DOI:10.13925/j.cnki.gsxb.20220646

土壤中梨火疫病菌实时荧光 定量PCR检测及动态分析

乾义柯1,韩丽丽2,陈珊珊1,罗 亮1,魏 霜3,李晓妹4,牛蒙亮1*,陈卫民2*

('江汉大学,武汉 430056;²伊犁职业技术学院,新疆伊宁 835000;³广州海关技术中心, 广州 510000;⁴通用生物(安徽)股份有限公司,合肥 230000)

摘 要:【目的】利用实时荧光定量PCR检测土壤中梨火疫病菌(Erwinia amylovora)浓度,明确梨火疫病菌在土壤中的 动态变化规律。【方法】2021年3—11月采集库尔勒市发病香梨园810份土壤样品,应用所建立的实时荧光定量PCR检 测体系,测定土壤中的梨火疫病菌浓度,同时对梨园发病率及病情指数进行调查。【结果】土壤中梨火疫病菌浓度值变化 趋势与梨园病情指数变化趋势一致,4—5月梨园病情指数快速升高至最高值,随着果树生长期延长,病情指数逐渐降 低。土壤中梨火疫病菌浓度值从4月逐渐升高,6月平均浓度值为914 CFU·g⁻¹,7月平均浓度值最高为965 CFU·g⁻¹,随 后逐渐降低;6月土壤带菌率为42.2%,浓度值≥10³ CFU·g⁻¹的土样13份;7月土壤带菌率为44.4%,浓度值≥10³ CFU·g⁻¹ 的土样26份;6月、7月土壤中梨火疫病菌浓度显著高于4月、10月、11月,致病风险较高。【结论】6月和7月土壤中梨火 疫病菌浓度值最高,主要与4月、5月大量病花病果掉落造成病原菌积累有关。加强花期病害防治和梨园病残体清理 可有效降低土壤中梨火疫病菌浓度,是降低梨火疫病菌在梨树根部侵染风险的关键点。

关键词:梨火疫病菌;土壤;荧光定量PCR;动态分析

中图分类号:S661.2 S436.612 文献标志码:A 文章编号:1009-9980(2023)09-1839-09

Real-time PCR detection and dynamic analysis of *Erwinia amylovora* in the soils of pear orchards

QIAN Yike¹, HAN Lili², CHEN Shanshan¹, LUO Liang¹, WEI Shuang³, LI Xiaomei⁴, NIU Mengliang^{1*}, CHEN Weimin^{2*}

(⁴Jianghan University, Wuhan 430056, Hubei, China; ²Yili Vocational and Technical College, Yining 835000, Xinjiang, China; ³Guangzhou Customs Technology Center, Guangzhou 510000, Guangdong, China; ⁴General Biology (Anhui) Co., Ltd., Hefei 230000, Anhui, China)

Abstract: [Objective] The pear fire blight is induced by *Erwinia amylovora* (*E. amylovora*). It first appeared in May, 2016 in Huocheng County, Xinjiang Yili, China. It has spread to 14 Xinjiang regions, posing danger to pears, apples, hawthorns, quince, and other fruit trees, particularly in Korla. The disease has been considered an enormous risk to the Xinjiang fruit industry. Since 2019, we have discovered that the main stem of the pear tree exhibits noticeable lesions and bacterial fluids that spread from the root to the stem and ultimately induce the tree to die. Thus, we assessed the *E. amylovora* concentrations in the soils of the pear orchards and monitor the dynamic variation trend of *E. amylovora* by real-time fluorescence quantitative PCR in order to get insight into the occurence and control of the pear fire blight. [Methods] Six samples were collected from the each point following the random diagonal five-point sampling method. From March to November 2021, we collected 810 soil samples from the diseased pear orchards in Korla, with a sampling depth of 0-20 cm and a sampling volume of around 100 g

收稿日期:2022-11-22 接受日期:2023-06-01

基金项目:国家重点研发计划(2022YFC2601500)

作者简介:乾义柯,男,高级实验师,研究方向为植物病理学。E-mail:qianyike123@126.com

^{*}通信作者 Author for correspondence. E-mail:nfuyuer@163.com; E-mail:chenweiming3998@126.com

at every point. The soil was sieved in order to obtain a 2.0 mm fraction, air-dried at room temperature for 2 days and stored in paper bags. The total DNA was extracted from the each soil sample at a dry weight of 0.25 g using the MOBIO Soil Genomic DNA Extraction Kit. 0.25 g dry soil was taken out, and a standard bacterial suspension of 2.0×10^{9} CFU \cdot mL⁻¹ was used for serial dilution of quantitative soil DNA using sterile water. The standard curve was generated using different amounts of standard DNA dilutions, and the concentration of E. amylovora in soil samples was detected by the real-time fluorescence quantitative PCR established by our lab. [Results] The real time fluorescence quantitative PCR reaction was conducted under conditions of initial 5 min denaturation at 95 °C, 45 cycles of 95 °C for 10 s, 60 °C for 30 s. The equation of standard curve was y=-3.458x + 46.033, there was a good linear relationship between the CT value and the logarithm of pathogen concentration. The evaluation standard was based on the CT value and the fluorescence enhancement signal, with a positive result when the CT value was less than 40 and there was a clear fluorescence enhancement signal and a negative result when the CT value was larger than 40 or there was no amplification signal. E. amvlovora accounted for a small proportion of total microorganisms in the soils, and the CT value of positive samples ranged from 30 to 40 in general. The carrier rate was 24.2%, 8.9%, 22.2%, 42.2%, 44.4%, 17.8%, 23.3%, 2.2% and 2.2%, and the average concentration of *E. amylovora* was 515, 82, 428, 914, 965, 277, 408, 15 and 15 $CFU \cdot g^{-1}$ from March to November respectively. E. amylovora levels were significantly higher in June and July than those in April, October, and November. The highest concentration of E. amylovora in the 810 soil samples was 5.29×10^4 CFU \cdot g⁻¹, with a CT value of 31.8. 13 soil samples had concentrations greater than 10^3 CFU · g⁻¹ in June, and 26 soil samples had concentrations greater than 10^3 CFU · g⁻¹ in July. The results of the study suggested that June and July would have a higher risk of diseases. Since April, the concentration of *E. amylovora* in the soils had gradually increased with the growing period of pear plants. Because diseased residues such as diseased leaves and fruits were not cleaned in time after the picking season in 2020, the average concentration of E. amylovora in March was higher than those in April and May. The carrier rate and average concentration of E. amylovora in the soils were at their maximum in July and gradually decreased later. Because diseased leftovers such as diseased leaves and fruits were cleaned in time according to prevention and control requirements following the picking period in 2021, the average concentration of E. amylovora was reduced significantly in October and November 2021. In accordance with the survey data, the average concentration and carrier rate of E. amylovora fluctuated with the disease index. The pear orchard disease index was highest in May, whereas the average concentration and carrier rate of E. amylovora were at their maximum in July. The average E. amylovora concentration and carrier rate in the soils had a time lag, due to the sedimentation and accumulation. [Conclusion] The average concentration and carrier rate of E. amylovora were at their maximum in June and July in the soils of the pear orchards, which had a time lag with the disease index due to the sedimentation and accumulation of the pathogen. The diseased residues should be cleaned out from the orchard in time for effective control of the disease.

Key words: Erwinia amylovora; Soil; Real-time fluorescence quantitative PCR; Dynamic analysis

梨火疫病是由解淀粉欧文氏菌(Erwinia amylovora)引起的一种重大国际检疫性病害,现已扩散 分布于世界近50个国家和地区^[1]。2005年以来,与 我国毗邻的日本、韩国、哈萨克斯坦、吉尔吉斯斯坦 和俄罗斯等相继报道发生^[24]。2016年5月梨火疫病 首次在中国新疆伊犁霍城县发生,现已蔓延至新疆 14个地州(市),严重危害梨、苹果、山楂、海棠、榅 桲、杏等果树,尤其是在库尔勒香梨上传播极为迅 速,对新疆乃至全国林果产业带来严重威胁^[5]。梨 火疫病菌在果园中主要通过风、雨以及果树修剪传 播,也可以依靠昆虫和飞鸟远距离传播^[6]。发病病 株溃疡斑处的菌脓可随雨水的冲击汇集于土壤,成 为重要的侵染源。有研究报道用梨火疫病菌菌液灌 溉土壤感染梨树幼苗,证实了土壤中梨火疫病菌从 梨树受伤根部侵染的风险性^[7]。2020年Ricardo等^[8] 利用绿色荧光蛋白转化体、落射荧光显微镜和激光 共聚焦扫描显微镜等技术手段,证实了梨火疫病菌 具有感染、定殖和侵入梨树根部的能力,并在根部和 地上部分均能引起典型的火疫病症状。因此,对梨 园土壤中梨火疫病菌进行早期诊断和动态监测,对 于掌握土壤中梨火疫病菌消长规律、有效控制病害 的发生至关重要。

土传致病菌一般所占土壤中总微生物的比例较 低,而且易受其他微生物及土壤复杂成分的干扰,因 此对检测体系的稳定性和灵敏度要求较高的。实时 荧光定量PCR(quantitative real-time PCR)技术能进 行定性定量的快速检测,且灵敏度高。钱国梁等[10] 建立了梨火疫病菌荧光染料 SYBR Green I 检测方 法,对梨枝条浸泡液进行实时荧光PCR 检测,检测 的灵敏度可达24个菌体细胞。尚琳琳等¹¹¹利用4种 实时荧光PCR方法分别对从美国进境的326批樱桃 果实中梨火疫病菌进行检测,表明探针Ams最为灵 敏。袁英哲等^[12]将叠氮溴化丙啶(PMA)与实时荧 光定量PCR技术相结合,建立了梨火疫病菌活菌检 测方法。综合上述研究方法,笔者在本研究中建立 土壤中梨火疫病菌的实时荧光定量检测体系,并应 用建立的检测体系对库尔勒香梨园整个生长期土壤 中梨火疫病菌进行动态监测,明确土壤中梨火疫病 菌消长分布规律,为梨火疫病的防治提供技术支持。

1 材料和方法

1.1 材料

阳性菌株:梨火疫病菌从新疆库尔勒市香梨园 土壤中分离,经生化测定、PCR扩增测序分析鉴定为 E. amylovora,菌株保存于江汉大学生命科学学院。

引物及探针:梨火疫病菌荧光PCR检测^[13]用引物探针由武汉天一辉远基因科技有限公司合成,扩增片段79 bp。

引物Ams116F:5'-TCCCACATACTGTGAAT-CATCCA-3';

引物Ams189R:5'-GGGTATTTGCGCTAATTT-TATTCG-3', 探针 Ams141T: FAM-5' - CCAGAATCTG-GCCCGCGTATACCG-3'-TAMRA。

培养基:梨火疫病菌平板培养采用营养琼脂 (NA)+5%蔗糖-牛肉浸膏1.0g·L⁻¹,酵母膏2.0g·L⁻¹, 蛋白胨5.0g·L⁻¹,氯化钠5.0g·L⁻¹,琼脂粉18.0g·L⁻¹, 蔗糖50.0g·L⁻¹,pH7.2。液体培养采用营养肉汤培 养基(NB)+5%蔗糖-牛肉浸膏1.0g·L⁻¹,酵母膏 2.0g·L⁻¹,蛋白胨5.0g·L⁻¹,氯化钠5.0g·L⁻¹,蔗糖 50.0g·L⁻¹,pH7.2。

土壤来源:土壤样品于2021年3—11月定点采 集于库尔勒市包头湖农场梨园、和什力克乡萨依力 克村梨园、阿瓦提农场拓普农业开发进出口股份有 限公司梨园。

主要试剂及仪器:细菌基因组 DNA 提取试剂盒 (TIANGEN,型号:DP302),土壤基因组 DNA 提取 试剂盒(MOBIO DNeasy Power Soil Kit,型号: 12888-50),AceQ Universal U+ Probe Master Mix V2 (Vazyme);荧光定量 PCR 仪(型号:Applied Biosystems StepOnePlusTM Real-Time System);紫外分光 光度计(Thermo NANo DROP 8000)。

1.2 方法

1.2.1 土壤采集及前处理 在库尔勒地区选定3个 取样点,取样地点1为包头湖农场香梨园(土壤类 型:黏土;地理坐标:41°41′04″N,85°50′12″E)、取 样地点2为拓普农业开发进出口股份有限公司香 梨园(土壤类型:沙土;地理坐标:41°36′55″N,86° 06′42″E)、取样地点3为和什力克乡萨依力克村香 梨园(土壤类型:壤土;地理坐标:41°46'13" N,85° 52'27"E),采集时间2021年3-11月,同时对梨园果 树发病情况进行调查统计。在梨园东、西、南、北、中 5个方位随机取样,每个方位点取6份土样,取样深 度0~20 cm,取样量约100g,尽量避免沙石、枯枝、树 叶等其他杂质,装入密封袋备用。土壤样品过筛(孔 径2mm),去除沙石、枯枝等杂物,保持样品均一 性。同时采集未发病健康梨园土壤进行土壤带菌分 离检测,确认无梨火疫病菌检出的土壤作阴性对 照。采样梨园信息详见表1。

1.2.2 土壤中总DNA提取 参照MOBIO土壤基因 组DNA提取试剂盒,每个过筛土样取干质量0.25g 提取总DNA。

1.2.3 荧光定量 PCR 反应体系与反应程序 使用 AceQ Universal U+ Probe Master Mix V2(Vazyme)

	of sampling location			
Table 1	The in	cidence rate and disease index		
	表1	采样梨园病情信息		

	,					
	梨园发病率和病情指数 Incidence rate/% and disease index					
口 期 Date	取样地点1 Sampling location 1	取样地点2 Sampling location 2	取样地点3 Sampling location3			
2021-03-08	_	-	_			
2021-04-06	4.08/0.47	2.74/0.27	4.33/0.40			
2021-05-06	19.85/2.53	12.45/2.20	15.56/2.04			
2021-06-04	11.37/1.65	9.76/1.69	13.34/1.61			
2021-07-05	14.79/2.18	10.47/1.74	13.73/1.29			
2021-08-05	6.93/1.03	6.72/1.42	6.21/0.75			
2021-09-10	5.18/0.42	5.12/0.81	5.12/0.57			
2021-10-06	_	_	_			
2021-11-06	_	_	_			

试剂盒进行 PCR 扩增,每样3次重复。反应体系20 μL: 2×AceQ qPCR Probe Master Mix V2 10 μL,10 μmol·L⁻¹ 上下游引物各 0.4 μL,10 μmol·L⁻¹探针 0.2 μL,DNA 模板 2.0 μL。扩增条件:预变性,95 ℃ 5 min;变性, 95 ℃ 10 s、退火/延伸,60 ℃ 30 s(45 个循环)。

1.2.4 梨火疫病菌菌悬液制备 梨火疫病阳性菌株 划线于NA+5%蔗糖培养基上,28.5℃活化培养48h, 挑单菌落接种于NB+5%蔗糖营养肉汤培养液中, 28.5℃,150 r·min⁻¹振荡培养12h至OD₆₀₀1.0~ 1.2^[12]。10000 r·min⁻¹离心10min收集病原菌,弃上 清液,再用无菌水重悬病原菌配置新鲜菌悬液。用 紫外分光光度计在OD₆₀₀波段下检测,检测值1.0对 应浓度为2.0×10⁹CFU·mL⁻¹,4℃备用。

1.2.5 土壤定量加标检测 取1 mL浓度为2.0×10° CFU·mL⁻¹的标准菌液10 000 r·min⁻¹离心10 min收 集全部菌株于离心管底部,去上清液,添加0.25 g健 康土壤涡旋混匀,配置为8.0×10° CFU·g⁻¹的定量土 样。参照 MOBIO 土壤基因组 DNA 提取试剂盒,3 次重复提取加标土壤中总 DNA,并分别依次6个梯 度 10 倍稀释,每个梯度稀释液取 2.0 μL DNA 做模 板,按照 1.2.3 体系和程序扩增,获取检测样品 Ct 值。以病菌浓度的对数值和检测样品的Ct值为横、 纵坐标,建立标准曲线。

2 结果与分析

2.1 标准曲线制作结果

土壤加标标准曲线制作结果显示,每个梯度重

复检测3次,重复性较好。以模板DNA起始浓度对应的梨火疫病菌浓度值的对数值(x)为横坐标,以Ct值(y)为纵坐标制作荧光定量PCR标准曲线,结果如图1所示。标准曲线方程为y=-3.458x+46.033, CT值与病原菌DNA浓度的对数值呈良好的线性关系,扩增效率(E)为94.6%,表明所建立的梨火疫病菌荧光定量PCR检测体系结果可信度高,扩增效率较理想,可以满足定量检测结果计算标准。

2.2 检测体系质控对照结果

阳性质控(PC)为加标土壤样品,带菌浓度8.0× 10°CFU·g⁻¹;阴性质控(NC)为未发病健康梨园采集 的9份土壤样品,经验证未能分离到梨火疫病菌且 PCR检测为阴性;空白对照(CK)取2.0 µL无菌水做 模板;测试样品(TC)为发病梨园随机采集的10份土 壤样品,经验证均能从样品中成功分离到梨火疫病 菌且巢式PCR检测为阳性。质控对照荧光PCR检 测结果显示,空白对照无荧光增强信号;阳性质控样 品有明显的扩增曲线,Ct值在24.2,与预期结果相 符;9份阴性质控样品中有7份未检测到荧光信号,2 份阴性样品有微弱荧光信号,但Ct值在40.0以上, 有可能受土壤中其他微生物 DNA 干扰,出现非特异 性扩增:10份测试样品均检测到不同程度荧光信 号,Ct值分布在30~40之间(图2),根据标准曲线公 式,当Ct值为40时,计算浓度值为222 CFU·g·1土 壤,该浓度值的土壤致病风险较低。为保证检测结 果的准确性,将Ct值小于40且有明显荧光增强信 号的检测结果定为阳性,检测值可信:Ct值大于40 或无扩增信号的检测结果定为阴性,按未检出处 理。

2.3 田间土壤样品检测结果

2021年3—11月,每月定点采集90份土样,共 计810份土样DNA进行荧光定量PCR检测,土壤 带菌平均值为当月样品带菌总量与土样总数之比 值,土壤带菌率即阳性检出率为当月阳性样品份数 与土样总数之比值,结果见表2。3月土壤带菌率 为24.2%,平均带菌浓度为515 CFU·g⁻¹;4月土壤带 菌率为8.9%,平均带菌浓度为82 CFU·g⁻¹;5月土壤 带菌率为22.2%,平均带菌浓度为428 CFU·g⁻¹;6月 土壤带菌率为42.2%,平均带菌浓度为914 CFU·g⁻¹ 土壤;7月土壤带菌率为44.4%,平均带菌浓度为 965 CFU·g⁻¹;8月土壤带菌率为17.8%,平均带菌浓 度为277 CFU·g⁻¹;9月土壤带菌率为23.3%,平均带



图 1 荧光定量 PCR 检测土壤中 E. amylovora 的标准曲线 Fig. 1 Standard curve of detecting E. amylovora by fluorescence quantitative PCR in soil



PC. 阳性对照;TC. 测试样品;NC. 阴性对照;CK. 空白对照。
PC. Positive control; TC. Test samples; NC. Negative control; CK. Blank control.
图 2 质控样品荧光定量 PCR 扩增曲线

Fig. 2 Amplification curve of detecting quality control samples by fluorescence quantitative PCR

菌浓度为409 CFU·g⁻¹;10—11 月土壤带菌率均为 2.2%,平均带菌浓度为15 CFU·g⁻¹。7月梨园果树生 长高峰期土壤带菌率和平均带菌浓度均最高,6月 与7月的检测结果差距较小;10—11 月梨园采摘后 期土壤带菌率和平均带菌浓度均最低。810份土壤 样品中,带菌浓度最高的土样采于3月,样品检测Ct 值为31.8,浓度为5.29×10⁴ CFU·g⁻¹;6月带菌浓度≥ 10³ CFU·g⁻¹的土样有13份,7月带菌浓度≥10³ CFU·g⁻¹

表 2	3-11	日十壇山	F	amvlovora	荧光定量	PCR	检测结果
12 4	5 11	刀工墩丁	Ŀ.	umytovoru	火儿足里	IUN	迎洲归不

Table 2 The detected results of *E. amylovora in* soil by fluorescence quantitative PCR from March to November

月份 Month	平均带菌浓度 Average value/ (CFU·g ⁻¹)	阳性样品带菌浓度 Value of positive samples/(CFU·g ⁻¹)	土壤带菌率 Carrier rate of <i>E.</i> <i>amylovora</i> in soil/%
3	515	$5.29 \times 10^{4} \times 1.07 \times 10^{4} \times 3.59 \times 10^{3} \times 1.52 \times 10^{3} \times 1.36 \times 10^{3} \times 1.29 \times 10^{3} \times 1.20 \times 10^{3} \times 1.11 \times 10^{3} \times 9.36 \times 10^{2} \times 9.04 \times 10^{2} \times 7.20 \times 10^{2} \times 7.10 \times 10^{2} \times 6.46 \times 10^{2} \times 6.22 \times 10^{2} \times 6.01 \times 10^{2} \times 5.77 \times 10^{2} \times 5.14 \times 10^{2} \times 4.98 \times 10^{2} \times 4.11 \times 10^{2} \times 3.76 \times 10^{2} \times 3.37 \times 10^{2} \times 2.75 \times 10^{2}$	24.2
4	82	3.88×10 ³ \3.01×10 ³ \8.80×10 ² \6.40×10 ² \5.55×10 ² \4.17×10 ² \3.42×10 ² \2.46×10 ²	8.9
5	428	$2.19 \times 10^{4} \times 1.07 \times 10^{4} \times 1.02 \times 10^{4} \times 7.95 \times 10^{3} \times 2.45 \times 10^{3} \times 2.43 \times 10^{3} \times 2.36 \times 10^{3} \times 1.71 \times 10^{3} \times 1.33 \times 10^{3} \times 1.14 \times 10^{3} \times 1.26 \times 10^{3} \times 8.37 \times 10^{2} \times 6.73 \times 10^{2} \times 5.60 \times 10^{2} \times 5.32 \times 10^{2} \times 5.16 \times 10^{2} \times 4.91 \times 10^{2} \times 4.73 \times 10^{2} \times 4.28 \times 10^{2} \times 3.64 \times 10^{2}$	22.2
6	914	$2.14 \times 10^4 \times 1.83 \times 10^4 \times 1.28 \times 10^4 \times 2.57 \times 10^4 \times 2.05 \times 10^4 \times 1.54 \times 10^3 \times 1.52 \times 10^3 \times 1.42 \times 10^3 \times 1.38 \times 10^3 \times 1.21 \times 10^3 \times 1.07 \times 10^3 \times 1.03 \times 10^3 \times 8.37 \times 10^2 \times 8.16 \times 10^2 \times 7.94 \times 10^2 \times 7.71 \times 10^2 \times 7.64 \times 10^2 \times 7.63 \times 10^2 \times 7.40 \times 10^2 \times 7.38 \times 10^2 \times 7.09 \times 10^2 \times 6.90 \times 10^2 \times 6.77 \times 10^2 \times 5.97 \times 10^2 \times 5.85 \times 10^2 \times 5.60 \times 10^2 \times 5.56 \times 10^2 \times 5.45 \times 10^2 \times 5.42 \times 10^2 \times 5.10 \times 10^2 \times 4.27 \times 10^2 \times 4.20 \times 10^2 \times 3.81 \times 10^2 \times 3.37 \times 10^2 \times 3.37 \times 10^2 \times 3.09 \times 10^2 \times $	42.2
7	965	$\begin{array}{l} 8.70 \times 10^3 , 7.57 \times 10^3 , 5.65 \times 10^3 , 5.21 \times 10^3 , 5.01 \times 10^3 , 4.65 \times 10^3 , 4.62 \times 10^3 , 4.31 \times 10^3 , 3.44 \times 10^3 , 3.29 \times 10^3 , 2.31 \times 10^3 , 1.85 \times 10^3 , 1.81 \times 10^3 , 1.70 \times 10^3 , 1.65 \times 10^3 , 1.28 \times 10^3 , 1.27 \times 10^3 , 1.26 \times 10^3 , 1.25 \times 10^3 , 1.24 \times 10^3 , 1.17 \times 10^3 , 1.16 \times 10^3 , 1.15 \times 10^3 , 1.01 \times 10^3 , 9.95 \times 10^2 , 9.82 \times 10^2 , 8.56 \times 10^2 , 8.22 \times 10^2 , 8.19 \times 10^2 , 7.88 \times 10^2 , 7.00 \times 10^2 , 6.55 \times 10^2 , 6.36 \times 10^2 , 6.20 \times 10^2 , 5.56 \times 10^2 , 4.96 \times 10^2 , 3.90 \times 10^2 \end{array}$	44.4
8	277	$\begin{array}{c} 4.17\times10^3\checkmark4.16\times10^3\backslash1.53\times10^3\backslash1.49\times10^3\backslash1.46\times10^3\backslash1.44\times10^3\backslash1.42\times10^3\backslash1.33\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash1.24\times10^3\backslash1.25\times10^3\backslash$	17.8
9	409	$1.75 \times 10^{4} \times 2.39 \times 10^{3} \times 2.35 \times 10^{3} \times 1.93 \times 10^{3} \times 1.22 \times 10^{3} \times 1.03 \times 10^{3} \times 1.03 \times 10^{3} \times 9.67 \times 10^{2} \times 9.42 \times 10^{2} \times 7.83 \times 10^{2} \times 7.11 \times 10^{2} \times 7.01 \times 10^{2} \times 6.83 \times 10^{2} \times 6.65 \times 10^{2} \times 6363 \times 10^{2} \times 6.00 \times 10^{2} \times 5.89 \times 10^{2} \times 5.54 \times 10^{2} \times 5.34 \times 10^{2} \times 5.31 \times 10^{2} \times 4.48 \times 10^{2}$	23.3
10	15	6.94×10 ² \.6.36×10 ²	2.2
11	15	6.04×10^2 5.70×10^2	2.2

的土样有26份,8月带菌浓度≥10°CFU·g⁻¹的土样有 12份,均处于较高致病风险;相较而言,4月、5月、9 月土壤带菌致病风险中等,10—11月土壤带菌致病 风险较低。 病情指数变化曲线结果见图3。2021年3月、6月、7 月土壤平均带菌浓度显著高于4月、10月、11月;4— 8月不同梨园土壤平均带菌浓度误差较大,3月、10 月、11月误差较小,不同梨园土壤平均带菌浓度误 差变化较大可能与梨园的病情指数、土壤类型及梨

3-11月,土壤带菌浓度平均值柱形图与梨园



数据为 3 个重复的平均值±标准误。不同小写字母表示结果经过邓肯氏新复极差检测(p<0.05)达到显著水平。

Mean values \pm SE of 3 replicates are given. Different small letters indicate significant differences at p < 0.05 by Duncans multiple range test.

图 3 3-11 月土壤中 E. amylovora 平均带菌浓度和病情指数趋势

Fig. 3 Trend chart of the average content of *E. amylovora* and disease index in soil from March to November

园管理等多因素有关。3月、10月、11月梨园果树处 于休眠期,未做发病率和病情指数调查;病情指数变 化曲线显示,4—5月期间病情指数快速升高,发病 率显著提升达到最高值,随着果树生长期延长,病 情指数逐渐降低。梨园病情指数变化趋势与土壤 平均带菌浓度趋势整体上基本一致,表现为先升后 降,土壤带菌浓度变化趋势要晚于梨园病情发展1 个月左右。

3 讨 论

土壤是梨火疫病菌传播的主要非生物因子之 一,自2016年首次报道梨火疫病菌传入新疆伊犁地 区以来,该病迅速在南北疆蔓延开来,尤其是库尔勒 地区果园香梨树受灾最为严重,2019年之前梨树病 害症状从花腐、枝枯到树干溃疡,病害症状逐渐加 重,2019年后在库尔勒市重度发病梨园病情调查中 发现,梨树主干从根部向上出现明显溃疡及流脓症 状,继而造成整棵梨树病死。可能原因一方面与土 壤中不断积累的梨火疫病菌有关,另一方面与果农 园间旋耕造成根部伤口加快病原菌侵染有关。因 此,对土壤中梨火疫病菌浓度及变化规律进行检测 和动态分析,摸清土壤中病原菌浓度与梨园病情指 数、果树生长期之间的关系,对科学评估不同时期土 壤致病风险及采取有效防控措施具有重要意义。

实时荧光定量技术在土壤中病原菌的定性定量 检测、早期诊断和预测预警方面已得到应用。张纪 利等[14]利用二次实时荧光定量技术建立了土壤中枯 萎病菌和黑胫病菌的快速检测方法。何子康等[15]针 对青枯病菌建立了二次荧光定量PCR方法,用于烟 草青枯病的预警控制。肖姬玲等师运用二次荧光定 量PCR方法检测土壤中西瓜枯萎病菌,检测下限达 到每克土壤100个孢子。张海燕等四利用荧光染料 SYBR Green I 定量技术建立了土壤中茄科雷尔氏 菌实时荧光定量PCR快速检测体系,预测细菌性青 枯病发病风险。笔者在本研究中对国内外已报道的 梨火疫病菌荧光定量PCR检测方法进行比较分析, 选用梨火疫病菌检测国家标准中推荐的Ams探针 法,该探针灵敏度较高,通过优化荧光PCR扩增体 系,采用45个扩增循环,结合质控对照分析,确认阳 性、阴性检出标准及可信检测值,建立了土壤中梨火 疫病菌实时荧光定量PCR检测体系,并应用建立的 检测体系对库尔勒香梨园 2021 年整个生长期土壤 中梨火疫病菌进行动态监测。建立的检测体系在质 控对照验证中,阳性测试样品的Ct值整体偏高,实 际样品检测的阳性Ct值也均在30以上,说明梨火疫 病菌所占土壤中总微生物的比例较低。

利用荧光定量PCR技术对土壤中致病菌进行 定量检测及动态分析,探寻土壤中病原菌浓度与作 物发病率和病情指数之间的关系[18-19]、病原菌浓度与 作物生长时期的关系[20]、作物根际土壤微生物与病 原菌之间的相关性[21],以及病原菌在时间和空间分 布的规律[22-23]等,从不同层面为土传病害的有效防控 提供了科学依据。为确保采集样品在时间和空间上 具有较好的代表性,采集时间从2021年3-11月,总 计810份样品,每月定点采集90份样品;采集区域分 布在发病区的3个重点梨园按月进行定点取样;同 时对梨园生长期4-9月发病率和病情指数进行调 查统计。前期,笔者采用巢式PCR对2020年春季(3 月)和秋季(9月)土壤中梨火疫病菌进行检测,其土 壤带菌率分别为72.8%和91.8%,明显高于2021年 土壤带菌率。2021年3月土壤带菌浓度与4月、10 月、11月存在显著性差异,应该与2020年采摘期后 没有及时清理梨园落叶、落果等病残体,造成病原菌 大量积累有关。2021年秋季采摘后,对梨园落叶、 落果等病残体进行了及时清理,10月、11月土壤带 菌率显著低于2020年秋季。上述结果表明加强梨 园枯枝、落叶及落果等病残体的清理,能有效降低土 壤中梨火疫病菌浓度。4月随着果树萌发,生长期 气温升高、降雨量增加,果树花腐为主要病害症状, 到5月病情指数最高,落花、落果情况最为严重,土 壤中梨火疫病菌大量积累,应该是6-7月土壤中梨 火疫病菌浓度显著升高的重要原因。随着夏季果树 生长旺盛期到来,果树抗病能力增强,土壤湿度、光 照等条件变化,土壤中梨火疫病菌浓度又出现逐渐 降低的趋势。从全年土壤带菌浓度、土壤带菌率及 高浓度样品比例来看,6-7月土壤中梨火疫病菌的 致病风险概率较高,因此控制梨园花期发病率,加强 落花、落果后期园间清理,降低土壤中梨火疫病菌的 沉降积累,是有效降低土壤中梨火疫病菌致病风险 的重要环节。有相关研究表明不同果树、作物在不 同生长期,根际与非根际土壤细菌多样性均有较大 差异[24-26],而土壤微生物对植物土传病害的抑制作用 是在土壤微生物群体影响下完成的,并不是单一菌 群作用的结果[27],因此对梨园土壤中梨火疫病菌防 治研究还需从土壤微生物中各类细菌数量的具体分 析深入探讨。

4 结 论

笔者在本研究中对库尔勒市发病梨园整个生长 期土壤中梨火疫病菌浓度进行定量检测、动态监测, 明确了土壤中梨火疫病菌消长分布规律及梨园病情 指数与浓度变化的关系,以及土壤中梨火疫病菌高 致病风险时期及防控关键环节,为土壤中梨火疫病 菌的早期诊断及梨火疫病的防治提供了技术支持。

参考文献 References:

- MOLINA L, REZZONICO F, DÉFAGO G, DUFFY B. Autoinduction in *Erwinia amylovora*: Evidence of an acyl-homoserine lactone signal in the fire blight pathogen[J]. Journal of Bacteriology, 2005, 187(9):3206-3213.
- [2] KIM W S, HILDEBRAND M, GEIDER K, JOCK S. Molecular comparison of pathogenic bacteria from pear trees in Japan and the fire blight pathogen *Erwinia amylovora*[J]. Microbiology, 2001,147(11):2951-2959.
- [3] DOOLOTKELDIEVA T, BOBUSHEVA S. Fire blight disease caused by *Erwinia amylovora* on Rosaceae plants in Kyrgyzstan and biological agents to control this disease[J]. Advances in Microbiology,2016,6(11):831-851.
- [4] JOCK S, WENSING A, PULAWSKA J, DRENOVA N, DREO T, GEIDER K. Molecular analyses of *Erwinia amylovora* strains isolated in Russia, Poland, Slovenia and Austria describing further spread of fire blight in Europe[J]. Microbiological Research, 2013, 168(7):447-454.
- [5] 李晓妹,韩丽丽,何亚南,张学超,陈卫民.20个苹果品种(类型) 对梨火疫病菌的抗病性评价[J]. 植物检疫,2022,36(4):6-12.
 LI Xiaomei, HAN Lili, HE Yanan, ZHANG Xuechao, CHEN Weimin. Evaluation on the resistance of 20 apple varieties to *Er-winia amylovora*[J]. Plant Quarantine,2022,36(4):6-12.
- [6] BILLING E. Fireblight *Erwinia amylovora* and weather: A comparison of warning systems[J]. Annals of Applied Biology, 1980,95(3):365-377.
- [7] SANTANDER R D, MARCO-NOALES E, ORDAX M, BIOS-CA E G. Erwinia amylovora colonization of host plants inoculated by irrigation[C]//Microorganisms in Industry & Environmentfrom Scientific & Industrial Research to Consumer Products-the III International Conference on Environmental, 2015.
- [8] SANTANDER R D, CATALÀ-SENENT J F, FIGÀS-SEGURA À, BIOSCA E G. From the roots to the stem: unveiling pear root colonization and infection pathways by *Erwinia amylovora*[J]. FEMS Microbiology Ecology, 2020, 96(12): 210.
- [9] 王秋君,马艳,常志州.土壤团聚体对微生物及土传病原菌的 影响[J]. 江苏农业学报,2015,31(4):946-950.

WANG Qiujun, MA Yan, CHANG Zhizhou. The effect of soil aggregate on soil microorganism and soil borne pathogen[J]. Jiangsu Journal of Agricultural Sciences, 2015, 31(4):946-950.

- [10] 钱国良,胡白石,卢玲,刘凤权,许志刚.梨火疫病菌的实时荧光 PCR 检测[J]. 植物病理学报,2006,36(2):123-128.
 QIAN Guoliang, HU Baishi, LU Ling, LIU Fengquan, XU Zhigang. Detection of *Erwinia amylovora* by real-time fluorescent PCR[J]. Acta Phytopathologica Sinica,2006,36(2):123-128.
- [11] 尚琳琳,周国梁,仇书红,陈仲兵,徐殿胜,易建平.美国进境樱桃果实中梨火疫病菌的检测[J].植物保护学报,2010,37(5): 441-446.

SHANG Linlin, ZHOU Guoliang, QIU Shuhong, CHEN Zhongbing, XU Diansheng, YI Jianping. Detection of *Erwinia amylovora* in cherry fruits imported from USA by PCR[J]. Journal of Plant Protection, 2010, 37(5):441-446.

[12] 袁英哲,韩剑,王岩,罗明,包慧芳,张春竹,黄伟.梨火疫病菌 活菌快速定量检测方法的建立[J].果树学报,2020,37(9): 1425-1433.

YUAN Yingzhe, HAN Jian, WANG Yan, LUO Ming, BAO Huifang, ZHANG Chunzhu, HUANG Wei. Establishment of rapid quantitative detection of viable *Erwinia amylovora*[J]. Journal of Fruit Science, 2020, 37(9): 1425-1433.

- [13] PIRC M, RAVNIKAR M, TOMLINSON J, DREO T. Improved fireblight diagnostics using quantitative real-time PCR detection of *Erwinia amylovora* chromosomal DNA[J]. Plant Pathology, 2009,58(5):872-881.
- [14] 张纪利,齐是,栾新博,金亚波,黄崇峻,黎平,韦建玉,颜健.植 烟土壤中枯萎病菌和黑胫病菌的快速检测方法[J].广东农业 科学,2022,49(2):101-108.

ZHANG Jili, QI Shi, LUAN Xinbo, JIN Yabo, HUANG Chongjun, LI Ping, WEI Jianyu, YAN Jian. Method for rapid detection of *Fusarium oxysporum* and *Phytophthora parasitica* var. *nicotianae* in tabacco planting soil[J]. Guangdong Agricultural Sciences, 2022, 49(2): 101-108.

[15] 何子康,张纪利,聂锦瑶,齐是,彭玮瑶,黎平,刘桔,韦建玉,颜 健.土壤中青枯病菌快速检测方法的建立与应用[J].中国植 保导刊,2022,42(8):5-9.

HE Zikang, ZHANG Jili, NIE Jinyao, QI Shi, PENG Weiyao, LI Ping, LIU Ju, WEI Jianyu, YAN Jian. Establishment and application of rapid detection method for *Ralstonia solanacearum* in soil[J]. China Plant Protection, 2022, 42(8):5-9.

[16] 肖姬玲,张屹,李基光,朱菲莹,魏林,梁志怀.实时荧光定量 PCR 检测土壤西瓜枯萎病菌体系的建立[J].植物保护学报, 2018,45(4):921-922.

XIAO Jiling, ZHANG Yi, LI Jiguang, ZHU Feiying, WEI Lin, LIANG Zhihuai. Establishment of real- time PCR system for quantitatively detecting *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *niveum* in soil[J]. Journal of Plant Protection, 2018, 45(4):921-922.

[17] 张海燕,张小芳,魏兰芳,李雪,艾瑛,姬广海.土壤中茄科雷尔 氏菌实时荧光定量 PCR 快速检测体系的建立与应用[J].江苏

农业科学,2017,45(14):17-20.

ZHANG Haiyan, ZHANG Xiaofang, WEI Lanfang, LI Xue, AI Ying, JI Guanghai. Establishment and application of real-time PCR system for *Ralstonia solanacearum* in soil[J]. Jiangsu Agricultural Sciences, 2017, 45(14): 17-20.

[18] 李华.山东省小麦-玉米轮作田土壤中多种镰孢菌的周年动态 检测[D].泰安:山东农业大学,2021.

LI Hua. Annual dynamic detection of *Fusarium* sp. in soil of wheat-maize rotation field in Shandong province[D]. Tai' an: Shandong Agricultural University, 2021.

- [19] 秦帅.实时荧光定量 PCR 技术用于土壤中烟草青枯病菌的定量检测及动态分析[D]. 泰安:山东农业大学,2016.
 QIN Shuai. Quantitative detection and dynamic analysis of *Ralstonia solanacearum* of tobacco in soil by real-time PCR[D].
 Tai'an:Shandong Agricultural University,2016.
- [20] 徐娜娜.实时荧光定量 PCR 技术用于土壤中小麦纹枯病菌的 定量检测及动态分析[D].泰安:山东农业大学,2014.
 XU Nana. Quantitative detection and dynamic analysis of *Rhizoctonia cerealis* of wheat in soil by real-time PCR[D]. Tai'an: Shandong Agricultural University,2014.
- [21] 党文芳,李雪艳,杨红梅,楚敏,高雁,曾军,霍向东,张涛,林 青,欧提库尔,李玉国,娄恺,史应武.新疆棉田根际土壤真菌 荧光 PCR 技术定量及其时空动态分析[J].新疆农业科学, 2019,56(2):317-324.

DANG Wenfang, LI Xueyan, YANG Hongmei, CHU Min, GAO Yan, ZENG Jun, HUO Xiangdong, ZHANG Tao, LIN Qing, Outikuer, LI Yuguo, LOU Kai, SHI Yingwu. Quantitative and spatio-temporal dynamic analysis of rhizosphere soil fungi by PCR technology in Xinjiang cotton fields[J]. Xinjiang Agricultural Sciences, 2019, 56(2):317-324.

[22] 关格格. 芸薹根肿菌分子检测与田间时空动态分析[D]. 沈阳: 沈阳农业大学,2019.

GUAN Gege. Molecular detection and dynamic analysis of temporal- spatial distribution on *Plasmodiophora brassicae*[D]. Shenyang Agricultural University, 2019.

[23] 马丹丹,关欢欢,李寿如,贾景丽,于秀梅,刘大群,赵伟全.马 铃薯疮痂病菌在植株和田间的分布与动态分析[J].植物病理 学报,2022,52(1):61-67.

MA Dandan, GUAN Huanhuan, LI Shouru, JIA Jingli, YU Xiumei, LIU Daqun, ZHAO Weiquan. Analysis of *Streptomyces* scabies distribution in plants and population dynamics in the field[J]. Acta Phytopathologica Sinica, 2022, 52(1):61-67.

- [24] 肖慧琳,王建萍,杨业凯,郑秋玲,徐维华,宫磊,宋志忠,唐美玲,刘万好.基于高通量测序技术的阳光玫瑰不同砧木根际 微生物多样性研究[J]. 果树学报,2022,39(9):1639-1648.
 XIAO Huilin, WANG Jianping, YANG Yekai, ZHENG Qiuling, XU Weihua, GONG Lei, SONG Zhizhong, TANG Meiling, LIU Wanhao. Analysis of microbial diversity in rhizosphere soil of Shine Muscat grape on different rootstocks using high-throughput sequencing[J]. Journal of Fruit Science, 2022, 39(9): 1639-1648.
- [25] 邵微,于会丽,张培基,徐国益,乔宪生,高登涛,王志强,田鹏, 司鹏.不同落叶果树根际微生物群落代谢与组成的差异性研 究[J].果树学报,2020,37(9):1371-1383. SHAO Wei,YU Huili,ZHANG Peiji,XU Guoyi,QIAO Xiansheng,GAO Dengtao,WANG Zhiqiang,TIAN Peng,SI Peng. Differences in metabolism and composition of microbial commu-

Differences in metabolism and composition of microbial communities in rhizosphere soils with different deciduous fruit trees[J]. Journal of Fruit Science, 2020, 37(9): 1371-1383.

- [26] 吴宇佳,吉清妹,解钰,雷菲,郑道君.西瓜连作土壤细菌种群 消长变化[J].中国瓜菜,2018,31(11):18-21.
 WU Yujia, JI Qingmei, XIE Yu, LEI Fei, ZHENG Daojun. Soil bacterial population dynamics of continuous watermelon cropping[J]. China Cucurbits and Vegetables,2018,31(11):18-21.
- [27] REN L X, SU S M, YANG X M, XU Y C, HUANG Q W, SHEN Q R. Intercropping with aerobic rice suppressed *Fusarium* wilt in watermelon[J]. Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 2008, 40(3):834-844.