Open Access <https://doi.org/10.48130/sif-0024-0015> *Studies in Fungi***2024**, 9: e015

Identification and fungicide sensitivity of the blue mold pathogen in postharvest-stored elephant garlic bulbs in Thailand

Nakarin Suwannarach^{1,2,3*}, Surapong Khuna^{1,2}, Kittayod Chaiwong^{2,4}, Chanokned Senwanna^{1,2}, Wipornpan Nuangmek⁵ and Jaturong Kumla^{1,2,3}

¹ *Office of Research Administration, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai 50200, Thailand*

³ *Department of Biology, Faculty of Science, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai 50200, Thailand*

⁴ *Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Science, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok 10330, Thailand*

5 *School of Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of Phayao, Phayao 56000, Thailand*

* Corresponding author, E-mail:suwan.462@gmail.com

Abstract

Blue mold disease is one of the most important postharvest diseases affecting garlic bulbs. In 2023, this disease was found on bulbs of elephant garlic [*Allium ampeloprasum* var. *ampeloprasum* (Borrer) Syme] in Chiang Mai Province, Thailand, during the postharvest storage period. Three fungal isolates were obtained and identified as *Penicillium allii* based on morphological characteristics and phylogenetic analysis of combined sequences of the internal transcribed spacer (ITS) of ribosomal DNA, *β*-tubulin (*BenA*), calmodulin (*CaM*), and RNA polymerase II second largest subunit (*rpb2*) genes. In the pathogenicity test, garlic bulbs inoculated with the isolated fungi exhibited symptoms similar to those observed during the postharvest storage period. In the fungicide screening test, carbendazim, difenoconazole + azoxystrobin, and difenoconazole effectively completely inhibited this fungus at both half and recommended dosages, while the fungus showed insensitivity to captan and mancozeb. Additionally, double-recommended dosages of carbendazim, copper oxychloride, difenoconazole combined with azoxystrobin, and difenoconazole alone exhibited complete inhibition of the fungus. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first report of postharvest blue mold disease on elephant garlic bulbs caused by *P. allii* in Thailand. Furthermore, the results of the fungicide sensitivity screening could help in developing effective management strategies for controlling postharvest blue mold disease on elephant garlic bulbs caused by *P. allii*.

Citation: Suwannarach N, Khuna S, Chaiwong K, Senwanna C, Nuangmek W, et al. 2024. Identification and fungicide sensitivity of the blue mold pathogen in postharvest-stored elephant garlic bulbs in Thailand. *Studies in Fungi* 9: e015 [https://doi.org/10.48130/s](https://doi.org/10.48130/sif-0024-0015)if[-0024-0015](https://doi.org/10.48130/sif-0024-0015)

Introduction

Garlic (*Allium* spp.), especially the bulb, is commonly consumed and valued for both culinary and medicinal purposes due to its nutritional richness and numerous beneficial bioac-tive compounds essential for human health^{[[1](#page-7-0)–[3](#page-7-1)]}. Elephant garlic [*Allium ampeloprasum* var. *ampeloprasum* (Borrer) Syme], hardneck garlic [*A. sativum* var. *ophioscorodon* (Link) Döll], and softneck garlic (*A. sativum* var. *sativum* L.) are popular varieties that have been cultivated worldwide<a>[\[4](#page-7-2),[5\]](#page-7-3). In 2022, global garlic production reached 2.91 million tons, valued at 3.43 billion USD. China was the largest producer, contributing 2.13 million tons (73% of world production), followed by India with 0.3 million tons, Bangladesh with 0.05 million tons, and Egypt with 0.03 million tons^{[\[6](#page-7-4)]}. Myanmar is the top garlic producer in Southeast Asia followed by Thailand and Indonesia^{[[6](#page-7-4)]}. At every stage of growth, harvesting, and post-harvest storage, garlic is susceptible to various diseases caused by bacteria, fungi, and viruses^{[[7−](#page-7-5)[9\]](#page-7-6)}. Diseases can significantly damage garlic bulb production and quality[[9](#page-7-6),[10\]](#page-7-7) . Blue mold disease, caused by *Penicillium* species, is a common issue affecting garlic bulbs during both the cultivation process and postharvest storage^{[\[9,](#page-7-6)[11](#page-7-8)–14]}. This disease can lead to significant customer dissatisfaction and economic losses in garlic production worldwide^{[\[9,](#page-7-6)[11](#page-7-8),[14](#page-7-9)[,15\]](#page-7-10)}.

In Thailand, the northern part is the main region for garlic cultivation^{[[16](#page-7-11)]}. Nowadays, elephant garlic is a significant

vegetable crop extensively cultivated in Thailand. Thus, the area of plantations used for growing garlic has significantly increased in Thailand. However, the incidence and severity of diseases have also increased when plants are grown in suboptimal areas and unsuitable storage conditions. In 2023, blue mold disease caused by fungi was observed on elephant garlic bulbs during the storage period in Chiang Mai Province in Thailand, with a degree of incidence within the range of 20% to 30%. Importantly, there had been no prior reports of blue mold disease on elephant garlic bulbs in Thailand. Therefore, the objective of this study was to isolate the causal fungal agents of this disease. The isolated fungi were identified using both morphological and molecular data. Pathogenicity tests were conducted, and Koch's postulates were applied to assess the effects of the isolated fungi on asymptomatic elephant garlic bulbs. Moreover, the sensitivity of the isolated fungi to several commercial fungicides was investigated using solid culture techniques.

Materials and methods

Sample collection

Blue mold disease was observed on elephant garlic bulbs (*A. ampeloprasum* var. *ampeloprasum*) throughout the postharvest storage at 25 to 30 °C and 65% to 75% relative humidity

² *Center of Excellence in Microbial Diversity and Sustainable Utilization, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai 50200, Thailand*

over a period of 7 to 14 d in Chiang Mai Province, northern Thailand in 2023 (March to April). Garlic bulbs exhibiting typical symptoms were collected from postharvest storage stores and shipped to the laboratory within 24 h. After being transferred to the laboratory, symptomatic bulbs were examined using a stereo microscope (Nikon H55OS, Tokyo, Japan) and stored in a plastic container with moist filter paper to promote fungal sporulation.

Fungal isolation and morphological study

Samples of bulb disease were processed to isolate the fungal causal agents. The single conidial isolation method described by Choi et al.^{[[17](#page-7-12)]} was used to isolate the causal fungi from the lesions. This process was conducted on 1.0% water agar containing 0.5 mg/L streptomycin. The individual germinated conidia were observed after incubation at 25 °C for 24–48 h and then transferred directly onto potato dextrose agar (PDA; CONDA, Madrid, Spain) supplemented with 0.5 mg/L streptomycin under a stereo microscope. Pure cultures were deposited in the Culture Collection of Sustainable Development of Biological Resources (SDBR) Laboratory, Faculty of Science, Chiang Mai University, Thailand. The characteristics of the fungal colonies, including colony morphology, pigmentation, and odor, were examined on PDA, Czapek yeast extract agar (CYA), and malt extract agar (MEA; Difco, France) after incubation in the dark for 7 d at 25 °C. Micromorphological characteristics were assessed using a light microscope (Nikon Eclipse Ni-U, Tokyo, Japan). The Tarosoft® Image Frame Work software was used to measure at least 50 samples for each anatomical structure (such as conidiophores, phialides, and conidia).

DNA extraction, PCR amplification, and sequencing

Genomic DNA was extracted from the fungal cultures of each isolate that grew on PDA at 25 °C for 5 d, using a Fungal DNA Extraction Kit (FAVORGEN, Ping-Tung, Taiwan) according to the manufacturer's protocol. Amplification of the internal transcribed spacer (ITS) of ribosomal DNA, *β*-tubulin (*BenA*), calmodulin (*CaM*), and RNA polymerase II second largest sub-unit (rpb2) genes using ITS5/ITS4^{[[18](#page-7-13)]}, Bt2a/Bt2b^{[\[19\]](#page-7-14)}, CF1/CF4^{[\[20\]](#page-7-15)}, and RPB2-5F/RPB2-7CR^{[\[21\]](#page-7-16)}, respectively. The PCR for these four genes was conducted in separate PCR reactions and consisted of an initial denaturation at 95 °C for 3 min, followed by 35 cycles of denaturation at 95 °C for 30 s, annealing at 52 °C for 30 s (ITS and *BenA*); 51 °C for 1 min (*CaM*) and 52 °C for 1 min (*rpb2*), extension at 72 °C for 1 min, and final extension at 72 °C for 10 min on a peqSTAR thermal cycler (PEQLAB Ltd., Fareham, UK). PCR products were checked on 1% agarose gel electrophoresis and purified using a PCR clean-up Gel Extraction NucleoSpin® Gel and a PCR Clean-up Kit (Macherey-Nagel, Düren, Germany), according to the manufacturer's instructions. The purified PCR products were directly sequenced. Sequencing reactions were performed, and the above-mentioned PCR primers were employed to automatically determine the sequences in the Genetic Analyzer at the 1st Base Company (Kembangan, Malaysia).

Sequence alignment and phylogenetic analyses

The analysis of the ITS, *BenA*, *CaM*, and *rpb2* sequences was conducted with the use of similarity searches employing the BLAST program available at NCBI [\(http://blast.ddbj.nig.ac.jp/](http://blast.ddbj.nig.ac.jp/top-e.html) [top-e.html,](http://blast.ddbj.nig.ac.jp/top-e.html) accessed on 10 July 2024). The sequences from this study and those obtained from previous studies, together with sequences downloaded from the nucleotide GenBank database are listed in [Table 1](#page-2-0). Multiple sequence alignment was performed with MUSCLE^{[[22](#page-7-17)]} and improved where necessary using BioEdit v. $6.0.7^{[23]}$ $6.0.7^{[23]}$ $6.0.7^{[23]}$. Finally, the combination datasets of ITS, *BenA*, *CaM*, and *rpb2* sequences were performed.

For phylogenetic analyses, *Penicillium italicum* (CBS 339.48) and *P. ulaiense* (CBS 210.92) were selected as the outgroup. The maximum likelihood (ML) analysis was carried out using RAxML-HPC2 version 8.2.12 on the GTRCAT model with 25 categories and 1000 bootstrap (BS) replications[[24](#page-7-19)[,25\]](#page-7-20) *via* the CIPRES web portal. Bayesian inference (BI) analysis was performed with MrBayes v. 3.2.6 software for Windows^{[\[26\]](#page-7-21)}. The best substitution model for BI analysis was estimated using the jModelTest $2.1.10^{[27]}$ $2.1.10^{[27]}$ $2.1.10^{[27]}$ by employing the Akaike information criterion (AIC). Bayesian posterior probability (PP) was determined by Markov Chain Monte Carlo Sampling (MCMC). Four simultaneous Markov chains were run for a million generations with random initial trees, wherein every 100 generations were sampled. The first 25% of generated trees representing the burn-in phase of the analysis were eliminated, while the remaining trees were used for calculating PP in the majority-rule consensus tree. The phylogenetic trees were visualized using FigTree v1.4.0^{[[28\]](#page-7-23)}.

Pathogenicity tests

Conidia from fungal isolates cultivated for two weeks on PDA were used in this experiment. Healthy commercial elephant garlic bulbs were washed thoroughly, and then their surfaces were sterilized by soaking them for 5 min in a sterile sodium hypochlorite solution with a concentration of 1.5% (*v*/*v*). Following that, sterile distilled water was used to wash them three times. The bulbs were allowed to air-dry at room temperature (25 \pm 2 °C) for 10 min after surface disinfection. Following the air-drying process, a quantity of 10 μL of a conidial suspension (1 \times 10⁶ conidia/mL) in sterile water from each fungal isolate was dropped onto each bulb. Consequently, sterile distilled water was used as an inoculant for the control. The inoculated bulbs were placed in individual 4 L sterile plastic boxes maintained at 80% relative humidity. These containers were kept in a growth chamber at a temperature of 25 °C under a 12-h light cycle for one week. A total of ten replicates were used for each treatment, which was repeated twice under the same conditions. The disease symptoms were observed. Confirmation of Koch's postulates was achieved by re-isolating the fungi through the isolation method from any lesions that occurred on the inoculated bulbs.

Screening of commercial fungicides against the causal agent

Seven commercially available fungicides, including benalaxyl-M (4%) + mancozeb (65%) (Fantic M WG®, Thailand), captan (Captan 50®, Thailand), carbendazim (Dazine®, Thailand), copper oxychloride (Copina 85 WP®, Thailand), difenoconazole (12.5%) + azoxystrobin (20%) (Ortiva®, Thailand), difenoconazole (Score®, Thailand), and mancozeb (Newthane M-80®, Thailand), were examined in this study according to the approach indicated through previous studies^{[\[29,](#page-7-24)[30](#page-7-25)]}. The fungicides used in this study were available commercially in Thailand and were approved for usage. The *in vitro* applications of benalaxyl-M + mancozeb, captan, carbendazim, copper oxychloride, difenoconazole + azoxystrobin, difenoconazole, and mancozeb were recommended at dosages of 1,380, 750, 750, 1,700, 243.75, 187.5, and 1,200 ppm, respectively, according to the labels for each fungicide. The final concentration was

Blue mold disease of garlic in Thailand

Ex-type species are indicated by the superscript letters as 'T'. '−' indicates the absence of sequencing information in GenBank. The fungal isolates and sequences obtained in this study are in bold.

obtained by preparing each fungicide and adding it to an autoclaved PDA. Each fungicide was used in three different dosages: half-recommended, recommended, and double-recommended. The test media were inoculated with mycelial plugs (5 mm in diameter) that had been cultivated on PDA in the dark at 25 °C for one week. The control did not add any fungicide. The plates were maintained in darkness at a temperature of 25 °C. Following one week of incubation, the mycelial growth of each isolate was evaluated on individual plates and a comparison was made between the growth in PDA supplemented with fungicides and the growth observed in the control. The calculation of the percentage growth inhibition for each isolate was performed using the formula provided by Pandey et al.^{[[31](#page-7-26)]}. Each isolate was classified as sensitive (> 50% inhibition), insensitive (< 50% inhibition), or totally inhibited (100% inhibition) based on their growth inhibition rates^{[\[30,](#page-7-25)[31\]](#page-7-26)}. Five replicates were conducted for each fungicide and fungal isolate, and the experiments were independently repeated twice under the same biological conditions.

Statistical analysis

The Shapiro-Wilk test in SPSS software version 26 was used to examine data from the two repeated fungicide sensitivity experiments at a significant level of $p < 0.05$ to perform the normality test. The results indicated non-significant findings, so the data from these repeated experiments were assessed for the assumptions of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Duncan's Multiple Range Test (DMRT) was then used to identify significant differences at *p* ≤ 0.05.

Results

Disease symptoms

Initial symptoms, water-soaked areas on the outer surface of scales were observed. Later, white mycelium and blue powdery mold develop on the surface of the lesions [\(Fig. 1a](#page-3-0)). These lesions appear as brown, tan, or grey colored areas when the bulbs are cut. In advanced stages, infected bulbs disintegrated into a watery rot.

Fungal isolation and morphological characteristics

Three fungal isolates (CMU499, CMU500, and CMU501) with similar morphology were obtained and deposited at the SDBR-CMU under accession numbers SDBR-CMU499, SDBR-CMU500, and SDBR-CMU501, respectively. Colonies PDA, CYA, and MEA were 29–32, 32–37, and 33–37 mm in diameter, respectively after incubation for one week at 25 °C [\(Fig. 1b–d](#page-3-0)). Colonies on

Fig. 1 (a) Natural symptoms of blue mold disease on bulbs of elephant garlic by *Penicillium allii* . Colonies of *Penicillium allii* SDBR-CMU499 after incubation at 25 °C for one week. (b) PDA. (c) CYA. (d) MEA. (e)–(g) Conidiophores. (h) Conidia. Scale bars: (a)–(d) = 10 mm, (e)–(h) = 10 μm.

PDA and MEA were white, flat with entire edges, conidium turquoise, white in the center, dull green at the margins; reverse pale yellow for PDA and yellow-brown for MEA. Colonies on CYA were white, flat with entire edges, conidium dull green; reverse white. All fungal isolates could produce conidiophores, and phialides, and s[porulate in](#page-3-0) all of the agar media. *Conidiophores* terverticillate [\(Fig. 1e](#page-3-0)–[g\)](#page-3-0). *Stipes* roughwalled, 13.2–181.2 × 2.3–3.9 μm. *Rami* one or two, roughwalled and appressed or divergent, $8.4-24.7 \times 2.5-4.6$ µm. *Metulae* divergent, in verticils of 2-4, 8-19.1 \times 2.3-4.6 μ m. *Phialides* ampulliform, in verticils of 3 to 9, 6–17.9 × 1.7–6.9 μm. *Conidia* [globo](#page-3-0)se, 2.6–4.3 μm in diameter, smooth-walled, dull green([Fig. 1h](#page-3-0)). Based on these morphological characteristics, all fungal isolates were initially identified as belonging to *Penicillium*[\[32](#page-7-27)[−35\]](#page-7-28) . Fungal identification was then further confirmed using multi-gene phylogenetic analyses.

Phylogenetic analysis

The ITS, *BenA*, *CaM*, and *rpb2* sequences obtained from three fungal isolates in this study have been deposited in GenBank ([Table 1](#page-2-0)). According to the BLAST results, all fungal isolates were identified as members of the *Penicillium* section *Fasciculata*. The combined ITS, *BenA*, *CaM*, and *rpb2* sequences dataset consists of 32 taxa, and the aligned dataset includes 2,399 characters comprising gaps (ITS: 1–553, *BenA*: 554–927, *CaM*: 928–1,442, and *rpb2*: 1,443–2,399). The best-scoring RAxML tree was established with a final ML optimization likelihood value of –9,279.455311. Accordingly, the matrix contained 612 distinct alignment patterns with 5.04% undetermined characters or gaps. The estimated base frequencies were found to be: $A =$ 0.235164, C = 0.269054, G = 0.262373, and T = 0.233408; substitution rates AC = 1.298254, AG = 4.466196, AT = 1.340638, CG = 0.787838, CT = 9.362594 , and GT = 1.00000. The values of the gamma distribution shape parameter alpha and the Tree-Length were 0.580385 and 0.524602, respectively. Additionally, BI analysis yielded a final average standard deviation of 0.002257 for the split frequencies at the end of all MCMC generations. Regarding topology, the phylogenetic trees generated from both ML and BI analyses were similar. Consequently, the phylogenetic tree obtained from the ML analysis was selected and is displayed in [Fig. 2](#page-5-0). The results indicated that three fungal isolates SDBR-CMU499, SDBR-CMU500, and SDBR-CMU501 clustered with *P. allii* CBS 131.89 (ex-type strain) with strong statistical (100% BS and 1.0 PP) supports. Therefore, all fungal isolates obtained in this were identified as *P. allii* based on morphological and molecular data.

Pathogenicity tests

The initial symptoms appeared on bulbs of elephant garlic 3 d after being inoculated. After 7 d, all inoculated bulbs displayed powdery mold at their centers, surrounded by orange-brown water-soaked lesions [\(Fig. 3b](#page-5-1)-[d\)](#page-5-1). Whereas, control bulbs were asymptomatic ([Fig. 3a](#page-5-1)). *Penicillium allii* was consistently reisolated from the inoculated bulbs on PDA to complete Koch's postulates.

Reactions of commercial fungicides against *Penicillium allii*

Seven commercially available fungicides in Thailand were tested in this study. After one week, the mycelial growths in response to the fungicides at three different dosages, including half-recommended (1/2RD), recommended (RD), and double-recommended (2RD) were calculated and presented in [Table 2](#page-4-0). The results revealed that the growth inhibition values varied across different fungicides, dosages, and fungal isolates. Data on the percentage of mycelial inhibition for each fungal isolate, related to the fungicides, passed the normality test (Shapiro-Wilk test, *p* < 0.001), thereby assuming normal distributions. Therefore, ANOVA followed by DMRT (*p* ≤ 0.05) was used to identify significant differences. The findings indicated that all fungal isolates were completely inhibited by carbendazim, difenoconazole + azoxystrobin, and difenoconazole at all tested dosages [\(Table 2](#page-4-0)). In the tests for captan and mancozeb, all isolates demonstrated sensitivity to 2RD. Therefore, based on the recommended dosages, carbendazim, difenoconazole + azoxystrobin, and difenoconazole could be effectively applied to control this pathogen.

Discussion

Penicillium species are widely recognized as one of the most significant genera, known to cause major diseases in numerous economically valuable crops cultivated worldwide, including garlic[[9,](#page-7-6)[10,](#page-7-7)[12](#page-7-29),[13](#page-7-30)[,36\]](#page-7-31) . Traditionally, *Penicillium* species have been identified using both macromorphological and micromorphological characteristics. However, morphological traits alone are insufficient to differentiate closely related *Penicillium* species due to the extensive range of morphological variations. Therefore, molecular techniques are crucial for accurately identifying *Penicillium* at the species level. Several previous studies have utilized a combination of ribosomal DNA (ITS) and proteincoding genes (*BenA*, *CaM*, *rpb1*, and *rpb2*) as powerful tools to identify *Penicillium* species since species-level identification remained unresolved when used solely on the ribosomal DNA gene[\[32](#page-7-27),[34](#page-7-32),[35](#page-7-28)[,37\]](#page-7-33) . In this study, three isolates of *P. allii* were obtained from the rot lesions of blue mold disease on elephant

Table 2. Percentage of mycelial inhibition and reactions of three isolates of *Penicillium allii* against fungicides.

| Fungicides | Dosages | Inhibition of mycelial growth (%)* | | | Reaction |
|-------------------------------|-----------|------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | SDBR-CMU499 | SDBR-CMU500 | SDBR-CMU501 | |
| Benalaxyl-M + mancozeb | 1/2RD | 30.08 ± 1.41 c | 29.27 ± 2.25 c | 30.08 ± 2.53 c | Insensitive |
| | RD | 55.28 ± 1.41 b | 56.10 \pm 3.62 b | 60.16 ± 1.67 b | Sensitive |
| | 2RD | 82.11 ± 2.82 a | 83.74 ± 1.41 a | 83.74 ± 3.45 a | Sensitive |
| Captan | 1/2RD | 2.44 ± 3.50 c | 1.63 ± 2.41 c | 2.44 ± 1.25 c | Insensitive |
| | RD | 4.88 ± 2.25 b | 4.88 ± 2.23 b | 5.69 ± 2.30 b | Insensitive |
| | 2RD | 72.36 ± 1.60 a | 73.93 ± 3.45 a | 73.98 ± 2.82 a | Sensitive |
| Carbendazim | 1/2RD | $100 \pm 0 a$ | $100 \pm 0 a$ | $100 \pm 0 a$ | Inhibition |
| | RD | $100 \pm 0 a$ | $100 \pm 0 a$ | $100 \pm 0 a$ | Inhibition |
| | 2RD | $100 \pm 0 a$ | $100 \pm 0 a$ | $100 \pm 0 a$ | Inhibition |
| Copper oxychloride | 1/2RD | 61.79 ± 1.60 c | 58.54 \pm 1.05 c | 56.91 ± 1.41 f | Sensitive |
| | RD | 68.29 ± 1.20 b | 68.29 ± 2.05 b | 68.29 ± 2.54 d | Sensitive |
| | 2RD | $100 \pm 0 a$ | $100 \pm 0 a$ | $100 \pm 0 a$ | Inhibition |
| Difenoconazole + azoxystrobin | 1/2RD | $100 \pm 0 a$ | $100 \pm 0 a$ | $100 \pm 0 a$ | Inhibition |
| | RD | $100 \pm 0 a$ | $100 \pm 0 a$ | $100 \pm 0 a$ | Inhibition |
| | 2RD | $100 \pm 0 a$ | $100 \pm 0 a$ | $100 \pm 0 a$ | Inhibition |
| Difenoconazole | 1/2RD | $100 \pm 0 a$ | $100 \pm 0 a$ | $100 \pm 0 a$ | Inhibition |
| | RD | $100 \pm 0 a$ | $100 \pm 0 a$ | $100 \pm 0 a$ | Inhibition |
| | 2RD | $100 \pm 0 a$ | $100 \pm 0 a$ | $100 \pm 0 a$ | Inhibition |
| Mancozeb | 1/2RD | 19.51 ± 2.44 c | 22.76 ± 3.73 c | 21.14 ± 1.41 c | Insensitive |
| | RD | 47.15 ± 1.45 b | 47.15 ± 2.82 b | 43.90 ± 2.44 b | Insensitive |
| | 2RD | 58.54 ± 2.44 a | 54.47 \pm 1.42 a | 55.28 ± 1.45 a | Sensitive |

* Results are means of five replicates ± standard deviation with the independently repeated twice. Data with different letters within the same column for each fungal isolate and fungicide indicate a significant difference at *p* ≤ 0.05 according to Duncan's multiple range test. 1/2RD, RD, and 2RD indicate half of the recommended dosage, recommended dosage, and double the recommended dosage, respectively.

Fig. 2 Phylogram derived from maximum likelihood analysis of the combined ITS, *BenA*, *CaM*, and *rpb2* sequences of 30 taxa in the *Penicillium* section *Fasciculata* and two taxa in the *Penicillium* section *Penicillium*. *Penicillium italicum* CBS 339.48 and *P. ulaiense* CBS 210.92 were used as outgroups. Bootstrap values ≥ 50% (left) and Bayesian posterior probabilities ≥ 0.90 (right) are displayed above nodes. The scale bar represents the expected number of nucleotide substitutions per site. The sequences of fungal species obtained in this study are in red. The ex-type strain are in bold.

Fig. 3 Pathogenicity test using *Penicillium allii* SDBR-CMU499, SDBR-CMU500, and SDBR-CMU501 on bulbs of elephant garlic after one week inoculation at 25 °C. (a) Control bulbs treated with sterile distilled water instead of inoculum. Blue mold disease on bulbs of elephant garlic after inoculation of isolate (b) SDBR-CMU499, (c) SDBR-CMU500, and (d) SDBR-CMU501. Scale bar: 10 mm.

garlic bulbs in northern Thailand. The identification of this fungal species followed methods similar to those used for identifying *Penicillium*, which involve combining phylogenetic analysis of multiple genes with their morphological characteristics.

In this study, Koch's postulates were fulfilled by conducting pathogenicity tests on all isolates of *P. allii*. The findings demonstrate that postharvest blue mold disease on elephant garlic bulbs in northern Thailand, caused by *P. allii* identified in this study resembles the disease caused by previously identified *Penicillium* pathogens, particularly *P. hirsutum*, which affects garlic bulbs worldwide[\[11−](#page-7-8)[13,](#page-7-30)[36\]](#page-7-31) . *Penicillium polonicum* has been reported as a causal agent of blue mold on stored garlic bulbs in Pakistan[[38](#page-8-0)] . *Penicillium allii* was known to cause postharvest blue mold disease on garlic bulbs in Argentina[\[15,](#page-7-10)[39](#page-8-1),[40](#page-8-2)] . In the USA, *P. albocoremium*, *P. expansum*, *P. glabrum*, *P. paraherquei*, and *P. radicicola* can cause blue mold on garlic bulbs^{[[13](#page-7-30)]}. In Korea, blue mold disease on garlic bulbs caused by *P. hirsutum* has been reported[\[41\]](#page-8-3) . Five *Penicillium* species, namely *P. allii*, *P. glabrum*, *P. italicum*, *P. polonicum*, and *P. psychrotrophicum* were identified and confirmed as posthar-vest pathogens causing blue mold rot of garlic in Serbia^{[\[42\]](#page-8-4)}. Recently, *P. allii* was the most virulent pathogen causing blue mold disease of elephant garlic bulbs in Italy, accounting for 95% of cases, followed by *P. citrinum* (4%) and *P. brevicompactum* (1%)[[43](#page-8-5)] . Before this study, there were no reports of blue mold disease on elephant garlic bulbs in Thailand. Thus, this represents the first report of postharvest blue mold disease on elephant garlic bulbs caused by *P. allii* in Thailand.

To manage and control fungal-caused plant diseases, a variety of fungicides have been used. Several studies have documented the effectiveness of fungicides in affecting sensitive, resistant strains of plant pathogenic fungi, particularly those in the *Penicillium* species, on their *in vitro* mycelial growth[[44](#page-8-6)−[46](#page-8-7)] . In this study, the sensitivity and inhibition of *P. allii* to fungicides varied among different fungicides and dosages. These findings are consistent with previous studies, which reported that the sensitivity and inhibition of *Penicillium* species to fungicides varies based on the type and dosage of the fungicide, as well as fungal species^{[46–[48](#page-8-8)]}. Before this study, prochloraz had been used against *P. allii* to control diseases related to sprouting germination in Europe^{[\[49\]](#page-8-9)}. In this study, carbendazim, difenoconazole + azoxystrobin, and difenoconazole at both half and recommended dosages exhibited complete inhibition of *P. allii*. The information on the *in vitro* inhibition, sensitivity, and resistance of fungicides against *P. allii*, which causes postharvest blue mold disease on elephant garlic bulbs, would be beneficial for *in vivo* applications and for managing this disease in Thailand and globally. However, environmental factors and the fungicide's metabolism in the plant can cause the results of *in vitro* fungicide testing to differ from *in vivo* responses. Therefore, further studies are required to conduct *in vivo* fungicide sensitivity and disease inhibition assays based on the *in vitro* findings. Additionally, several previous studies have established that fungicide-resistant strains are [a](#page-8-10) [res](#page-8-11)ult of both exces-sive and prolonged fungicide treatment^{[[50](#page-8-10)–52]}. Utilizing biological control agents, rotating crops, adhering to fungicide treatment guidelines, and maintaining cleanliness in fields, equipment, and storage spaces are all essential components of a com[pr](#page-7-6)[eh](#page-8-10)[e](#page-8-12)[nsi](#page-8-13)ve strategy to reduce fungicide resistance in fungi[\[9,](#page-7-6)[50](#page-8-10),[53](#page-8-12),[54\]](#page-8-13) .

Conclusions

Garlic blue mold disease, caused by *Penicillium* species, leads to significant economic losses during postharvest storage worldwide. In the present study, *P. allii* was isolated from infected bulbs of elephant garlic in northern Thailand. The identification of this fungi involved the analysis of their

morphological characteristics and conducting multi-gene phylogenetic analyses. The assessment of pathogenicity for *P. allii* showed similar symptoms throughout the artificial inoculation process, as observed during the postharvest storage period. Therefore, this study represents the first report of elephant garlic blue mold disease caused by *P. allii* in Thailand. In the fungicide screening test, carbendazim, difenoconazole + azoxystrobin, and difenoconazole were found to effectively control this pathogen at both half and full recommended dosages. Thus, half of the recommended dosages can be used in managing this disease, serving as a guideline for prevention and helping to reduce pathogen resistance to fungicides. The findings of this study will enhance our understanding of postharvest blue mold disease in elephant garlic bulbs and provide insights for developing effective management strategies and prevention methods to minimize significant economic losses. Further research on the epidemiology of this disease would be required for effective monitoring, prevention, and control.

Author contributions

The authors confirm contribution to the paper as follows: conceptualization: Suwannarach N, Khuna S; formal analysis: Suwannarach N, Khuna S, Chaiwong K, Senwanna C, Kumla J; investigation, methodology: Suwannarach N, Khuna S, Chaiwong K; resources: Suwannarach N, Khuna S, Chaiwong K; software: Khuna S, Chaiwong K, Senwanna C, Kumla J; validation: Suwannarach N, Khuna S, Senwanna C, Nuangmek W; data curation: Khuna S, Senwanna C, Nuangmek W, Kumla J; visualization: Khuna S, Chaiwong K; writing–original draft: Suwannarach N, Khuna S, Nuangmek W, Kumla J; writing–review & editing: Suwannarach N, Khuna S, Chaiwong K, Senwanna C, Nuangmek W, Kumla J; supervision, project administration: Suwannarach N; funding acquisition: Suwannarach N, Nuangmek W. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Data availability

The DNA sequences generated in this study have been submitted to GenBank and can be accessed through the accession numbers provided in the paper.

Acknowledgments

The authors sincerely appreciate the financial support provided by Chiang Mai University, Thailand and the University of Phayao Innovation Fund [Fundamental Fund 2024 (227/2567)], Thailand.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest. Nakarin Suwannarach and Jaturong Kumla are the Editorial Board members of *Studies in Fungi* who are blinded from reviewing or making decisions on the manuscript. The article was subject to the journal's standard procedures, with peer review handled independently of these Editorial Board members and the research groups.

Dates

Received 5 November 2024; Revised 25 November 2024; Accepted 26 November 2024; Published online 20 December 2024

References

- 1. Bongiorno PB, Fratellone PM, LoGiudice P. 2008. Potential health benefits of garlic (*Allium sativum*): A narrative review. *[Journal of](https://doi.org/10.2202/1553-3840.1084) [Complementary and Integrative Medicine](https://doi.org/10.2202/1553-3840.1084)* 5:1−24
- Najda A, Błaszczyk L, Winiarczyk K, Dyduch J, Tchórzewska D. 2016. 2. Comparative studies of nutritional and health-enhancing properties in the "garlic-like" plant *Allium ampeloprasum* var. *ampeloprasum* (GHG-L) and *A. sativum*. *[Scientia Horticulturae](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2016.01.044)* 201:247−55
- Sahidur MR, Islam S, Jahurul MHA. 2023. Garlic (*Allium sativum*) as a 3. natural antidote or a protective agent against diseases and toxicities: A critical review. *[Food Chemistry Advances](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.focha.2023.100353)* 3:e100353
- Kim S, Kim DB, Jin W, Park J, Yoon W, et al. 2018. Comparative studies of bioactive organosulphur compounds and antioxidant activities in garlic (*Allium sativum* L.), elephant garlic (*Allium ampeloprasum* L.) and onion (*Allium cepa* L.). *[Natural Product Research](https://doi.org/10.1080/14786419.2017.1323211)* 32:1193−97 4.
- Painter R, Wszelaki A, Washburn D, Bruce N. 2024. *Garlic and* 5. *Elephant Garlic*. Center for Crop Diversification, University of Kentucky College of Agriculture, Food and Environment, USA. <https://ccd.uky.edu/resources/crops/vegetables/garlic>
- FAOSTAT. 2022. *Crop and livestock products*. [http://fao.org/](http://fao.org/faostat/en/#data/QCL) 6. [faostat/en/#data/QCL](http://fao.org/faostat/en/#data/QCL) (Accessed 25 March 2024)
- 7. Mishra RK, Jaiswal RK, Kumar D, Saabale PR, Singh A. 2014. Management of major diseases and insect pests of onion and garlic: A comprehensive review. *[Journal of Plant Breeding and Crop Scienc](https://doi.org/10.5897/JPBCS2014.0467)e* 6:160−170
- Mondani L, Chiusa G, Battilani P. 2021. Fungi associated with garlic 8. during the cropping season, with focus on *Fusarium proliferatum* and *F. oxysporum*. *[Plant Health Progress](https://doi.org/10.1094/php-06-20-0054-rs)* 22:37−46
- 9. Anum H, Tong Y, Cheng R. 2024. Different preharvest diseases in garlic and their eco-friendly management strategies. *[Plants](https://doi.org/10.3390/plants13020267)* 13:e267
- 10. Schwartz HF, Mohan SK. 2008. Compendium of Onion and Garlic *Diseases and Pests*. 2nd Edition. Saint Paul, Minnesota, USA: American Phytopathological Society. 136 pp. doi: [10.1094/9780890545003](https://doi.org/10.1094/9780890545003)
- 11. Overy DP, Frisvad JC, Steinmeier U, Thrane U. 2005. Clarification of the agents causing blue mold storage rot upon various flower and vegetable bulbs: implications for mycotoxin contamination. *[Postharvest Biology and Technology](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.postharvbio.2004.08.001)* 35:217−21
- 12. Dugan FM, Hellier BC, Lupien SL. 2007. Pathogenic fungi in garlic seed cloves from the United States and China, and effcacy of fungicides against pathogens in garlic germplasm in Washington State. *[Journal of Phytopathology](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0434.2007.01255.x)* 155:437−45
- 13. Dugan FM, Lupien SL, Vahling-Armstrong CM, Chastagner GA, Schroeder BK. 2017. Host ranges of *Penicillium* species causing blue mold of bulb crops in Washington State and Idaho. *[Crop](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2017.03.002) [Protection](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2017.03.002)* 96:265−72
- 14. Dugan FM, Strausbaugh CA. 2019. Catalog of *Penicillium* spp. causing blue mold of bulbs, roots, and tubers. *[Mycotaxon](https://doi.org/10.5248/134.197)* 134:197−213
- 15. Salinas MC, Cavagnaro PF. 2020. In vivo and in vitro screening for resistance against *Penicillium allii* in garlic accessions. *[European](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10658-019-01875-z) [Journal of Plant Pathology](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10658-019-01875-z)* 156:173−187
- 16. Office of Agricultural Economics. 2024. Garlic percent product 67. www.frac.info (Accessed 4 November 2024)
- 17. Choi YW, Hyde KD, Ho WH. 1999. Single spore isolation of fungi. *Fungal Diversity* 3:29−38
- 18. White TJ, Bruns T, Lee S, Taylor J. 1990. Amplification and direct sequencing of fungal ribosomal RNA genes for phylogenetics. In

PCR Protocols: A Guide to Methods and Applications, eds. Innis MA, Gelfand DH, Sninsky JJ, White TJ. New York: Academic Press. pp. 315−22. doi: [10.1016/b978-0-12-372180-8.50042-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-372180-8.50042-1)

- 19. Glass NL, Donaldson GC. 1995. Development of primer sets designed for use with the PCR to amplify conserved genes from filamentous ascomycetes. *[Applied and Environmental Microbiology](https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.61.4.1323-1330.1995)* 61:1323−30
- 20. Peterson SW, Vega FE, Posada F, Nagai C. 2005. Penicillium coffeae, a new endophytic species isolated from a coffee plant and its phylogenetic relationship to *P. fellutanum, P. thiersii* and *P. brocae* based on parsimony analysis of multilocus DNA sequences. *[Mycologia](https://doi.org/10.1080/15572536.2006.11832796)* 97:659−66
- 21. Liu YJ, Whelen S, Hall BD. 1999. Phylogenetic relationships among ascomycetes: evidence from an RNA polymerse II subunit. *[Molecu](https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.molbev.a026092)[lar Biology and Evolution](https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.molbev.a026092)* 16:1799−808
- Edgar RC. 2004. MUSCLE: multiple sequence alignment with high 22. accuracy and high throughput. *[Nucleic Acids Research](https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkh340)* 32:1792−97
- 23. Hall T. 1999. BioEdit: a user-friendly biological sequence alignment editor and analysis program for Windows 95/98/NT. *Nucleic Acids Symposium Series* 41:95−98
- 24. Felsenstein J. 1985. Confidence limits on phylogenies: an approach using the bootstrap. *[Evolution](https://doi.org/10.2307/2408678)* 39:783−91
- 25. Stamatakis A. 2014. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-analysis of large phylogenies. *[Bioinformatics](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btu033)* 30:1312−13
- 26. Ronquist F, Teslenko M, Van Der Mark P, Ayres DL, Darling A, et al. 2012. MrBayes 3.2: efficient Bayesian phylogenetic inference and model choice across a large model space. *[Systematic Biology](https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/sys029)* 61:539−42
- 27. Darriba D, Taboada GL, Doallo R, Posada D. 2012. jModelTest 2: more models, new heuristics and parallel computing. *[Nature Meth](https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2109)[ods](https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2109)* 9:772
- 28. Rambaut A. 2014. FigTree. Version 1.4. 2. University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK. <http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/Figtree/>
- 29. Khuna S, Kumla J, Srinuanpan S, Lumyong S, Suwannarach N. 2023. Multifarious characterization and efficacy of three phosphate-solubilizing *Aspergillus* species as biostimulants in improving root induction of cassava and sugarcane stem cuttings. *[Plants](https://doi.org/10.3390/plants12203630)* 12:3630
- 30. Suwannarach N, Khuna S, Thitla T, Senwanna C, Nuangmek W, et al. 2024. Morpho-phylogenetic identification and characterization of new causal agents of *Fusarium* species for postharvest fruit rot disease of muskmelon in northern Thailand and their sensitivity to fungicides. *[Frontiers in Plant Science](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2024.1459759)* 15:e1459759
- 31. Pandey AK, Hubballi M, Sharma HK, Ramesh R, Roy S, et al. 2024. Molecular delineation and genetic diversity of *Fusarium* species complex causing tea dieback in India and their sensitivity to fungicides. *[Crop Protection](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2024.106707)* 181:e106707
- 32. Frisvad JC, Samson RA. 2004. Polyphasic taxonomy of *Penicillium* subgenus *Penicillium*: a guide to identification of food and airborne terverticillate *Penicillia* and their mycotoxins. *Studies in Mycology* 49:1−174
- 33. Houbraken J, Samson RA. 2011. Phylogeny of Penicillium and the segregation of *Trichocomaceae* into three families. *[Studies in](https://doi.org/10.3114/sim.2011.70.01) [Mycology](https://doi.org/10.3114/sim.2011.70.01)* 70:1−51
- 34. Houbraken J, Kocsubé S, Visagie CM, Yilmaz N, Wang XC, et al. 2020. Classification of *Aspergillus, Penicillium, Talaromyces* and related genera (*Eurotiales*): an overview of families, genera, subgenera, sections, series and species. *[Studies in Mycolog](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.simyco.2020.05.002)y* 95:5−169
- 35. Visagie CM, Houbraken J, Frisvad JC, Hong SB, Klaassen CHW, et al. 2014. Identification and nomenclature of the genus *Penicillium*. *[Studies in Mycology](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.simyco.2014.09.001)* 78:343−371
- 36. Cavagnaro PF, Camargo A, Piccolo, RJ, Lampasona SG, Burba JL, et al. 2005. Resistance to *Penicillium hirsutum* Dierckx in garlic accessions. *[European Journal of Plant Pathology](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10658-005-1750-6)* 112:195−199
- 37. Visagie CM, Yilmaz N. 2023. Along the footpath of *Penicillium* discovery: six new species from the Woodville big tree Forest Trail. *[Mycologia](https://doi.org/10.1080/00275514.2022.2135915)* 115:87−106

Blue mold disease of garlic in Thailand

- 38. Bashir U, Javed S, Anwar W, Nawaz K, Hafeez R. 2017. First report of *Penicillium polonicum* causing blue mold on stored garlic (*Allium sativum*) in Pakistan. *[Plant Disease](https://doi.org/10.1094/pdis-07-16-1069-pdn)* 101:1037−38
- 39. Valdez JG, Makuch MA, Ordovini AF, Masuelli RW, Overy DP, et al. 2006. First report of *Penicillium allii* as a field pathogen of garlic (*Allium sativum*). *[Plant Pathology](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3059.2006.01411.x)* 55:e583
- 40. Valdez JG, Makuch MA, Ordovini AF, Frisvad JC, Overy DP, et al. 2009. Identification, pathogenicity and distribution of *Penicillium* spp. isolated from garlic in two regions in Argentina. *[Plant Pathol](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3059.2008.01960.x)[ogy](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3059.2008.01960.x)* 58:352−61
- 41. Kim YK, Hong SJ, Jee JJ, Park JH, Han EJ, et al. 2010. Biological control of garlic blue mold using *Pantoea agglomerans* S59-4. *The Korean Journal of Pesticide Science* 14:148−56
- 42. Stošić S, Risti ć D, Trkulja N, Živkovi ć S . 2024. *Penicillium* species associated with postharvest blue mold rots of garlic in Serbia. *[Plant Disease](https://doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-04-24-0890-RE)* 101:e6
- 43. Tini F, Beccari G, Terzaroli N, Berna E, Covarelli L, et al. 2024. Phytosanitary problems in elephant garlic (*Allium ampeloprasum* var. *holmense*) in the "Val di Chiana" area (Central Italy), and evaluation of potential control strategies. *[Phytopathologia Mediterranea](https://doi.org/10.36253/phyto-14911)* 63:53−72
- 44. Sharma K, Raj H, Sharma A. 2019. *In vitro* evaluation of safer fungicides in management of *Penicillium digitaum* causing green mould of Kinnow. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry* 8:1291−94
- Ghuffar S, Irshad G, Naz F, Khan MA. 2021. Studies of *Penicillium* 45. species associated with blue mold disease of grapes and management through plant essential oils as non-hazardous botanical fungicides. *[Green Processing and Synthesis](https://doi.org/10.1515/gps-2021-0007)* 10:21−36
- 46. Zhang Y, Zhang B, Luo C, Fu Y, Zhu F. 2021. Fungicidal actions and resistance mechanisms of prochloraz to *Penicillium digitatum*. *[Plant Disease](https://doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-05-20-1128-RE)* 105:408−15
- 47. Jurick WM, Macarisin O, Gaskins VL, Janisiewicz WJ, Peter KA, et al. 2019. Baseline sensitivity of *Penicillium* spp. to difenoconazole. *[Plant Disease](https://doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-05-18-0860-RE)* 103:331−37
- Khadiri M, Boubaker H, Farhaoui A, Ezrari S, Radi M, et al. 2024. *In* 48. *vitro* assessment of *Penicillium expansum* sensitivity to difenoconazole. *[Microorganisms](https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms12112169)* 12:e2169
- Gálvez L, Palmero D. 2022. *Fusarium* dry rot of garlic bulbs caused 49. by *Fusarium proliferatum*: a review. *[Horticulturae](https://doi.org/10.3390/horticulturae8070628)* 8:628
- FRAC. 2020. *Fungal control agents sorted by cross resistance pattern* 50. *and mode of action*. www.frac.info (Accessed 3 November 2024)
- 51. Yin Y, Miao J, Shao W, Liu X, Zhao Y, et al. 2023. Fungicide resistance: progress in understanding mechanism, monitoring, and management. *[Phytopathology](https://doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO-10-22-0370-KD)* 113:707−18
- 52. Deising HB, Reimann S, Pascholati SF. 2008. Mechanisms and significance of fungicide resistance. *[Brazilian Journal of Microbiol](https://doi.org/10.1590/S1517-83822008000200017)[ogy](https://doi.org/10.1590/S1517-83822008000200017)* 39:286−95
- 53. Corkley I, Fraaije B, Hawkins N. 2022. Fungicide resistance management: maximizing the effective life of plant protection products. *[Plant Pathology](https://doi.org/10.1111/ppa.13467)* 71:150−69
- 54. Davies CR, Wohlgemuth F, Young T, Violet J, Dickinson M, et al. 2021. Evolving challenges and strategies for fungal control in the food supply chain. *[Fungal Biology Reviews](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fbr.2021.01.003)* 36:15−26

Copyright: © 2024 by the author(s). Published by Maximum Academic Press, Fayetteville, GA. This

article is an open access article distributed under Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), visit [https://creative](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)[commons.org/licenses/by/4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)/.