as medium to high only if resistance was reported in commercial situations for more than one fungicide class.

Wheat powdery mildew is considered as high risk pathogen because resistance evolved to six different chemical classes within 2 to 5 years, whereas wheat brown rust is a low risk pathogen because no resistance evolved to the major fungicide classes (DMIs, QoIs, morpholines) used against this pathogen, even not after 25 year (DMIs). Eyespot in wheat bears a medium risk, resistance evolved to MBCs and prochloraz (DMIs) only after 10 to 15 years.

An interesting case is *Phytophthora infestans* that developed resistance quite rapidly to the phenylamide fungicides but not at all to dimethomorph, iprovalicarb, fluazinam, cymoxanil, azoxystrobin and fenamidone (QoI fungicides), cyazofamid (QiI fungicide), propamocarb, and organotin. Therefore, we re-classified *P. infestans* as high risk pathogen for the RNA

polymerase target only and as a medium risk pathogen for all other modes of action (see Table 1 and 2).

### Pathogen risk classes

The following plant pathogens (Table 1) from major world markets have evolved resistance to fungicides in a time span sufficiently short to be a serious threat to the commercial success of more than one fungicide class.

Table 1: Plant pathogens accepted as showing a high risk of development of resistance to fungicides (adapted from EPPO 2002, FRAC Monograph No. 3, Russell, 2003)

<b>Pathogen</b>	<b>Crop</b>	<b>Disease</b>
<i>Botryotinia fuckeliana</i> ( <i>Botrytis cinerea</i> )	various, especially grapevine	grey mould
<i>Erysiphe</i> (= <i>Blumeria</i> ) <i>graminis</i>	wheat/barley	powdery mildew
<i>Mycosphaerella fijiensis</i>	banana	black sigatoka
<i>Penicillium</i> spp.	citrus, various	post harvest rot
<i>Phytophthora infestans</i> (RNA polymerase)	potato/tomato	late blight
<i>Plasmopara viticola</i>	grapevine	downy mildew
<i>Pseudoperonospora cubensis</i> and related spp.	cucurbits, various	downy mildews
<i>Pyricularia</i> spp.	rice, turf	rice blast, leaf spot
<i>Sphaerotheca fuliginea</i> and related spp.	cucurbits, various	powdery mildews
<i>Venturia</i> spp.	apple, pear	scab

The following pathogens (Table 2) are regarded as posing a much lower risk because resistance is not a major problem or has been slow to develop. In some cases this due to the pattern of product use. Cases of specific isolates being classed as resistant may be known in some instances, but in commercial practice resistance has not created major disease control problems. The EPPO Guideline does not list these and decisions on baseline production must be made on individual case reviews.

Table 2: Plant pathogens accepted as showing a medium risk of development of resistance to fungicides

<b>Pathogen</b>	<b>Crop</b>	<b>Disease</b>
<i>Bremia lactucae</i>	lettuce	downy mildew
<i>Cercospora</i> spp.	sugar beet, peanuts, various	leaf spots
<i>Gibberella fujikuroi</i> *	rice	bakanae
<i>Monilinia</i> spp.	various	Monilia rot
<i>Mycosphaerella graminicola</i> ( <i>Septoria tritici</i> )	wheat	leaf spot
<i>Mycosphaerella musicola</i>	banana	yellow sigatoka
<i>Peronospora</i> spp.	various	downy mildews
<i>Phytophthora infestans</i> (target outside RNA polymerase)	potato/tomato	late blight
<i>Pyrenophora teres</i>	barley	net blotch
<i>Rhynchosporium secalis</i>	barley	leaf blotch/scald
<i>Sclerotinia</i> spp. (especially <i>homoeocarpa</i> , <i>sclerotiorum</i> )	various (turf, oil seed rape)	Sclerotinia diseases, dollar spot
<i>Tapesia</i> spp.	wheat/barley	eyespot
<i>Uncinula</i> (= <i>Erysiphe</i> ) <i>necator</i> *	grapevine	powdery mildew
* The EPPO Guideline lists these pathogens as high risk pathogens of which baseline sensitivity is normally requested		

In some cases the financial outlay in establishing baselines will not be justified by the small markets involved irrespective of their risk of resistance development. Typical pathogens and diseases are given in Table 3. Pathogens in this group are of local importance, but in commercial market terms are considered as minor pathogens. Decisions on baseline production must be made on a case by case basis. For certain pathogens (e.g. *Phytophthora infestans*), resistance occurred only to one chemical class (phenylamides) but not to others and therefore, the pathogen is considered as low risk pathogen.

Table 3: Plant pathogens with low risk of development of resistance to fungicides or of minor commercial importance

<b>Pathogen</b>	<b>Crop</b>	<b>Disease</b>
<i>Alternaria</i> spp.	various	leaf spots
<i>Colletotrichum</i> spp.	various	anthracnose
<i>Fusarium</i> and related spp.	various	Fusarioses
<i>Hemileia vastatrix</i>	coffee	rust
<i>Leptosphaera</i> (= <i>Stagonospora</i> ) <i>nodorum</i>	wheat	leaf spot
<i>Phytophthora</i> spp. (soil borne)	various	damping off
<i>Podosphaera leucotricha</i>	apple	powdery mildew
<i>Puccinia</i> and related rust spp.	wheat/barley, various	rusts
<i>Pythium</i> spp.	various	damping off
<i>Rhizoctonia</i> spp.	various	foot and root rot
<i>Sclerotium</i> spp.	various	blight
<i>Tilletia</i> spp.	cereals	bunts
<i>Ustilago</i> spp.	cereals	smuts

When the pathogen risk is plotted against the inherent resistance risk of the fungicide class, the combined resistance risk for each pathogen/fungicide combination can be estimated (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Combined resistance risk diagram based on inherent fungicide risk and inherent pathogen risk (\* only most important classes and groups mentioned) (according to FRAC Monograph No. 2, by K.J. Brent and D.W. Hollomon, 1998, \*\* QoI fungicides have been moved from medium to high risk)

↓ Fungicide Classes *	↓ Fungicide Risk	Combined Risk		
benzimidazoles dicarboximides phenylamides QoI fungicides **	high = 3	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>
carboxamides SBI fungicides anilinopyrimidines phenylpyrroles phosphorothiolates	medium = 2	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>
multi site fungicides (e.g. dithiocarbamates Copper, Sulphur) MBI-R inhibitors SAR inducers	low = 1	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
Pathogen risk →		low = 1	medium = 2	high = 3
Pathogen groups * →		seed borne pathogens (e.g. <i>Pyrenophora</i> spp. <i>Ustilago</i> spp.) soil-borne pathogens (e.g. <i>Phytophthora</i> spp.) rust fungi <i>Rhizoctonia</i> spp. <i>Tapesia</i> spp.	<i>Rhynchosporium secalis</i> <i>Septoria tritici</i>	<i>Erysiphe graminis</i> <i>Botrytis cinerea</i> <i>Penicillium</i> spp. <i>Magnaporthe grisea</i> <i>Venturia inaequalis</i> <i>Mycosphaerella fijiensis</i> <i>Phytophthora infestans</i>

The pathogen risk should be estimated also in regard to the local intensity of disease development that is based on weather conditions, fertilization, irrigation, cultural practices and degree of resistance of cultivars. Therefore, we propose to modify the risk diagram in the following manner (Figure 2). Detail can be found in the article written by KH Kuck, "Fungicide Resistance Management in a New Regulatory Environment", in the Proceedings of the Reinhardtsbrunn Symposium 2004 (Modern fungicides and antifungal agents, Dehne, Gisi, Kuck, Russell, eds., BCPC 2005).

Figure 2: Combined resistance risk diagram based on inherent fungicide risk, inherent pathogen risk, and agronomic risk (\* only most important classes and groups mentioned) (according to Kuck, 2005)

↓ Fungicide Classes *	↓ Fungicide Risk	Combined Risk			↓ Agronomic Risk
benzimidazoles dicarboximides phenylamides QoI fungicides	high = 6	<b>6</b> <b>3</b> <b>1,5</b>	<b>12</b> <b>6</b> <b>3</b>	<b>18</b> <b>9</b> <b>4,5</b>	high = 1 medium = 0.5 low = 0.25
carboxamides SBI fungicides anilinopyrimidines phenylpyrroles	medium = 4	<b>4</b> <b>2</b> <b>1</b>	<b>8</b> <b>4</b> <b>2</b>	<b>12</b> <b>6</b> <b>3</b>	high = 1 medium = 0.5 low = 0.25
multi site fungicides (e.g.dithiocarbamates) MBI-R inhibitors SAR inducers	low = 1	<b>1</b> <b>0,5</b> <b>0,25</b>	<b>2</b> <b>1</b> <b>0,5</b>	<b>3</b> <b>1,5</b> <b>0,75</b>	high = 1 medium = 0.5 low = 0.25
Pathogen risk →		low = 1	medium = 2	high = 3	
Pathogen groups * →		seed borne pathogens (e.g. <i>Pyrenophora</i> sp. <i>Ustilago</i> sp.) soil-borne pathogens (e.g. <i>Phytophthora</i> sp.) rust fungi <i>Rhizoctonia</i> sp. <i>Fusarium</i> sp.	<i>Uncinula necator</i> <i>Gibberella fujikuroi</i> <i>Tapesia</i> sp. <i>Rhynchosporium secalis</i> <i>Pyrenophora teres</i> <i>Septoria tritici</i> <i>Sclerotinia</i> sp. <i>Monilinia</i> sp. <i>Cercospora</i> sp. <i>Phytophthora infestans</i> /other modes of action	<i>Erysiphe graminis</i> <i>Botrytis cinerea</i> <i>Plasmopara viticola</i> <i>Magnaporthe grisea</i> <i>Venturia inaequalis</i> <i>Mycosphaerella fijiensis</i> <i>Phytophthora infestans</i> /RNA polymerase	