

Document downloaded from:

[\[http://redivia.gva.es/handle/20.500.11939/5703\]](http://redivia.gva.es/handle/20.500.11939/5703)

This paper must be cited as:

[Moscoso-Ramirez, P. A., Palou, L. (2014). Preventive and curative activity of postharvest potassium silicate treatments to control green and blue molds on orange fruit. *European Journal of Plant Pathology*, 138(4), 721-732.]

ivia
Institut Valencià
d'Investigacions Agràries

The final publication is available at

[\[http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10658-013-0345-x\]](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10658-013-0345-x)

Copyright [Springer]

1

**1 Preventive and curative activity of postharvest potassium silicate treatments to
2 control green and blue molds on orange fruit**

3 Pedro A. Moscoso-Ramírez,^{1,2} Lluís Palou^{1*}

4¹Laboratori de Patologia, Centre de Tecnologia Postcollita (CTP), Institut Valencià d

5 Investigacions Agràries (IVIA), 46113 Montcada, Valencia, Spain.

6²Campus Tabasco, Colegio de Postgraduados, 86500 H. Cárdenas, Tabasco, México.

7

8

9* **Corresponding author:** palou_llu@gva.es

10 Tel. +34 963424117; Fax: +34 963424001

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1Abstract

2Preventive and curative antifungal activities of postharvest treatments with potassium
3silicate (PSi) against green (GM) and blue (BM) molds were evaluated on oranges (cvs.
4‘Valencia’ or ‘Lanelate’) artificially inoculated in rind wounds with *Penicillium digitatum*
5and *P. italicum*, respectively. The most effective PSi concentration, the effect of fungal
6inoculum concentration, and the influence of temporal and spatial factors on antifungal
7activity were assessed in *in vivo* primary screenings. After 6 days of incubation at 20°C,
8significant preventive (treatment before fungal inoculation) and curative (treatment after
9inoculation) activities against GM and BM were observed with PSi at 90 mM (GM and BM
10incidence reductions of 23 and 52%, and 23 and 40%, respectively). In preventive tests, the
11effectiveness of PSi was influenced by inoculum concentration (10^3 , 10^4 , 10^5 , or 10^6 spores
12mL⁻¹), but not by the distance between treatment and inoculation sites (10, 20 or 30 mm).
13PSi applied about 2 h before inoculation showed higher preventive activity than applied
14before 24, 48 or 96 h. In order to determine the best dip treatment conditions, PSi at 90 mM
15was tested at 20 or 50°C for 60 or 150 s in small-scale trials with ‘Lanelate’ oranges
16artificially inoculated before or after the treatment and incubated for 7 days at 20°C. Dips at
1720°C for 60 s were selected and subsequently applied on inoculated ‘Valencia’ oranges
18stored at 5°C and 90% RH for up to 6 weeks. Curative postharvest dips effectively reduced
19the incidence and severity of both GM and BM during cold storage, while preventive dips
20significantly reduced the severity but not the incidence. Overall, postharvest PSi treatments
21showed potential as a new tool to be part of non-polluting strategies to control penicillium
22decay of citrus fruit.

23 **Key words** *Penicillium digitatum*, *Penicillium italicum*, *Citrus sinensis*, silicon,
24 alternative postharvest disease control

1

1

2Introduction

3Green (GM) and blue (BM) molds caused by *Penicillium digitatum* (Pers.:Fr.) Sacc. and *P.*
4*italicum* Wehmer, respectively, are major diseases responsible for postharvest losses of
5citrus fruit worldwide (Palou et al. 2008). In spite of the application of fungicides and the
6increasing implementation of some alternative control strategies, the high incidence of GM
7and BM still accounts for important economical problems on stored citrus commodities.
8Therefore, it is necessary to further develop alternative approaches and novel technologies,
9including physical, chemical and biological control methods, for a cost-effective integrated
10control of these molds (Droby et al. 2009; Palou et al. 2008).

11Silicon (Si) is considered a functional plant nutrient that plays an important role as a
12component of cell walls (Laing et al. 2006). In agriculture, the interest of Si is multiple
13because has shown value as a fertilizer and for pest and disease control. In addition, some
14positive effects on the reduction of physiological disorders have also been described. In the
15particular case of citrus fruit, it was found that postharvest Si treatments could alleviate
16chilling injury, especially on long-term cold-stored lemons (Mathaba et al. 2009). The
17earliest scientific works on the role of Si in plant disease control were reported in the 1920s
18and 1930s. Wagner (1940) was the first to report an interaction between Si fertilization and
19the incidence of cucumber powdery mildew. In Europe, more recent research demonstrated
20that the addition of potassium silicate (PSi; K_2SiO_3) to nutrient solutions reduced the
21incidence of powdery mildew and stem lesions caused by the pathogen *Botrytis cinerea* on
22cucumber plants (O'Neill 1991). While the role of silicified cell walls in protecting plants
23against pathogens may not be completely discarded, other results suggest that Si acts in the
24host tissue by affecting the signals between host and pathogen, resulting in a more rapid

land extensive activation of plant defense mechanisms (Chérif et al. 1992a,b, 1994; Samuels et al. 1991). The specific mechanisms responsible for the protection of plants from fungal diseases by Si are not well understood. Si may act by eliciting biochemical defense reactions, including the accumulation of lignin, phenolic compounds, and pathogenesis-related proteins in infected plants (Chérif et al. 1992a; Epstein 1999). Results by Shen et al. (2010) suggested that reductions in fungal disease after treatment of field plants with low concentrations of P₂Si were probably not due to fungistatic effects of Si, but rather to other mechanisms such as Si acting as a physical barrier against pathogen penetration or Si-induced defense response in plants.

In contrast to P₂Si, whose antifungal activity has been practically assessed only as field treatments for herbaceous crops, another Si salt, sodium silicate (SSi), has been tested as postharvest treatments for some fruit or vegetable commodities. Bi et al. (2006) found that SSi at 100 mM was more effective than SSi at 25 or 50 mM to control diseases caused by *Alternaria alternata*, *Fusarium semitectum*, and *Trichothecium roseum* on artificially inoculated Hami melon fruit; SSi at 200 mM was phytotoxic. Furthermore, SSi treatments applied at 100 mM before inoculation with *T. roseum* induced lower decay incidence and severity on melons than treatments applied after fungal inoculation. According to these workers, the protection provided by SSi treatments was correlated with the activation of two families of defense-related enzymes, peroxidase and quitinase. In further research with melons, Guo et al. (2007) reported that SSi and silicon oxide, both applied as postharvest dips, reduced the severity of pink rot, caused by *T. roseum*, on Chinese cantaloupes, with lesion diameters reduced by up to fivefold when compared with the controls. In the same work, the effectiveness of SSi increased at higher concentrations and the growth of the fungus was completely inhibited at 100 mM. Few research results are available on the

1 activity of SSi against citrus postharvest pathogens. Liu et al. (2010) found that the plasma
2 membrane of Si-treated spores of *P. digitatum* was damaged, which suggested that Si
3 played a crucial role as antifungal agent. This author showed that treatments with SSi
4 significantly controlled GM caused by *P. digitatum* on citrus fruit. In addition, Youssef et
5 al. (2012) recently reported that both preharvest and postharvest treatments with SSi were
6 effective against *P. digitatum* or *P. italicum* on oranges and mandarins. Furthermore, we
7 observed very recently that postharvest treatments with SSi significantly reduced
8 penicillium molds on oranges artificially inoculated with *P. digitatum* or *P. italicum* about
9 24 h after treatment. However, these treatments left visible salt residues and were
10 potentially phytotoxic to the fruit peel (Moscoso-Ramírez and Palou 2013).

11 Before the promising activity of Si, applied as SSi, against some important postharvest
12 diseases and the lack of information on the performance of PSi, this research focused on the
13 evaluation of the antifungal properties of postharvest treatments with PSi against GM and
14 BM. Particularly, the objectives of this study were to: i) determine in *in vivo* primary
15 screenings the range of effective PSi concentrations for optimization of both preventive and
16 curative activities of PSi against GM and BM on orange fruit, ii) determine the influence of
17 temporal and spatial factors on the preventive activity of PSi against *P. digitatum*, iii)
18 optimize the conditions for postharvest dip treatments with PSi, and iv) evaluate the
19 effectiveness of postharvest PSi treatments during prolonged cold storage of oranges.

20

21 **Material and methods**

22 **Fruit**

23 The experiments were carried out with ‘Valencia’ and ‘Lanelate’ oranges (*Citrus sinensis*
24 (L.) Osbeck) collected from commercial orchards in the Valencia area (Spain). The fruit

1

1 were used the same day or stored up to 1 week at 5°C and 90% relative humidity (RH)
2 before use. Before each experiment, fruit were selected, randomized, washed with fresh
3 water and allowed to air dry at room temperature.

4

5 Fungal inoculum

6 *P. digitatum* and *P. italicum* , isolates NAV-7 and MAV-1, respectively, from the fungal
7 culture collection of the Laboratori de Patologia, Centre de Tecnologia Postcollita (CTP),
8 Institut Valencià d'Investigacions Agràries (IVIA), were cultured on potato dextrose agar
9 (PDA, Sigma-Aldrich Chemical Co., St. Louis, MA, USA) plates at 25°C. Conidia of each
10 fungus from 7- to 14-days-old were taken from the agar surface with a sterile glass rod and
11 transferred to a sterile aqueous solution of 0.05% Tween[®] 80 (Panreac, S.A.U., Barcelona,
12 Spain). Conidial suspensions were filtered through two layers of cheesecloth to separate
13 hyphal fragments and, depending on the experiment, adjusted to 10³, 10⁴, 10⁵ or 10⁶ spores
14 ml⁻¹ using a haemocytometer.

15

16 Determination of potassium silicate concentration

17 *In vivo* primary screenings were used to establish the most appropriate concentration for
18 both preventive and curative activity of PSi against GM and BM. For preventive activity,
19 30 µl of solution of PSi (K₂SiO₃; syns.: potassium salt of silicic acid, potassium
20 metasilicate; Sil-MATRIX[®], 29.1% a.i. PSi, PQ Corporation, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania,
21 USA) at 0.9, 9 or 90 mM a.i. were placed, using a micropipette, in a 1 mm wide, 2 mm
22 long, 1 mm diameter wound made with a stainless steel rod on the equatorial region of
23 'Valencia' oranges. About 24 h later, 30 µl of conidial suspension at 10⁵ spores ml⁻¹ of *P.*

digitatum or *P. italicum* were placed, using a micropipette, in a new identical wound adjacent to the first one (about 1-2 mm of separation between wounds). No good decay rate had been obtained in control fruit in previous experiments when the fungal inoculation had been performed in the same wound inflicted 24 h before, probably due to wound lignification during this period of time. To evaluate the curative activity, 30 µl of PSi solution at 0.9, 9, 30, 90 or 150 mM were placed, using a micropipette, in the same inoculation rind wound about 24 h after the inoculation of the pathogen. Control fruit were treated with 30 µl of sterile distilled water. In all cases, 4 replicates of 5 oranges each were used for each treatment. Treated fruit were stored at 20°C and 90% RH for 6 days, at which time disease incidence (% of infected fruit) and severity (lesion diameter) were evaluated.

11

12 Influence of inoculum concentration

13 To evaluate the influence of inoculum concentration of *P. digitatum* on the preventive or 14 curative activity of PSi, concentrations of 10^3 , 10^4 , 10^5 and 10^6 spores ml⁻¹ of *P. digitatum* 15 were prepared following the procedure described above. Thirty µl of PSi solution at 90 mM 16 (13.9 g l⁻¹) were placed, using a micropipette, in a 1 mm wide, 2 mm long, 1 mm diameter 17 wound made with a stainless steel rod on the equatorial region of ‘Lanelate’ oranges. For 18 preventive and curative activity, 30 µl of conidial suspension of *P. digitatum* at the desired 19 inoculum concentration were placed, using a micropipette, in the same peel wound about 2 20 h after and before, respectively. Control fruit were treated with 30 µl of sterile distilled 21 water. Each treatment was applied to 4 replicates of 5 oranges each. Treated fruit were 22 stored at 20°C and 90% RH for 6 days, at which time disease incidence and severity were 23 recorded. The experiment was repeated once.

24

1 Assessment of temporal and spatial characteristics of preventive activity

2 An experiment with ‘Valencia’ oranges was conducted in order to temporally characterize
3 the preventive activity of PSi. Thirty μl of PSi aqueous solution at 90 mM were placed,
4 using a micropipette, in a 1 mm wide, 2 mm long, 1 mm diameter wound made with a
5 stainless steel rod in the equator of the fruit. Subsequently, 30 μl of a 10^5 spores ml^{-1} *P.*
6 *digitatum* conidial suspension were pipetted about 2, 24, 48 or 96 h after treatment in a new
7 adjacent wound (about 2 mm of separation between wounds). Each treatment was applied
8 to 4 replicates of 5 oranges each. Treated fruit were stored at 20°C and 90% RH for 6 days,
9 at which time disease incidence and severity were evaluated. The experiment was repeated
10 once.

11 Another experiment was designed to evaluate the spatial influence on the preventive
12 activity of PSi. Fifty μl of PSi aqueous solution at 90 mM were pipetted in a wound made
13 with a stainless steel rod in the fruit equatorial region as described above. About 2 h after
14 treatment, 30 μl of a 10^4 spores ml^{-1} *P. digitatum* conidial suspension were placed in a new
15 rind wound inflicted at a distance of 10, 20 or 30 mm from the initial treatment wound.
16 Control fruit were treated with sterile distilled water and then inoculated in the same rind
17 wound. Four replicates of 5 oranges each were used per treatment. Treated fruit were stored
18 at 20°C and 90% RH for 6 days, at which time disease incidence and severity were
19 recorded. The experiment was repeated once.

20

21 Assessment of optimal dip treatment conditions

22 Small-scale trials were conducted using ‘Lanelate’ oranges to establish the best dip
23 treatment conditions to resemble potential commercial applications in citrus packinghouses.
24 Fungal inoculation in one peel wound per fruit at a concentration of 10^5 spores ml^{-1} of *P.*

digitatum or *P. italicum* was carried out following the procedure previously described. Dips were performed in stainless steel buckets containing 10 L of 90 mM aqueous solution of PSi. This concentration of PSi was selected according to previous results obtained in the *in vivo* primary screenings. When needed, PSi solutions were heated by placing the buckets in a 250-L stainless steel water tank fitted with two electrical resistances (4.5 kW each), a thermostat, and an automatic water-recirculating system. Fruit were placed into 18 L multi-perforated wall stainless steel containers, exactly fitting in the above-mentioned buckets, and completely immersed in the treatment solution for 60 or 150 s at 20 or 50°C. To assess preventive activity, dips were performed about 2 h before fungal inoculation and control fruit were dipped for 60 s in water alone at both 20 and 50°C. To assess curative activity, dips were performed about 24 h after fungal inoculation and control fruit were dipped in water alone at 20°C for 60 s. After treatment, fruit were not rinsed with tap water. Forty fruit per treatment (4 replicates of 10 fruit each) were arranged in plastic cavity sockets on cardboard trays. Treated fruit were incubated at 20°C and 90% RH. Disease incidence and severity were assessed after 7 days of incubation. Potential fruit phytotoxicity caused by PSi or heat was visually assessed after 3 days at 20°C. For this purpose, fruit were classified into one of four categories, depending on peel appearance: 0 = no peel damage; 1 = slight brownish blemishes present (<10% fruit surface); 2 = moderate brownish blemishes present (10% <fruit surface<25%) and 3 = severe peel injury (>25% fruit surface). A ponderate peel pitting index (0–3 scale) was calculated for each treatment. These trials were performed twice.

22

23Effectiveness on long-term cold-stored fruit

1

1 Both preventive and curative activities of postharvest PSi dips against GM and BM were
2 evaluated on ‘Valencia’ oranges subjected to long-term cold storage. Stainless steel buckets
3 containing 10 L of 90 mM PSi aqueous solution were used to dip the fruit at 20°C for 60 s.
4 Fruit were inoculated and treated or vice versa as described before and stored up to 6 weeks
5 at 5°C and 90% RH in a cold room in the IVIA CTP facilities. Control fruit were dipped in
6 water alone at 20°C for 60 s. Forty fruit per treatment (4 replicates of 10 fruit each) were
7 used. Disease incidence and severity were assessed after 2, 4, and 6 weeks at 5°C.

8

9 Statistical analysis

10 Data were analyzed by analyses of variance (ANOVA) with Statgraphics software
11 (Statgraphics Plus, v. 5.1; Manugistics Inc., Rockville, Maryland, USA). Data on disease
12 incidence were transformed to the arcsine of the square root of the proportion of infected
13 fruit to assure the homogeneity of variances. In some cases, reductions with respect to the
14 control treatments were calculated as percentages. Statistical significance was judged at the
15 level $P = 0.05$. Unless otherwise stated, results are means from two repeated experiments.
16 When appropriated, the Fisher’s Protected Least Significant Difference (LSD) test was
17 applied to separate means. Shown values are non-transformed means.

18

19 Results

20 Potassium silicate concentration

21 Among the concentrations of PSi evaluated in this set of *in vivo* experiments to prevent the
22 molds, the concentration of 90 mM significantly inhibited the development of GM and BM
23 on ‘Valencia’ oranges and was clearly superior to the concentrations of 0.9 and 9 mM (Fig.

11). The incidence of GM and BM was reduced by 23 and 52%, respectively, by PSi at 90 mM after 6 days of incubation at 20°C. Furthermore, PSi at 90 mM effectively reduced the severity of GM and BM by 74 and 67%, respectively (Fig. 1).

In the curative tests, the most effective treatment was also PSi at a concentration of 90 mM, which significantly reduced the incidence of GM and BM on ‘Valencia’ oranges by 23 and 64%, respectively, after 6 days of incubation at 20°C (Fig. 1). Likewise, the severity of GM and BM was effectively reduced by 57 and 66%, respectively, by treatment at 90 mM. Conversely, PSi treatments at 0.9, 9, 30 and 150 mM did not significantly reduce or reduced very slightly the incidence and severity of both molds (Fig. 1).

10

11 Influence of inoculum concentration

12 Regardless the inoculum concentration of *P. digitatum*, the preventive activity of PSi at 90 mM on ‘Lanelate’ orange fruit was clearly significant. On PSi-treated fruit GM incidence was reduced by 90, 66, 65, and 30% at concentrations of *P. digitatum* of 10^3 , 10^4 , 10^5 , and 10^6 spores ml⁻¹, respectively, while it was 50, 74, 100, and 100% on control fruit (Fig. 2). Similarly, GM lesion diameters were significantly reduced from 33, 51, 62 and 98 mm on control fruit to lesions of 4, 13, 28 and 52 mm on PSi-treated fruit when the oranges had been inoculated with concentrations of 10^3 , 10^4 , 10^5 and 10^6 spores ml⁻¹ of *P. digitatum*, respectively (Fig. 2).

In the curative tests, the effectiveness of PSi treatments at 90 mM to reduce GM incidence was lower and there were only significant differences with the control treatment when an inoculum concentration of *P. digitatum* of 10^4 spores ml⁻¹ was used (GM incidence reduction of about 30%; Fig. 2). Likewise, GM severity was not significantly reduced by PSi treatment regardless of the inoculum concentration (Fig. 2).

1

1In general, both GM incidence and severity significantly and expectedly increased on both
2control and PSi-treated fruit as the concentration of *P. digitatum* used for inoculation
3increased. The main exception was GM incidence on control fruit used on curative trials,
4which already reached 100% with an inoculum concentration of 10^4 spores ml⁻¹ (Fig. 2).

5

6Influence of temporal and spatial characteristics on preventive activity

7The preventive activity of PSi at 90 mM against GM on ‘Valencia’ oranges incubated at
820°C for 6 days was significantly different only when the fruit were inoculated with *P.*
9*digitatum* about 2 h after the treatment. GM incidence and severity were 35, 95, 95 and
10100% and 11, 69, 68 and 93 mm, respectively, when the time interval between treatment
11and inoculation were of 2, 24, 48 and 96 h (Table 1).

12On the other hand, the performance of PSi at 90 mM against GM on ‘Valencia’ oranges
13was not affected by the distance between the treatment and inoculation sites (10, 20 or 30
14mm). None of the PSi preventive treatments at these distances significantly reduced green
15mold in comparison with water-treated control fruit (Table 1).

16

17Dip treatment conditions

18A concentration of aqueous solution of 90 mM PSi was selected as the most effective in the
19previous *in vivo* primary screenings. Thus, this concentration was used in this subsequent
20set of trials. Dips of PSi at 90 mM at 20 or 50°C for 60 or 150 s significantly prevented the
21incidence of GM and BM on ‘Lanelate’ oranges inoculated about 2 h after treatment and
22incubated for 7 days at 20°C. On fruit dipped for 60 or 150 s at 20 or 50°C, PSi at 90 mM
23significantly reduced GM incidence by 37 and 27% and 50 and 55%, respectively, with

1 respect to water-treated control treatments (GM incidence of 100%; Fig. 3). On fruit dipped
2 for 60 or 150 s at 20 or 50°C, PSi treatment significantly reduced BM incidence by 18 and
3 33% and 40 and 28%, respectively, with respect to the controls (Fig. 3). Likewise, the
4 severity of both molds was similarly reduced by PSi at 90 mM on these preventive tests.
5 GM and BM lesion diameters were reduced from 105 and 46 mm on control fruit to 50-70
6 and 15-20mm, respectively, on PSi-treated oranges (Fig. 3). Thus, mold development on
7 PSi-treated oranges was not significantly affected by immersion time.

8 In tests to assess the curative activity, dips with PSi at 90 mM applied at 20 or 50°C for 60
9 or 150 s significantly reduced the incidence of GM and BM on ‘Lanelate’ oranges
10 inoculated 24 h before treatment and incubated for 7 days at 20°C. On fruit dipped for 60 or
11 150 s at 20 or 50°C, PSi at 90 mM reduced the incidence of GM by 35 and 38% and 40 and
12 62%, respectively. There was, therefore, a significant effect of immersion time, but only
13 when the dips were performed at 50°C (Fig. 4). This pattern was also observed for the
14 incidence of BM, with reductions of 42 and 47%, and 35 and 57%, respectively, on fruit
15 dipped for 60 or 150 s at 20 or 50°C (Fig.4). Likewise, the severity of both molds also
16 followed very similar patterns, and significant differences between immersion times were
17 only observed for GM on oranges dipped at 50°C (Fig. 4).

18 As a conclusion of both preventive and curative tests, PSi dips at 20°C for 60 s were
19 selected for use in subsequent experiments.

20

21 Effectiveness on long-term cold-stored fruit

22 After 2 weeks of storage at 5°C, the incidence of both GM and BM on ‘Valencia’ oranges
23 artificially inoculated about 2 h after treatment (preventive activity) was totally prevented
24 by the application of PSi at 90 mM as 60 s dips at 20°C. At this time, however, the

1 incidence of GM and BM on control fruit was only of 23 and 20%, respectively. After 4
2 and 6 weeks of cold storage, PSi at 90 mM showed no protective effect, since the incidence
3 of GM and BM was not significantly different from that on control fruit (Fig. 5). In general,
4 PSi treatments significantly reduced the severity of GM and BM throughout the entire
5 storage period of 6 weeks at 5°C. GM lesion diameters after 4 and 6 weeks on control and
6 PSi-treated oranges were 93 and 48 mm, and 200 and 159 mm, respectively. In the case of
7 BM, these diameters were 48 and 35 mm, and 100 and 84 mm, respectively (Fig. 5).

8 In the curative tests, the incidence of both GM and BM on ‘Valencia’ oranges artificially
9 inoculated 24 h before treatment, and stored up to 6 weeks at 5°C and 90% RH were
10 significantly reduced by the application of PSi at 90 mM as 60 s dips at 20°C. At the end of
11 the cold storage period, the incidence of both GM and BM was significantly reduced by up
12 to 45% with respect to the control fruit (GM and BM incidence of 100%) (Fig. 6). The
13 treatment with PSi at 90 mM also effectively reduced the severity of GM and BM during
14 cold storage at 5°C. GM and BM lesion diameters at the end of the 6-week cold storage
15 period on control and PSi-treated oranges were 200 and 98 mm, and 100 and 48 mm,
16 respectively (Fig. 6).

17

18 Discussion

19 This study reports that postharvest treatments with Si in the form of PSi aqueous solutions
20 applied to ‘Valencia’ or ‘Lanelate’ oranges both before (preventive activity) and after
21 (curative activity) artificial fungal inoculation, showed significant antifungal activity
22 against citrus GM and BM. Results from *in vivo* primary screenings showed that PSi
23 treatments inhibited mold development in a concentration-dependent manner, and they
24 were more effective at a concentration of 90 mM. Therefore, PSi acted here probably more

1as a plant growth regulator, which are typically more effective when applied at an optimal
2concentration, than as a conventional fungicide, whose efficacy gradually increases as the
3application dose increases. This hypothesis was supported by the fact that in the screenings
4for curative action, disease reduction was lower after PSi application at 150 than at 90 mM
5(Fig. 1). Results from these tests showed that the effectiveness of PSi at 90 mM to prevent
6GM or BM on ‘Valencia’ orange fruit (incidence reduction of 23 and 52%, respectively)
7was slightly inferior or similar to that reported after sodium silicate treatments on citrus
8(Liu et al. 2010), and it was also similar to that observed on jujube fruit (Tian et al. 2005).
9Further, it was found in previous work in our laboratory that preventive treatments with SSi
10at 1000 mM reduced GM and BM on artificially inoculated oranges by 70-90%, but this
11treatment caused injuries in the fruit peel (Moscoso-Ramírez and Palou 2013). It can be
12therefore concluded that, from a practical point of view, postharvest PSi treatments are
13superior to SSi treatments for the purpose of postharvest disease reduction. In addition, PSi
14treatments not exceeding 1% (wt/vol) were exempted in the USA from the requirement of a
15tolerance for residues in or on all food commodities when applied or used as a fungicide,
16insecticide or miticide (US EPA 2006). Moreover, aqueous PSi was also included in the list
17of synthetic substances allowed for use in organic crop production. The only requirement is
18that the silica used for the manufacture of PSi must be sourced from naturally occurring
19sand (USDA AMS NOP 2010).

20It has been proposed that the mode of action of Si treatments is through a direct effect on
21the pathogen. For instance, Liu et al. (2010) reported damage on the plasma membrane of
22Si-treated *P. digitatum* spores, leading to higher leakage of proteins and sugars. However,
23other research works contradicted this hypothesis and attributed the antifungal action of Si
24to indirect effects to the fruit host. Hereto, Si can play an important role on the formation of

1physical and mechanical barriers to the penetration of pathogens at the cell wall level
2(Buonario et al. 2009; Datnoff et al. 2001). Si treatments may also act by eliciting
3biochemical defense reactions, including the accumulation of lignin, phenolic compounds
4and pathogenesis-related (PR) proteins in infected plants (Epstein 1999). According to our
5results, we can hypothesize that in the case of citrus penicillium molds, the mode of action
6of postharvest PSi treatments for disease control might be a combination of both direct
7effects on the pathogen *P. digitatum* or *P. italicum* and indirect effects on the fruit host.
8Curative tests were performed with oranges artificially inoculated in rind wounds with a
9conidial suspension about 24 h before the treatment. This is the usual procedure to simulate
10the most common natural infections on laboratory assays to test the efficacy of postharvest
11fungicides against citrus GM and BM (Eckert and Brown 1986). Since the spore
12suspensions were freshly prepared the same inoculation day and the inoculated fruit were
13kept at a constant temperature of 20°C during the 24-h period between inoculation and
14treatment, the effect of the treatment was mostly on recently germinated conidia (on germ
15tubes or young hyphae), although a variable proportion could still be ungerminated conidia.
16On the other hand, preventive tests were carried out with oranges wounded, treated and
17inoculated about 2 or 24 h after treatment, depending on the experiment. It seems that PSi
18treatment effectively conferred by some mechanism some degree of resistance to the fruit
19peel, since significant disease reductions were observed on both primary screenings and dip
20trials with a PSi concentration of 90 mM.

21In any case, both preventive and curative effects were, as expected, dependent on the
22concentration of pathogenic inoculum. Early research showed that this factor clearly
23influenced the rate of successful infections when citrus peel wounds are inoculated with *P.*
24*digitatum* or *P. italicum* (Eckert and Eaks 1989). This was confirmed in this work, as

1disease incidence and severity on control fruit consistently increased as inoculum density
2increased (Fig. 2). Conversely, the protective action of PSi consistently decreased as the
3inoculum load increased (GM incidence reductions after 6 days at 20°C of 90, 70 and 30%
4on oranges inoculated with 10^3 , 10^5 and 10^6 spores ml^{-1} of *P. digitatum*). This effect on the
5incidence of GM was not as pronounced in the tests to assess the influence on the curative
6activity of PSi, probably because control fruit was already 100% decayed with a
7concentration of 10^4 spores ml^{-1} of *P. digitatum*. In contrast, the effect of inoculum density
8in these tests was clear for GM severity, which steadily increased on both control and PSi-
9treated oranges as the inoculum load increased.

10The period of time between treatment and inoculation (temporal factor) affected the
11preventive performance of PSi only when it was of about 2 h. In this case, GM incidence
12and severity were significantly lower than with the rest of time intervals (Table 1). We
13assume that after 2 h, a large amount of active PSi residues might be present into the treated
14rind wound and they might adversely affect the viability of ungerminated spores that had
15just been inoculated into the adjacent wound. In contrast, time intervals of 24, 48 and 96 h
16between treatment and inoculation were too long to maintain equivalent proportions of
17active residues in the peel tissue. It appears, in addition, that during these time periods the
18treatment did not induce any defense or protection mechanisms against *P. digitatum*
19important enough to significantly reduce disease on inoculated fruit. The importance of the
20timing of defense responses in phenomena related to acquired or induced plant resistance to
21pathogens is critical, as it has been suggested by some researchers (Vallad and Goodman
222004). Our data also showed that PSi locally applied to a peel wound after harvest had no
23systemic activity and GM incidence and severity were not reduced on inoculated wounds
24located at 10, 20, or 30 mm from the treatment site. Therefore, the preventive action of

1 postharvest PSi treatments would be a type of local acquired resistance (LAR), since
2 resistance is only manifested in the same plant tissues that receive the resistance induction
3 treatments. In contrast, most of preharvest or field applications with chemical resistance
4 inducers typically induce systemic acquired resistance (SAR) or induced systemic
5 resistance (ISR), in which pathogen resistance is produced in plant organs other than those
6 that had been directly treated (Edreva 2004; Vallad and Goodman 2004). The production of
7 SAR or IRS is favored by the high metabolic activity of the plant growing in the field. In
8 general, resistance to plant pathogens are more easily induced in vegetative parts of the
9 plant than in reproductive portions, such as the peel tissues of citrus fruit (Porat et al. 2003).
10 In this study, variable results were obtained when postharvest PSi treatments at 90 mM
11 were applied with micropipette into wounds in *in vivo* primary screenings or as aqueous
12 dips in laboratory trials. With the exception of BM incidence in preventive tests, disease
13 incidence was generally higher on dip-treated oranges than on fruit treated with a solution
14 drop. This could be explained by different penetration capability of the product into peel
15 wounds and different length of contact between the product and the treated fruit.
16 In general, dip times and temperatures did not consistently influence the effectiveness of
17 PSi dips. Therefore, dips at room temperature (20°C) for 60 s were selected and applied on
18 subsequent trials with long-term cold stored oranges. This is a result that might facilitate the
19 commercial adoption of postharvest PSi treatments in citrus packinghouses, since
20 implementation and application costs of non-heated solutions would be considerably lower
21 than that of solutions heated to temperatures of 40-50°C. In our work, the curative
22 effectiveness of these PSi dips to reduce the incidence of GM and BM was similar to that
23 obtained by Bi et al. (2006) using SSi treatments to control melon pink rot caused by *T.*
24 *roseum*. GM and BM severity on oranges was reduced by up to two-fold by PSi dips at

1room temperature for 60 s in either preventive or curative tests. Although these reductions
2were significant, they were lower than those obtained by Guo et al. (2007) after dipping
3Chinese cantaloupes in SSi solutions to control pink rot (severity reduction of about five-
4fold).

5In preventive tests with long-term cold-stored fruit at 5°C, we found that PSi at 90 mM
6applied as 60 s dips at 20°C did not significantly reduce the incidence of GM and BM after
74 or 6 weeks of storage, but it was effective to reduce the severity of both molds. In
8contrast, in curative tests, this same treatment effectively reduced both incidence and
9severity of GM and BM with respect to control fruit (Figs. 5, 6). Therefore, before the
10overall performance of cold-stored oranges treated with PSi, this treatment could be
11recommended for long-term storage of citrus fruit at commercial refrigeration temperatures.
12The primary findings of this research work were that postharvest PSi treatments showed
13significant preventive and curative antifungal activity against citrus penicillium molds.
14Considering that Si is the second most abundant atom in the earth's crust and it is readily
15available, the cost of Si treatments are relatively inexpensive and, in any case, will be lower
16than that of other new alternative strategies for citrus postharvest disease control. Although
17large-scale semicommercial trials are needed for efficacy assessment before commercial
18implementation, Si treatments show great potential as part of non-polluting integrated
19disease management programs. According to Laing et al. (2006), the application of Si in crops
20provides a viable component of integrated management of insect pests and diseases because it
21leaves no insecticide residues in food or the environment, and it can be easily integrated with
22other pest management practices, including biological control.

1

1

2Acknowledgments

3This work was partially funded by the Spanish CICYT project AGL 2004-05271 and the
4European Commission (FEDER program). Fontestad S.A. (Montcada, Valencia) is
5gratefully acknowledged for providing fruit and technical assistance. Thanks to Dr. Mark
6Laing (University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa) for valuable contacts and advice. Pedro
7Antonio Moscoso-Ramírez's doctorate program is supported by a scholarship by the
8"Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología de México" (CONACYT-124182-México).

9

10References

- 11Bi, Y., Tian, S. P., Guo, Y. R., & Ge, Y.H. (2006). Sodium silicate reduces postharvest
12 decay on Hami melons: Induced resistance and fungistatic effects. *Plant Disease*, *90*,
13 279-283.
- 14Buonario, R., Iriti, M., & Romanazzi, G. (2009). Induced resistance to plant diseases
15 caused by oomycetes and fungi. *Petria*, *19*, 130-148.
- 16Chérif, M., Asselin, A., & Bélanger, R. R. (1994). Defense responses induced by soluble
17 silicon in cucumber roots infected by *Phytium* spp. *Phytopathology*, *84*, 236-242.
- 18Chérif, M., Benhamou, N., Menzies, J. G., & Bélanger, R. R. (1992a). Silicon induced
19 resistance in cucumber plants against *Phytium ultimum*. *Physiological and Molecular*
20 *Plant Pathology*, *41*, 411-425.
- 21Chérif, M., Menzies, J. G. Benhamou, N., & Bélanger, R. R. (1992b). Studies of silicon
22 distribution in wounded and *Phytium ultimum* infected cucumbers plants. *Physiological*
23 *and Molecular Plant Pathology*, *41*, 371-385.

- 1 Datnoff, L. E., Seebold, K. W., & Correa, V. F. J. (2001). The use of silicon for integrated
2 disease management: reducing fungicide applications and enhancing host plant
3 resistance. In L. E. Datnoff, G. H. Snyder, G. H. Korndorfer (Eds.), *Silicon in*
4 *Agriculture* (pp. 171-183). The Netherlands: Elsevier Science.
- 5 Droby, S., Wisniewski, M., Macarisin, D., & Wilson, C. L. (2009). Twenty years of
6 postharvest biocontrol research: Is it time for a new paradigm? *Postharvest Biology and*
7 *Technology*, *52*, 137-145.
- 8 Eckert, J. W., & Brown, G. E. (1986). Evaluation of postharvest treatments for citrus fruits.
9 In K. D. Hickey (Ed.), *Methods for Evaluating Pesticides for Control of Plant*
10 *Pathogens* (pp. 92-97). St. Paul, MN, USA: American Phytopathological Society Press.
- 11 Eckert, J. W., & Eaks, I. L. (1989). Postharvest disorders and diseases of citrus fruits. In W.
12 Reuter, E. C. Calavan, G. E. Carman (Eds.), *The Citrus Industry* (Vol. 5, pp.179-260).
13 Berkeley, CA, USA: University of California Press.
- 14 Edreva, A. (2004). A novel strategy for plant protection: Induced resistance. *Journal of Cell*
15 *and Molecular Biology*, *3*, 61-69.
- 16 Epstein, E. (1999). Silicon. *Annual Review of Plant Physiology and Plant Molecular*
17 *Biology*, *50*, 641-664.
- 18 Guo, Y., Liu, L., Zhao, J., & Bi, Y. (2007). Use of silicon oxide and sodium silicate for
19 controlling *Trichothecium roseum* postharvest rot in Chinese cantaloupe (*Cucumis melo*
20 *L.*). *International Journal of Food Science and Technology*, *42*, 1012-1018.
- 21 Laing, M. D., Gatarayiha, M. C., & Adandonon, A. (2006). Silicon use for pest control in
22 agriculture: A review. *Proceedings of the South African Sugar Technologists'*
23 *Association*, *80*, 278-286.

- 1 Liu, J., Zong, Y., Qin, G., Li, B., & Tian, S. (2010). Plasma membrane damage contributes
2 to antifungal activity of silicon against *Penicillium digitatum*. *Current Microbiology*,
3 *61*, 274-279.
- 4 Mathaba N., Tesfay, S., Bower, J. P., & Bertling, I. (2009). The potential of postharvest
5 silicon dips to mitigate chilling injury in citrus fruit with special emphasis on lemon (c.v
6 Eureka). In *Proceedings of the 1st Annual Research Day, Silicon in Agriculture*. Durban,
7 South Africa: South African Sugar Association.
- 8 Moscoso-Ramírez, P. A., & Palou, L. (2013). Evaluation of postharvest treatments with
9 chemical resistance inducers to control green and blue molds on orange fruit.
10 *Postharvest Biology and Technology*, *85*, 132-135.
- 11 O'Neill, T. M. (1991). Investigation of glasshouse structure, growing medium and silicon
12 nutrition as factors affecting disease incidence in cucumber crops. *Medelingen van de*
13 *Faculteit Landbouwwetenschappen, Rijksuniversiteit Gent*, *56*, 359-367.
- 14 Palou, L., Smilanick, J. L., & Droby, S. (2008). Alternatives to conventional fungicides for
15 the control of citrus postharvest green and blue molds. *Stewart Postharvest Review*, *2:2*,
16 1-16.
- 17 Porat, R., Vinokur, V., weiss, B., Cohen, L., Daus, A., Goldshmidt, E. E., & Droby, S.
18 (2003). Induction of resistance to *Penicillium digitatum* in grapefruit by β -aminobutyric
19 acid. *European Journal of Plant Pathology*, *109*, 901-907.
- 20 Samuels, A. L., Glass, A. D. M., Ehret, D. L., & Menzies, J. G. (1991). Mobility and
21 deposition of silicon in cucumber plants. *Plant Cell & Environment*, *14*, 485-492.

- 1 Shen, G. H., Xue, Q. H., Tang, M., Chen, Q., Wang, L. N., Duan, C. M., Xue, L., & Zhao,
2 J. (2010). Inhibitory effects of potassium silicate on five soil-borne phytopathogenic
3 fungi in vitro. *Journal of Plant Diseases and Protection*, *117*, 180-184.
- 4 Tian, S., Qin, G., & Xu, Y. (2005). Synergistic effects of combining biocontrol agents with
5 silicon against postharvest diseases of jujube fruit. *Journal of Food Protection*, *68*, 544-
6 550.
- 7 USDA AMS NOP. United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing
8 Service, National Organic Program. (2010). 7 CFR 205.601. Synthetic substances
9 allowed for use in organic crop production. Final rule. *Federal Register*, *75*(238),
10 77521-77524.
- 11 US EPA. United States Environmental Protection Agency. (2006). 40 CFR 180.1268.
12 Potassium silicate; exemption from the requirement of a tolerance. Final rule. *Federal*
13 *Register*, *71*(114), 34267-34272.
- 14 Vallad, G. E., & Goodman, R. M. (2004). Systemic acquired resistance and induced
15 systemic resistance in conventional agriculture. *Crop Science*, *44*, 1920-1934.
- 16 Wagner, F. (1940). Die bedeutung der kieselsäure für das wachstum einiger kulturpflanzen
17 ihren nährstoffhaushalt und ihre anfälligkeit gegen echte mehltäupilze.
18 *Phytopathologische Zeitschrift*, *12*, 427-479.
- 19 Youssef, K., Ligorio, A., Sanzani, S. M., Nigro, F., & Ippolito, A. (2012). Control of
20 storage diseases of citrus by pre- and postharvest application of salts. *Postharvest*
21 *Biology and Technology*, *72*, 57-63.

1

1

Table 1 Influence of temporal and spatial factors on the preventive activity of potassium silicate (PSi) against citrus green mold on ‘Valencia’ oranges artificially inoculated with *Penicillium digitatum* after treatment

Time between PSi treatment and fungal inoculation (h)	Green mold	
	Incidence (%)	Severity (mm)
2	35 b	11 b
24	95 a	69 a
48	95 a	68 a
96	100 a	93 a
Distance between PSi treatment application site and fungal inoculation site (mm)_____		
Control (water)	85 a	79 a
10	95 a	80 a
20	90 a	79 a
30	90 a	77 a

5

6

7

8

9

10

Fruit were treated in a rind wound with 30 µl of PSi at 90 mM, inoculated with *P. digitatum* and incubated at 20°C and 90% RH for 6 days. Means followed by different letters are significantly different according to Fisher’s protected LSD test ($P \leq 0.05$) applied after an ANOVA. Results are means from two experiments. Green mold incidence was arcsine transformed. Non-transformed means are shown.

1 FIGURES (Created with SigmaPlot)

2 **Fig. 1.** Preventive and curative activity of potassium silicate (PSi) at different
3 concentrations against green (GM) and blue (BM) molds in in vivo primary screenings with
4 'Valencia' oranges. In preventive tests, oranges were wounded, treated with 30 µl of PSi
5 solution at different concentrations and artificially inoculated 24 h later with *Penicillium*
6 *digitatum* or *P. italicum*. In curative tests, fungal inoculation was performed 24 h before the
7 application of PSi. Treated fruit were incubated for 6 days at 20°C and 90% RH. Disease
8 incidence and severity reductions were determined with respect to control fruit treated with
9 sterile water. For each mold, columns followed by different letters are significantly
10 different according to Fisher's protected LSD test ($P \leq 0.05$) applied after an ANOVA.
11 Disease incidence was arcsine transformed. Non-transformed means are shown.

12

13 **Fig. 2.** Influence of inoculum concentration on the preventive and curative activity of
14 postharvest treatments with 90 mM potassium silicate (PSi) against green mold on
15 'Lanelate' oranges. In preventive tests, oranges were wounded, treated with 30 µl of PSi
16 solution at 90 mM and artificially inoculated about 2 h later with *Penicillium digitatum*. In
17 curative tests, fungal inoculation was performed about 2 h before the application of PSi.
18 Control fruit were treated with sterile distilled water. Treated fruit were incubated for 6
19 days at 20°C and 90% RH. For each inoculum concentration and treatment, columns with
20 different lowercase and capital letters, respectively, are significantly different according to
21 Fisher's protected LSD test ($P \leq 0.05$) applied after an ANOVA. Results are means from

1

two experiments. Disease incidence was arcsine transformed. Non-transformed means are shown.

3

Fig. 3. Preventive activity of dips with 90 mM potassium silicate (PSi) against green (GM) and blue (BM) molds on artificially wounded ‘Lanelate’ oranges treated for 60 or 150 s at 20 or 50°C, inoculated about 2 h later with *Penicillium digitatum* or *P. italicum*, and incubated for 7 days at 20°C and 90% RH. Control fruit were dipped in water at 20 or 50°C for 60 s. For each mold and dip temperature and for each mold and PSi dip time, columns with different lowercase and capital letters, respectively, are significantly different according to Fisher’s protected LSD test ($P \leq 0.05$) applied after an ANOVA. Results are means from two experiments. Disease incidence was arcsine transformed. Non-transformed means are shown.

13

Fig. 4. Curative activity of dips with 90 mM potassium silicate (PSi) against green (GM) and blue (BM) molds on ‘Lanelate’ oranges artificially inoculated with *Penicillium digitatum* or *P. italicum*, dipped for 60 or 150 s at 20 or 50°C, about 24 h later and incubated for 7 days at 20°C and 90% RH. Control fruit were treated with water at 20°C for 1860 s. For each mold and for each mold and PSi dip time, columns with different lowercase and capital letters, respectively, are significantly different according to Fisher’s protected LSD test ($P \leq 0.05$) applied after an ANOVA. Results are means from two experiments. Disease incidence was arcsine transformed. Non-transformed means are shown.

22

Fig. 5. Preventive activity of potassium silicate (PSi) dips at 90 mM against green (GM) and blue (BM) molds on wounded ‘Valencia’ oranges dipped for 60 s at 20°C, artificially inoculated with *Penicillium digitatum* or *P. italicum* about 2 h later, and cold-stored at 5°C and 90% RH for 6 weeks. For each mold and evaluation date, means with different letters are significantly different according to Fisher’s protected LSD test ($P \leq 0.05$) applied after an ANOVA. Disease incidence was arcsine transformed. Non-transformed means are shown.

Fig. 6. Curative activity of potassium silicate (PSi) dips at 90 mM against green (GM) and blue (BM) molds on ‘Valencia’ oranges artificially inoculated with *Penicillium digitatum* or *P. italicum* in rind wounds, dipped 24 h later for 60 s at 20°C, and cold stored at 5°C and 90% RH for 6 weeks. For each mold and evaluation date, means with different letters are significantly different according to Fisher’s protected LSD test ($P \leq 0.05$) applied after an ANOVA. Disease incidence was arcsine transformed. Non-transformed means are shown.