

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

**Effect of biocontrol agents and potassium phosphite against *Phytophthora* crown rot, caused by *Phytophthora capsici*, on zucchini in a closed soilless system**

**This is the author's manuscript**

*Original Citation:*

*Availability:*

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1891853> since 2023-02-10T18:32:45Z

*Published version:*

DOI:10.1016/j.scienta.2020.109207

*Terms of use:*

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

1 **Effect of biocontrol agents and potassium phosphite against *Phytophthora* crown rot, caused**  
2 **by *Phytophthora capsici*, on zucchini in a closed soilless system**

3

4 **G. Gilardi<sup>a</sup>, M. Pugliese<sup>a,b,c</sup>, M.L. Gullino<sup>a,b</sup>, A. Garibaldi<sup>a</sup>**

5 <sup>a</sup> *Centre for Innovation in the Agro-Environmental Sector, AGROINNOVA, University of Torino,*  
6 *Largo P. Braccini 2, 10095 Grugliasco (TO), Italy*

7 <sup>b</sup> *Department of Agricultural, Forest and Food Sciences (DISAFA), University of Torino, Largo P.*  
8 *Braccini 2, 10095, Grugliasco (TO), Italy*

9 <sup>c</sup> *AgriNewTech srl, Torino, Italy.*

10

11 *Corresponding author:*

12 Tel: +39 0116708540

13 Fax: +39 0116708703

14 E-mail address: giovanna.gilardi@unito.it

15

16 **Abstract**

17 Five biocontrol agents and potassium phosphite, used at various concentrations and at a different  
18 number of applications, have been tested to establish their ability to control *Phytophthora capsici* on  
19 hydroponically grown zucchini plants. In a first set of trials, various experimental biocontrol agents  
20 (*Trichoderma* sp. TW2, a mixture of *Pseudomonas* FC7B, FC8B, FC9B, *Fusarium solani* FUS25 and  
21 *Pseudomonas* sp. PB26) and a commercial formulation of *Trichoderma gamsii* +*T. asperellum*  
22 (Remedier) were applied at the artificial infestation with the pathogen of a peat substrate, 5-7 days  
23 before planting the zucchini seedlings, and later at 5-day-intervals. BCAs were compared with a  
24 potassium phosphite-based fertiliser. In a second set of trials, the potassium phosphite fertiliser was  
25 applied directly to the growing media or via a nutrient solution every 6 days, starting at the infestation  
26 with the pathogen and 5-7 days before planting, in order to select the optimal rate, type and number

27 of applications. Potassium phosphite reduced by 62 to 94% *Phytophthora* crown rot of zucchini,  
28 providing more consistent disease severity reduction than those achieved using the experimental  
29 BCAs, alone or in mixture, and the *Trichoderma gamsii* + *T. asperellum* formulated mixture (29 to  
30 47% reduction in disease severity). One application of potassium phosphite, at the highest tested  
31 concentration, was less effective than three applications. Potassium phosphite consistently reduced  
32 the severity of *Phytophthora* crown rot under different disease pressure (by 48 to 79%) when applied  
33 via a treated peat growing media or via a nutrient solution with 3 to 6 applications, thereby offering  
34 growers an important opportunity to control *P. capsici* on soilless grown zucchini.

35

36 Keywords: Hydroponic; *Phytophthora* control, *Cucurbita pepo*, nutrient solution, microorganisms,  
37 phosphites.

38

## 39 **1. Introduction**

40

41 Zucchini (*Cucurbita pepo* L.) is an important crop throughout the world that is affected by several  
42 air- and soil-borne pathogens which cause severe losses (Gubler and Davis, 1996). Currently, soil-  
43 borne pathogens are a cause of particular concern in many geographical areas, including the  
44 Mediterranean, because of the difficulties encountered in their management, due to the increasing  
45 lack of effective, available control measures (Colla et al., 2014; Garibaldi et al., 2014; Katan, 2017).  
46 *Phytophthora capsici*, which causes the root and crown rot of zucchini (Lamour et al., 2012), has  
47 long been known in Italy (Cristinzio and Noviello, 1980) and remains one of the most critical  
48 pathogens of this crop (Gullino et al., 2018). This pathogen can also be spread through infected  
49 transplants, seeds and water resources (Granke et al., 2012; Lamour et al., 2012; Reistano and  
50 Stephens, 1999), and is thus also of concern for soilless systems, where oomycetes find an  
51 environment that is favourable for their survival and spread (Jenkins and Averre, 1983). In fact,  
52 despite having been developed and promoted to reduce the problems caused by soil-borne pathogens,

53 to reduce the release of nutrients into the environment and to improve water efficiency (Van Os,  
54 1999). However, closed soilless systems, which are increasingly adopted in southern countries, are  
55 often characterised by the presence of root diseases (Postma et al., 2008; Stanghellini and Rasmussen,  
56 1994).

57 Owing to the limited availability of synthetic fungicides registered for soilless systems, it is necessary  
58 to evaluate the efficacy of alternative disease control measures. Thus, disease management, based on  
59 biocontrol agents, suppressive soils and inorganic salts, is increasingly being exploited in such  
60 growing systems (Gullino et al., 2015; Paulitz, 1997; Van Os, 1999; Postma, 2004; 2010; Vallance et  
61 al., 2001). Phosphite has been shown to be effective in the control of oomycete related diseases in  
62 horticulture. Deliopoulos et al., (2010), for instance, showed that phosphite salts are effective against  
63 several soil-borne pathogens in different pathosystems, such as *Pythium ultimum*-cucumber,  
64 *Phytophthora cinnamomi*-lupin and *Phytophthora nicotianae*-tobacco. The protective effect induced  
65 by phosphite, and its persistence *in planta*, may vary among species (Barrett et al. 2003; Shearer and  
66 Crane, 2012), type of application (Guest and Grant 1991; Smillie et al., 1989), *Phytophthora* species  
67 and strains (Coffey and Bower, 1984), and could be affected by concentration (Jackson et al., 2000;  
68 Daniel and Guest, 2006). Although the extensive research carried out to better understand the mode  
69 of action of phosphite in plant protection (Hardy et al., 2001; Thao et al., 2009; Alexanderson et al.,  
70 2016), there is still a need to better understand their potential when applied in hydroponics. In the  
71 case of biocontrol agents, different microorganisms have been tested in the past in soilless systems,  
72 such as *Muscodor albus* against *Rhizoctonia* damping-off of broccoli, *Gliocladium virens* against  
73 *Rhizoctonia solani* and *Pythium ultimum* of zinnia, cotton and cabbage (Lumsden and Locke, 1989),  
74 and non-pathogenic *Fusarium oxysporum* against *Fusarium oxysporum* f.sp. *basilici* on basil (Fravel  
75 and Larkin 1999). Other studies have shown a positive effect of applying biocontrol agents to  
76 hydroponic systems via recirculating nutrient solutions or in the growing-medium on different hosts  
77 affected by oomycete pathogens; this is the case of bacterial isolates of fluorescent *Pseudomonades*  
78 in the *Pseudomonas fluorescens*, *P. putida* and *P. aeruginosa* group against *Pythium ultimum* on

79 tomato (Alsanius et al., 1999), of a mixture of *Fusarium* spp. and *Trichoderma* spp. against  
80 *Phytophthora cryptogea* on gerbera (Garibaldi et al., 2003), of indigenous *Pseudomonas* spp. and  
81 *Trichoderma* sp. against *Pythium aphanidermatum* on cucumber (Postma et al., 2000, 2005), of  
82 *Muscodor albus* against *Phytophthora capsici* on bell pepper (Mercier and Manker, 2005) and of  
83 *Bacillus subtilis* against *Pythium aphanidermatum* on lettuce (Utkhede et al., 2000). However, despite  
84 many studies, their practical application is still limited.

85 The type, rate and timing of the application of biocontrol agents and salts, which often act as  
86 resistance inducers, affect both the level of disease control and the yield (Paulitz, 1997; Walter et al.,  
87 2013; Bonanomi et al., 2018). Thus, finding the right application method for biocontrol agents and  
88 salts in soilless systems against zoospore producing pathogens merits further attention.

89 Although other studies have been carried out on the effect of biocontrol agents and salts against  
90 pathogens that are well adapted to soilless systems, such as *Pythium* spp., and *Phytophthora* sp.  
91 (Armitage, 1993; Förster et al., 1998; Garibaldi et al., 2003; Garibaldi and Gullino, 2010; Gullino et  
92 al., 2015; Stanghellini et al., 1994), there is still a lack of knowledge on their efficacy against  
93 *Phytophthora capsici* on zucchini grown in soilless systems, and the possible effect of combined  
94 BCAs on disease severity.

95 This work has been carried out in a closed soilless system, under controlled conditions, in order  
96 to evaluate the efficacy of experimental biocontrol agents used alone or in mixture, compared with  
97 a commercial formulation of *Trichoderma gamsii* + *T. asperellum*, and potassium phosphite salts,  
98 considering the long-term efficacy of different types and different numbers of applications to control  
99 *P. capsici* on zucchini, with the aim of developing practical solutions to manage the disease.

100

## 101 **2. Material and methods**

102

### 103 *2.1. Experimental layout, soilless system and plant material*

104 Thirteen trials were carried out in a glasshouse at the Agroinnova Centre of Competence of the  
105 University of Torino, in Grugliasco (Torino, Italy), at temperatures ranging from 20 to 28°C, in a  
106 fully automated closed soilless system. A small-scale hydroponic experimental system, with a  
107 recirculating nutrient solution, was used throughout the trials. Each hydroponic unit consisted of one  
108 channel (6 m long and 25 cm wide) connected to a storage tank (300 L) filled with a nutrient solution,  
109 which was automatically delivered to the plants, thanks to the use of an electronic control unit  
110 (Idromat2, Calpeda S.p.a., Vicenza, Italy). The nutrient solution was pumped at 1.5-1.6 mS cm<sup>-1</sup> from  
111 the water storage tank, fed to the plants through drip emitters and left to drain back into the storage  
112 tank by means of gravity. Nutrient solutions with the following compositions were used: 11.24 mM  
113 NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, 4.8 mM NH<sub>4</sub>, 0.75 mM KH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub>, 0.75 mM K<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>, 0.012 mM Iron chelate EDTA, 2 mM MgO,  
114 2 mM SO<sub>3</sub>, 0.2 mM B, 0.001 mM Mo, 0.15 mM Zn, 3.1 mM CaO, 0.05 mM Cu<sup>++</sup>, 0.25 mM Mn, 12.2  
115 mM K. The pH and E.C. values were checked regularly by means of portable instruments, that is, a  
116 pH meter and a SevenGo DUO TM SG23 conductivity meter (Tettler, Toledo, Spain). The plants  
117 were irrigated with the solution as described above and treated.

118 The experimental unit consisted of six pots replicated five times (n= 30 pots each channel). Two  
119 plants were planted in each pot, and six pots corresponded to one sub-replicate of 12 plants each. Five  
120 replicates were used per treatment (60 plants/treatment).

121 Each trial included one untreated and inoculated control and different treatments with products  
122 tested alone or in mixture, according to the protocol tested in the first and second set of trials  
123 (Tables 1 and 2).

124 The susceptible Genovese zucchini cv. (Furia Sementi, Monticelli Terme (PR), Italy) was  
125 transplanted at 15 days of age into 3 L plastic pots filled with a growing medium based on blonde  
126 peat (Tecno 2, Turco S.r.l., Albenga, Italy) in all the trials.

127

128 *2.2. Biological control agents (BCAs) and phosphite treatments*

129 The following BCAs, isolated from suppressive composts and provided by AgriNewTech srl  
130 (Italy), were tested alone and in mixture (1:1:1 v/v) in the first set of trials (trials 1- 4): *Pseudomonas*  
131 sp. PB26 (Pugliese et al., 2008), *Fusarium solani* FUS25 (Gullino and Pugliese, 2011), *Trichoderma*  
132 sp. TW2 (Cucu et al., 2019). A mixture of three *Pseudomonas* spp. strains, *Pseudomonas* sp. FC7B  
133 (EU836174) - *Pseudomonas putida* FC 8B (EU836171) and *Pseudomonas* sp. FC 9B (EU836172),  
134 isolated from a suppressive rockwool substrate in a soilless system (Clematis et al., 2009; Srinivasan  
135 et al., 2009), was also used (Table 1).

136 The bacterial strains were maintained at 4°C in Luria Bertani (LB) slants throughout the study.  
137 The fresh bacterial suspensions were prepared by inoculating a loopful of bacterial cells into 30 ml  
138 of an LB medium in 100 ml Erlenmeyer flasks, and then incubating the suspension on a rotary shaker  
139 at 600 rpm for 48 h at 23°C. The cell suspension was centrifuged, and the pellets were re-suspended  
140 in sterile deionised water. The bacterial concentrations were checked by means of optical density  
141 (OD<sub>600</sub>) before application. The density (OD<sub>600</sub>) was adjusted with sterile deionised water, by means  
142 of serial dilution, to 1x10<sup>8</sup> cell ml<sup>-1</sup> before application. *Trichoderma* sp. TW2 was grown in a 1000-  
143 ml-flask containing 250 ml of potato dextrose broth (SIGMA, Germany) and maintained under static  
144 conditions at 25°C. After 15 days, the produced mycelium was transferred to 200 ml sterile distilled  
145 water and homogenised using a hand-held rotary mixer. The conidia suspension obtained for the  
146 *Trichoderma* sp. TW2 isolate was standardised to 1x10<sup>7</sup>CFU ml<sup>-1</sup>.

147 The antagonistic *Fusarium solani* FUS25 was propagated into 1000-ml-flasks containing 250 ml  
148 of potato dextrose broth (Sigma, Germany) and maintained on a rotary shaker for ten days at 200  
149 rpm. The cultures were centrifuged at 8,000 g for 20 min at 4°C. The conidia and mycelium pellet  
150 were transferred into 200 ml of sterile distilled water and homogenised using a rotary mixer. The  
151 conidial suspension was adjusted with sterile deionized water, by means of serial dilution, to 1x10<sup>7</sup>  
152 conidia ml<sup>-1</sup> before application.

153 In the first set of trials, each BCA suspension was applied to each pot and after planting around the  
154 base of 15 day-old seedlings at a final concentration of 1x10<sup>7</sup>CFUml<sup>-1</sup>. The BCAs were applied six

155 times to the growing medium at 5 day-intervals using 100 ml/pot of the suspension, according to the  
156 experimental protocol (Table 1).

157 The experimental BCAs were compared with a commercial formulation of *Trichoderma*  
158 *asperellum* + *T. gamsii* (Remedier, Isagro, Milan, Italy), which had been applied at the label rate of  
159 0.25 g l<sup>-1</sup> of peat substrate and compared with the potassium phosphite fertilizer (Alexine 95PS P2O5  
160 52% + K2O,42%, Alexine, Massò, Spain), which was labelled as a phosphorus supplement for  
161 soilless application using 2.5 g/l (Table 1).

162 The second set of trials (trials 5 to 13) was conducted to select the optimal type, frequency and  
163 number of potassium phosphite applications (Table 2). The fertilizer-based phosphite was added  
164 directly to the nutrient solution (NS) or applied to each pot around the base of the seedlings using 100  
165 ml/pot of the suspension prepared at 1.125 and 2.5 g/l, according to the experimental protocol. K-  
166 phosphite was applied at 5-6 day intervals with 1, 3 and 6 applications (Table 2).

167 In both protocols, the first treatment, was carried out the same day of the artificial infestation of the  
168 peat substrate.

169

### 170 2.3. Artificial inoculation with the pathogen

171 A highly virulent strain of *Phytophthora capsici* (coded PHC 1/16), isolated from zucchini and  
172 taken from the AGROINNOVA collection, was cultured on a selective oomycete medium (Masago  
173 et al., 1977) at 20°C for one week. One mycelium-agar plug (5 mm diameter), taken from an actively  
174 growing colony, was transferred to a 1000-ml-flask containing the wheat-hempseed medium (200g  
175 wheat kernels, 100g hempseeds and 320 ml water, sterilized at 121°C for 30 min) and incubated at  
176 20°C in a growth chamber under a 12-h fluorescent photoperiod. The *P. capsici* produced after 10  
177 days of incubation at 22°C was mixed into the soil substrate at a concentration of 1 g of fresh biomass  
178 per litre of growing medium immediately before the first treatments was made.

179 Fifteen-day-old zucchini seedlings were transplanted into the treated and untreated pots 5-7 days after  
180 the artificial infestation of the substrate with the pathogen.



181

## 182 2.4. Disease assessment and statistical analysis

183 The zucchini plants were assessed at 7-day-intervals, starting from when the first symptoms  
184 caused by *Phytophthora* crown rot, corresponding to yellowing of the leaves, were observed. Disease  
185 severity was evaluated at the end of the trials 7 to 14 days after the final treatment, according to  
186 Padley et al., (2008). Disease severity was expressed using the  $[\sum(n^{\circ} \text{ plants} \times x_{0-5}) / (\text{total } n^{\circ} \text{ of plants}$   
187  $\text{recorded})]$  formula, with  $x_{0-5}$  corresponding to the reported value: 0=no symptoms, healthy plants;  
188 1=1 corresponding to 30% of the leaves being slightly wilted (midpoint 15%); 2=31 corresponding  
189 to 50% of foliar wilting and crown lesions (midpoint 40%); 3=51 corresponding to 70% of the plants  
190 being partially collapsed (midpoint 60%); 4=71 corresponding to 90% of the plants being collapsed  
191 (midpoint 80%); 5=over 90% of dead plants (midpoint 95%).

192 The data obtained from the experiments were subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA)  
193 appropriate to the experimental design using SPSS, Version 25. The experimental unit consisted of a  
194 3-L pot with two plants and sub-replicates with 12 plants each. Each set of treatments was repeated  
195 at last three times in the first and second sets of trials according to protocols 1 and 2 (Tables 1 and 2).  
196 The trials were combined when the 'trial' factor was not significant ( $P > 0,05$ ). The data were  
197 compared using Tukey's test at a significance level of 5%. The considered factors were: five  
198 experimental biocontrol agents and K-phosphite, and the type of application that is in pots to the peat  
199 medium or via nutrient solution (NS), rate (1.125 and 2.5 g/l) and number of applications (1, 3 or 6).  
200 The efficacy of the different treatments in controlling *P. capsici* was calculated as: % Disease

201 reduction (E%) =  $\frac{LS_i - LS_t}{LS_i} \times 100$

202 where LS = percentage of plants affected by DS; i = inoculated and untreated control; t = treatments.

203

## 204 3. Results

### 205 3.1. Effect of the biocontrol agents

206 The data from the first set of trials (1- 4) were analysed separately for each experimental run  
207 because there was evidence of heterogeneity ( $P < 0.05$ ) between the trial runs. *Phytophthora* crown  
208 root severity ranged from 30 to 47.9% (Table 1); the experimental biocontrol agents applied to the  
209 growing media every 4-5 days only partially reduced disease severity, with inconsistent results  
210 throughout the trials. For instance, the disease reduction of *Pseudomonas* Ant P28, compared to the  
211 untreated control, was from 17 to 47%, while it was from 8 to 54% for *Fusarium solani* FUS25, from  
212 12 to 54% for *Trichoderma* sp. TW2 and from 4 to 46% for *Pseudomonas* (FC7, FC 8, FC 9). The  
213 tested biocontrol generally provided results that were statistically comparable with the results for the  
214 formulated mixture of *Trichoderma asperellum* + *T. gamsii* (29 to 43% efficacy) used as reference.  
215 The co-application of the mixture of *Pseudomonas* PB26+ *F. solani* A25F+*Trichoderma* sp. TW2  
216 tested in this study did not enhance the disease control efficacy, compared to the efficacy achieved  
217 when BCAs were used on their own. The highest and most consistent *P. capsici* control was provided  
218 by K-phosphite (62 to 94% efficacy).

219

### 220 3.2. *Effect of the dosage, type and number of applications of potassium phosphite*

221 The data from trials 5-13 were combined when no significant differences in disease severity were  
222 found among the trials (Table 4). *Phytophthora* crown rot severity differed throughout the trials and  
223 resulted in an average disease severity in the untreated control of 20.3, 40.1 and 59.1, respectively  
224 (Table 5). The application of potassium phosphite significantly reduced disease severity in all the  
225 experiments. One-way analysis of variance showed that the tested dosages and the type of application  
226 (to the peat growing medium or to the nutrient solution) were not significant factors in the trials (Table  
227 4), while the number of applications (1, 3 and 6) and the interaction of all the considered factors  
228 significantly influenced disease severity under different disease pressures ( $P < 0.001$ ). The efficacy  
229 of potassium phosphite at the lowest tested rate increased by 30% and almost doubled when the  
230 number of treatments was increased from one to six (Table 5). Moreover, one application of  
231 potassium phosphite at the highest tested concentration resulted in a much lower effect than the three

232 applications in trials 5-7 and 8-10, while no significant effect ( $P = 0.259$ ) was found in trials 11-13  
233 (Tables 4 and 5). Three more applications (for a total of six) generally had little or no further effect  
234 on the efficacy of the treatment in two out of the three sets of trials that were carried out, and an  
235 efficacy of 43.2% to 78.8% was reached (Table 5). No effect of phosphite on plant growth was found  
236 at both tested rates and frequency of applications throughout the trials (data not shown).  
237 The effect of the interaction of all the factors (concentration, number of application and application  
238 method) was significant in all the experiments.

239

#### 240 **4. Discussion**

241

242 Hydroponic systems have become a standard cultivation method in Southern Europe for several  
243 intensively grown vegetables, in part because, despite the high initial investments, they can provide  
244 growers with higher incomes (Savvas et al., 2013; Sambo et al., 2019). In fact, soilless cultivation,  
245 apart from being a solution from a technical and agronomical point of view, in many cases represents  
246 the grower's choice when crop rotation is not feasible and resistant cultivars are not available, and  
247 when chemical control becomes complicated due to increasing limitations in the availability of  
248 fumigants and registered fungicides (Garibaldi et al., 2014; Vallance et al., 2011).

249 Unfortunately, soilless grown plants may be attacked by the same pests and diseases as plants  
250 cultivated traditionally in soil, even though the occurrence and degree of severity may be different  
251 (Schnitzler 2004), and one of the main concerns of closed systems is the potential spread of root  
252 pathogens with the recirculation of the nutrient solution (Postma et al., 2008). The very limited  
253 availability of traditional fungicides for soilless systems has stimulated the adoption of other options.  
254 For instance, some biocontrol agents have been labelled for applications in irrigation systems and  
255 phosphite fertilizers, when labelled as phosphorus supplements, are admitted for application in  
256 soilless systems (Gómez-Merino and Trejo-Télle, 2015). Hydroponic is a complex environment and

257 multiple chemical and biological equilibria must be taken into account for developing practical  
258 solutions to manage diseases of plants grown soilless.

259 In the present study, the experimental biocontrol agents obtained from suppressive compost  
260 (*Pseudomonas* sp. PB26, *F. solani* A25F and *Trichoderma* sp. TW2) and from a soilless rockwool  
261 medium (*Pseudomonas* FC7B, FC8B, FC9B mixture) have provided a certain degree of control and  
262 have led to results that are comparable with those obtained for the formulated mixture of *Trichoderma*  
263 *gamsii* + *T. apserellum*. Among the huge diversity of microorganisms that have shown to suppress  
264 the growth of *P. capsici*, the most explored belong to rizhobacteria (Thomashow et al., 1995; Sheoran  
265 et al., 2015; Agisha et al., 2019) and *Trichoderma* (Harman, 2006; Kaewchai et al., 2009; Segarra et  
266 al., 2016; Bae et al., 2011). *Trichoderma* spp. have shown high biocontrol potential through one or  
267 more mechanisms such as mycoparasitism, competition for key nutrients and colonization of sites,  
268 production of antibiotics, or by stimulating plant defense mechanisms (Benítez et al., 2004; Elad et  
269 al., ...). The disease suppression and plant-growth promotion activities of various strains might be  
270 related to the production of different antibiotics, secondary metabolites, lytic enzymes,  
271 phytohormones, siderophores, and volatiles (Bae et al., 2011; Li et al., 2019). *Trichoderma* species  
272 are well known for their capacity to produce secondary metabolites, including peptaibols, terpenes,  
273 diketopiperazines, steroids, amides, lactones, polyketides, tetrone acid derivatives, peptides,  
274 pyranone derivatives, pyridines, and cyclopentenones, which may have numerous biological  
275 activities, including antifungal, antibacterial, plant-growth-enhancing/inhibiting, bioinducer,  
276 antagonism and plant resistance effects (Li et al., 2019), suggesting a potential role also in the control  
277 of *P. capsici*, as demonstrated by Bae et al., 2011 *Pseudomonas* strains are known for producing  
278 metabolites active against *P. capsici*, like pyrazines, dimethyl trisulphide and dimethyl disulfide  
279 (Sheoran et al., 2015; Agisha et al., 2019). Among different mechanisms, the ability in inducing a  
280 motility inhibitory effect of zoospore of *P. capsici* provided by *Pseudomonas* has been demostred  
281 (Zohara et al., 2016). Non-pathogenic *Fusarium oxysporum* and *F. solani* collected from wilt-

282 suppressive soil have been reported as biocontrol agents against Fusarium wilt diseases of tomato,  
283 watermelon and muskmelon (Larkin and Fravel 1998; Malandrakisa et al., 2018).

284 Most biological control studies in hydroponics deal with one antagonist, although attempts to  
285 apply more than one antagonist helped in disease control efficiency. Indeed, the efficiency of  
286 biological control agents in mixtures may be related to complementary modes of action of combined  
287 organisms (Xu et al., 2011). For instance, a mixture of fluorescent pseudomonads and nonpathogenic  
288 isolates of *F. oxysporum* were effective in reducing the density of pathogenic *F. oxysporum* f.sp.  
289 *gladioli* populations in soils (Lemanceau and Alabouvette, 1993). Other studies have demonstrated  
290 that the combination of fungi and bacterial species, respectively, *Trichoderma hamatum* and  
291 *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, is able to significantly reduce the incidence of *P. capsici* disease in chili  
292 pepper (Chemeltorit et al. 2017). In the present study the co-application of the mixture of  
293 *Pseudomonas* sp. PB26 + *F. solani* A25F + *Trichoderma* sp. TW2 did not generally enhance the  
294 efficacy of the BCA used alone. However, in agreement with another study (Xu et al., 2011),  
295 combinations may be valuable for other reasons, including control of various pathogens, more  
296 consistent efficacy, or control over different environments and stress conditions, which were not  
297 evaluated in this study. Since inconsistent results were observed for the tested biocontrol agents,  
298 further investigations are needed under various environmental conditions. Indeed, introduction of  
299 single or mixtures of biocontrol agents that are not native to that microenvironment fail to sustain its  
300 population high enough for being effective. The presented results provided evidence of a new  
301 application potential of *Pseudomonas* sp. PB26, *F. solani* A25F and *Trichoderma* sp. TW2 for  
302 controlling *Phytophthora capsici* in soilless. Hence, future research on the dosage/frequency and on  
303 possible combinations with other control measures is suggested.

304 Among the options that were tested, the one with potassium phosphite provided a good control of  
305 the pathogen. Although studies have long been made on phosphite in order to understand its role in  
306 agriculture (McDonald et al., 2001; Ouimette and Coffey, 1989; 1990; Ristaino and Johnston, 1999;  
307 Thao and Yamakawa, 2009), its exploitation in soilless systems has been limited. Phosphite has, for

308 instance, been investigated under hydroponic conditions against the *Phytophthora* crown rot of tomato  
309 and pepper-*P. capsici* (Förster et al., 1998; Stanghellini et al., 1994) and lettuce- *Phytophthora*  
310 *drechsleri* (Jee et al., 2002). These compounds are systemic, can be transported upward in the xylem  
311 and downward in the phloem to the roots (Cohen and Coffey, 1986), and have both protective and  
312 curative properties (Barrett et al., 2003). Both direct and indirect modes of action may occur,  
313 depending on the time interval between the phosphite application and the inoculation, the applied  
314 phosphite concentration and the tolerance of the host and pathogen to phosphite (Jackson et al., 2000;  
315 Smillie et al., 1989). The high water solubility of phosphite allows different type of application,  
316 however, there is still a lack of information involving phosphite in soilless. Results from the present  
317 study help in elucidating the possible long-term effect of phosphite applied in soilless against  
318 *P.capsici*. Many phosphite application methods, including foliar, seed and root immersion, trunk  
319 injections and soil applications, have resulted to be efficient against several soilborne and foliar  
320 pathogens in horticultural crops (Alexandersson et al., 2016; Barrett et al., 2003; Carmona et al.,  
321 2018; Förster et al., 1998; Greenhalgh et al. 1994; Yandoc-Ables et al. 2007; Liljeroth et al., 2016;  
322 Lobato et al., 2010; Smillie et al., 1989). Under field conditions, phosphite-based fertilizers are  
323 normally applied as drenches or through an irrigation system. However, the application of phosphites  
324 should be timed carefully on the basis of the plant genotype, phenological stage and environmental  
325 conditions (Alexandersson et al., 2016). In fact, excessive phosphite concentrations have resulted in  
326 phytotoxicity in some horticultural crops (Barrett et al., 2003; Pilbeam et al., 2000; Walker, 1991). In  
327 the present study, potassium phosphite has been applied to zucchini plants by adding soluble forms  
328 of the element to the nutrient solution of a closed hydroponics system and the results have been  
329 compared with the results of its application to the growing media. The obtained results have pointed  
330 out that the type of application of potassium phosphite and the concentration of application did not  
331 affect the *Phytophthora* crown rot control in the trials carried out under different disease pressures.  
332 The results obtained in this study are in agreement with those of Pilbeam et al. (2000), who showed  
333 a slight improvement in the control of *Phytophthora cinnamomi* on *Eucalyptus marginata* above a

334 certain application rate. However, the efficacy of potassium phosphite was improved when the  
335 number of applications was increased from 1 to 3. When the number of application was increased,  
336 the protection provided by potassium phosphite was generally doubled, without any negative effect  
337 on plant growth. Increasing the number of applications from 3 to 6 did not provide any significant  
338 additional advantage. Because potassium phosphite acts systemically and is known for its direct effect  
339 on the pathogen (Guest and Bompeix, 1990; Smillie et al., 1989), its application in a closed soilless  
340 system under controlled conditions should be a topic of continuous research on different hosts and  
341 pathogens. Indeed, potassium phosphite acts primarily on the pathogen, inducing the release of stress  
342 metabolites to elicit the defence response (Guest and Grant, 1990) and some host plants are more  
343 responsive to phosphonate than others. In the present study, we did not evaluate the mechanism of  
344 action of phosphite. The results obtained consistently show that potassium phosphite, applied to the  
345 nutrient solution, represents an important option for growers to control *P. capsici* on soilless grown  
346 zucchini. Moreover, it is possible that the level of control provided by the here tested biocontrol  
347 agents may be improved in IPM programmes. The impact of combined application of BCA with  
348 reduced dosage of phosphite merits further evaluations.

349

#### 350 **Acknowledgements**

351 The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020  
352 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 633999 (EUCLID EU-CHINA Lever  
353 for IPM Demonstration). The authors would like to thank Andrea China Gallo for her technical  
354 assistance and Marguerite Jones for the language revision.

355

#### 356 **Conflict of Interest**

357 Massimo Pugliese declares he has a financial interest (shareholder) in the company AgriNewTech  
358 that provided three microorganisms (*Trichoderma* sp. TW2, *Fusarium solani* FUS25 and  
359 *Pseudomonas* sp. PB26) tested in this study.

360 **References**

361

362 Agisha, V. N., Kumar, A., Eapen, S. J., Sheoran, N., Suseelabhai, R., 2019. Broad-spectrum  
363 antimicrobial activity of volatile organic compounds from endophytic *Pseudomonas putida* BP25  
364 against diverse plant pathogens. *Biocontrol Sci. Techn.* 29 (11), 1069-1089.

365 Alexandersson, E., Mulugeta, T., Lankinen, Å., Liljeroth, E., Andreasson, E., 2016. Plant Resistance  
366 Inducers against Pathogens in Solanaceae Species-From Molecular Mechanisms to Field Application.  
367 *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* 2016, 17(10), 1673- 1695.

368 Alsanius, B.W., Khalil, S., Hultberg, M., Englund, J.E., Sundin, P. 1999. The influence of introduced  
369 *Pseudomonas* isolates on the rhizobacterial community of hydroponically cultivated tomato: a  
370 comparison of different methods of assessment, in: Hultberg M. (Ed.). Seed bacterization with  
371 *Pseudomonas fluorescens* and interactions with *Pythium ultimum* on tomato in soilless systems, *Acta*  
372 *universitatis agriculturae sueciae*, Agaria: 159.

373 Armitage, P., 1993. Chemical control of *Phytophthora cinnamomi* in irrigation water. *Australian*  
374 *Hort.* 91 (10), 30-36.

375 Bae, H., Roberts, D. P., Lim, H.-S., Strem, M. D., Park, S.-C., Ryu, C.-M., Melnick, R., L., Bailey,  
376 B. A., 2011. Endophytic *Trichoderma* isolates from tropical environments delay disease onset and  
377 induce resistance against *Phytophthora capsici* in hot pepper using multiple mechanisms. *Mol. Plant.*  
378 *Microbe In.* 24 (3), 336-351.

379 Barrett, S.R., Shearer, B.L., Hardy, G.E.S., 2003. The efficacy of phosphite applied after inoculation  
380 on the colonisation of *Banksia brownii* stems by *Phytophthora cinnamomi*. *Australas. Plant Pathol.*  
381 32, 1-7.

382 Barrett, S.R., Shearer, B.L., Hardy, G. J., 2002. Root and shoot development in *Corymbia calophylla*  
383 and *Banksia brownii* after the application of the fungicide phosphite. *Aust J Bot* 50,155–161

384 Benítez, T., Rincón, A. M., Limón, M. C., Codón, A. C., 2004. Biocontrol mechanisms of  
385 *Trichoderma* strains. *International Microbiology*, 7(4), 249-260.



386 Berg, G., 2009. Plant-microbe interactions promoting plant growth and health: perspective for  
387 controlled use of microorganisms in agriculture. *Appl. Microb. Biotec.* 84 (1), 11-18.  
388

389 Bonanomi, G., Lorito, M., Vinale, F., Woo, S.L., 2018. Organic amendments, beneficial microbes,  
390 and soil microbiota: toward a unified framework for disease suppression *Annu. Rev. Phytopathol.* 56,  
391 1-20.

392 Carmona, M.A., Sautua, F.J., Grijalba, P.E., Cassina, M., Pèrez-Hernandez, O., 2018. Effect of  
393 potassium and manganese phosphites in the control of *Pythium* damping-off in soybean: a feasible  
394 alternative to fungicide seed treatments. *Pest Manag. Sci.* 74, 366-374.

395 Chemeltorit, P. P., Mutaqin, K. H., Widodo, W., 2017. Combining *Trichoderma hamatum* THSW13  
396 and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* BJ10-86: a synergistic chili pepper seed treatment for *Phytophthora*  
397 *capsici* infested soil. *European Journal of Plant Pathology* 147, 157–166.

398 Cohen, Y., Coffey, M. D., 1986. Systemic Fungicides and the Control of Oomycetes. *Annual Review*  
399 *of Phytopathology* 24, 311-338.

400 Coffey, M.D., Bower, L.A., 1984. *In vitro* variability among isolates of eight *Phytophthora* species  
401 in response to phosphorous acid. *Phytopathology* 74, 738-42.

402 Colla, P., Garibaldi, A., Gullino, M.L, 2014. Consequences of European pesticide policies  
403 enforcement in soil disinfestation sector. *Acta Hort.* 1044, 363-366.

404 Cucu, M.A., Gilardi, G., Pugliese, M., Matic, S., Ulrich, G., Gullino, M.L., Garibaldi, A. 2019.  
405 Influence of different biological control agents and compost on total and nitrification-driven  
406 microbial communities at rhizosphere and soil level in a lettuce - *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *lactucae*  
407 pathosystem. *J Appl Microbiol*, 126, 905-918.

408 Daniel, R., Guest, D.I., 2006. Phosphite induces defence responses in *Arabidopsis thaliana*  
409 challenged with *Phytophthora palmivora*. *Phytopathology* 96, S28–S28.

410 Deliopoulos, T., Kettlewell, P.S., Hare, M.C., 2010. Fungal disease suppression by inorganic salts: A  
411 review. *Crop Prot.* 29, 1059-1075.

412 Föster, H., Adaskaveg, J.E., Kim D.H., Stanghellini, M.E., 1998. Effect of phosphite on tomato and  
413 pepper plants and on susceptibility of pepper to *Phytophthora* root and crown rot in hydroponic  
414 culture. *Plant Dis.* 82, 1165–1170.

415 Fravel, L.D., Larkin, R.P., 1999. Biocontrol of *Fusarium* wilt of hydroponically-grown basil  
416 (*Fusarium oxysporum* f.sp. *basilica*) using *F. oxysporum* CS-20. *Phytopathology* 89, S26.

417 Garibaldi, A., Minuto, A., Grasso, V., Gullino, M.L., 2003. Application of selected antagonistic  
418 strains against *Phytophthora cryptogea* on gerbera in closed soilless systems with disinfection by  
419 slow sand filtration. *Crop Prot.* 22, 1053–1061.

420 Garibaldi, A., Gilardi, G., Gullino, M.L., 2014. Critical aspects in disease management as a  
421 consequence of the evolution of soil-borne pathogens. *Acta Hort.* 1044, 43-52.

422 Gómez, J., Perez, A., Serrano, Y., Aguilar, M.I., Gómez, R., 2013. *Phytophthora* crown and root rot  
423 of zucchini squash in Almería, Spain. *Plant Dis.* 97, 1249.

424 Gómez-Merino, F.C., Trejo-Télle, L.L., 2015. Biostimulant activity of phosphite in horticulture. *Sci.*  
425 *Hortic.* 196, 82-90.

426 Granke, L. L., Quesada-Ocampo, L., Lamour, K., Hausbeck, M. K., 2012. Advances in research on  
427 *Phytophthora capsici* on vegetable crops in the United States. *Plant Dis.* 96, 1588–1600.

428 Greenhalgh, F.C., de Boer, R.F., Merriman, P.R., Hepworth, G., Keane, P.J., 1994. Control of  
429 *Phytophthora* root rot of irrigated subterranean clover with potassium phosphonate in Victoria,  
430 Australia. *Plant Pathol.* 43, 1009–1019.

431 Gubler, W.D., Davis, R.M., 1996. *Phytophthora* Root and Crown Rot. In: Zitter, T. A., Hopkins D.  
432 L., Thomas, C. E. (eds.) *Compendium of Cucurbit Diseases*, pp. 19-20. APS Press, St. Paul, MN.

433 Guest, D.I., Bompeix, G., 1990. The complex mode of action of phosphonates. *Australas. Plant*  
434 *Pathol.* 19,113-115

435 Gullino, M.L., Gilardi, G., Bertetti, D., Pugliese, M., Garibaldi, A., 2018. Emerging Soilborne  
436 Pathogens and Trends in Their Management. *Acta Hort.* in press.

437 Gullino, M.L., Pugliese, M., 2011. New strain of *Fusarium solani* and its uses. Patent number  
438 IT2011TO01016.

439 Gullino, M.L., Pugliese, M., Garibaldi, A., 2015. Use of silicon amendments against foliar and  
440 vascular diseases of vegetables grown soilless. p 293.-307 In: G. Sangeetha, V. Kurucheve and J.  
441 Jayaraj (eds.), Sustainable crop disease management using natural products, Cabi, Delémont,  
442 Switzerland.

443 Hardy GESJ, Barrett SR, Shearer BL, 2001. The future of phosphite as a fungicide to control the  
444 soilborne plant pathogen *Phytophthora cinnamomi* in natural ecosystems. Australasian Plant  
445 Pathology 30, 113 - 139.

446 Harman G.E., 2006. Overview of mechanisms and uses of *Trichoderma* spp. Phytopathology 96  
447 (2),190–194.

448 Hausbeck, M.K., Lamour, K. H., 2004. *Phytophthora capsici* on vegetable crops: research progress  
449 and management challenges. Plant Dis. 88, 1292-1303.

450 Jackson, T.J., Burgess, T., Colquhoun, I., Hardy, G.E.S., 2000. Action of fungicide phosphite on  
451 *Eucalyptus marginata* inoculated with *Phytophthora cinnamomi*. Plant Pathol. 49, 147–154.

452 Jarvis, B., 1991. Does Hydroponic Production Solve Soilborne Problems? American Vegetable  
453 Grower 10, 54- 57

454 Jee, H.J., Cho, W.D., Kim, C.H., 2002. Effect of potassium phosphonate on the control of  
455 *Phytophthora* root rot of lettuce in hydroponics. Plant Pathol. J. 18(3), 142–146.

456 Jenkins, S.F., Averre, C.W., 1983. Root diseases of vegetables in hydroponic culture systems, Plant  
457 Dis. 67, 968-970.

458 Katan, J., 2017. Diseases caused by soilborne pathogens: biology, management and challenges. J.  
459 Plant Pathol. 99, 305-315.

460 Lamour, K.H., Stam, R., Jupe, J., Huitema, E., 2012. The oomycete broad-host range pathogen  
461 *Phytophthora capsici*. Mol.Plant Pathol.13, 329-337.

462 Larkin, RP and Fravel, DR. 1998. Efficacy of various fungal and bacterial biocontrol organisms for  
463 control of Fusarium wilt of tomato. Plant Dis. 82, 1022–1028.

464 Lemanceau, P. and C. Alabouvette, 1993. Suppression of fusarium wilts by *Fluorescent*  
465 *pseudomonads*: Mechanisms and applications. Biocontrol Sci. Technol., 3, 219-234.

466 Li, M.-F., Li, G.-H., Zhang K.-Q., 2019. Non-volatile metabolites from Trichoderma spp. Metabolites  
467 9, 58.

468 Liljeroth, E., Lankinen, Å., Wiik, L., Burra, D.D., Alexandersson, E., Andreasson, E., 2016.  
469 Potassium phosphite combined with reduced doses of fungicides provides efficient protection against  
470 late blight in large-scale field trials. Crop Prot. 86, 42-55.

471 Lobato, M.C., Olivieri, F.P., Daleo, G.R., Andreu, A.B., 2010. Antimicrobial activity of phosphites  
472 against different potato pathogens. J. Plant Dis. Prot. 117, 102-109.

473 Lumsden, R. D., Locke, J.C., 1989. Biological Control of Damping-Off Caused by *Pythium ultimum*  
474 and *Rhizoctonia solani* with *Gliocladium virens* in Soilless Mix. Phytopathology 79, 361-366.

475 Malandrakisa A., Daskalakib E.R., Papadopoulou N., Kavroulakis N., 2018. A *Fusarium solani*  
476 endophyte vs fungicides: Compatibility in a *Fusarium oxysporum* f.sp. *radicis-lycopersici* – tomato  
477 pathosystem. Fungal Biology 122, 1215-1221.

478 Manasfi, Cannesan, M.A. Riah W., Bressan M., Laval K., Driouich A., Viché M., Trinsoutrot-Gattin  
479 I. Potential of combined biological control agents to cope with *Phytophthora parasitica*, a major  
480 pathogen of *Choisya ternata*.

481 McDonald, A.E., Grant, B.R., Plaxton, W.C., 2001. Phosphite (phosphorous acid): its relevance in  
482 the environment and agriculture and influence on plant phosphate starvation response. J. Plant Nutr.,  
483 24, 1505-1519.

484 Mercier, J., Manker, D.C., 2005. Biocontrol of soil-borne diseases and plant growth enhancement in  
485 greenhouse soilless mix by the volatile producing fungus *Muscodor albus*. Crop Prot. 24, 355–362.

486 Ouimette, D. G., Coffey, M. D., 1990. Symplastic entry and phloem translocation of phosphonate.  
487 Pestic. Biochem. Physiol. 38, 18-25.

488 Ouimette, D.G., Coffey, M.D., 1989. Comparative antifungal activity of four phosphonate  
489 compounds against isolates of nine *Phytophthora* species. *Phytopathology* 79,761–767.

490 Padley, L.D., Jr. Kabelka, E.A., Roberts, P., French, R., 2008. Evaluation of *Cucurbita pepo*  
491 accessions for crown rot resistance to isolates of *Phytophthora capsici*. *Hort. Sci.* 43, 1996-1999.

492 Paulitz, T.C., 1997. Biological control of root pathogens in soilless and hydroponic systems. *Hort.*  
493 *Sci.* 32, 193-196.

494 Pilbeam, R.A., Colquhoun, I.J., Shearer, B., Hardy, G.E. StJ, 2000. Phosphite concentration: its effect  
495 on phytotoxicity symptoms and colonisation by *Phytophthora cinnamomi* in three understory  
496 species of *Eucalyptus marginata* forest. *Australas. Plant Path.* 29, 86–95.

497 Postma, J., Geraats, B.P.J., Pastoor, R., van Elsas, J.D., 2005. Characterization of the microbial  
498 community involved in the suppression of *Pythium aphanidermatum* in cucumber grown on  
499 rockwool. *Phytopathology* 95, 808–818.

500 Postma, J., 2010. The Status of Biological Control of Plant Diseases in Soilless Cultivation. In *Recent*  
501 *Developments in Management of Plant Diseases*. pp 133-146 (Gisi U., Chet I., Gullino M.L.Eds.).  
502 Springer Netherlands.

503 Postma, J., Van Os, E.A., Bonants, P.J.M., 2008. Pathogen detection and management strategies in  
504 soilless plant growing systems. In: Raviv, M. & Lieth, J.H. (eds) *Soilless culture - theory and practice*.  
505 USA: Elsevier BV, pp. 425-458.

506 Postma, J., van Os, E.A., Kritzman, G., 1999. Prevention of root diseases in closed soilless growing  
507 systems by microbial optimization. *Med. Fac. Landbouww. Rijksuniv. Gent*, 64(3b), 431-440.

508 Postma, J., Willemsen-de Klein, M.J.E.I.M., Van Elsas, J.D., 2000. Effect of the indigenous  
509 microflora on the development of root and crown rot caused by *Pythium aphanidermatum* in  
510 cucumber grown on rockwool. *Phytopathology* 90 (2), 125–133.

511 Pugliese, M., Liu, B.P., Gullino, M.L., Garibaldi A., 2008. Selection of antagonists from compost to  
512 control soil-borne pathogens. *J. Plant Dis. Protect.* 115, 220-228.

513 Ristaino, J. B., Johnston, S. A., 1999. Ecologically based approaches to management of Phytophthora  
514 blight on bell pepper. *Plant Dis.* 83,1080-1089.

515 Sambo et al., 2019. Hydroponic Solutions for Soilless Production Systems: Issues and Opportunities  
516 in a Smart Agriculture Perspective.

517 Savvas, D., Gianquinto, G., Tuzel, Y., Gruda, N., 2013. Soilless culture Good Agricultural Practices  
518 for Greenhouse Vegetable Crops, Principles for Mediterranean Climate Areas, 217, FAO Plant  
519 Production and Protection Paper 303-354.

520 Segarra, G., Avilés, M., Casanova, E., Borrero, C., & Trillas, I. (2013). Effectiveness of biological  
521 control of *Phytophthora capsici* in pepper by *Trichoderma asperellum* strain T34. *Phytopathologia*  
522 *Mediterranea*, 52(1), 77-83.

523 Schnitzler, W.H., 2004. Pest and Disease Management of Soilless Culture. *Acta Hortic.* 648, 191-  
524 203.

525 Shearer, B.L., Crane, C.E., 2012. Variation within the genus *Lambertia* in efficacy of low-volume  
526 aerial phosphite spray for control of *Phytophthora cinnamomi*. *Australas Plant Pathol* 41,47–57.

527 Smillie, R., Grant, B.R., Guest, D., 1989. The mode of action of phosphite: evidence of both direct  
528 and indirect modes of action on three *Phytophthora* spp. in plants. *Phytopathology* 79, 921–926

529 Stanghellini, M.E., Rasmussen, S., 1994. Hydroponics: a solution for zoosporic pathogens. *Plant Dis.*  
530 74, 173-178.

531 Stanghellini, M.E., Kim, D.H., Rasmussen, S.L., Rorabaugh, P.A., 1996. Control of root rot of  
532 peppers caused by *Phytophthora capsici* with a non-ionic surfactant. *Plant Dis.* 80, 1113-1116.

533 Thao, H.T.B., Yamakawa, T., 2009. Phosphite (phosphorous acid): Fungicide, fertilizer or  
534 biostimulator? *Soil Science and Plant Nutrition* 55, 228-234.

535 Thomashow L.S., Weller D.M., 1995. Current concepts in the use of introduced bacteria for  
536 biological disease control: mechanisms and antifungal metabolites. In: Stacey., G., Keen, N.T. (Eds.),  
537 *Plant-Microbe Interactions*. Chapman and Hall, New York, NY, USA, pp. 187–235.

538 Utkhede, R.S., Levesque, C.A., Dinh, D., 2000. *Pythium aphanidermatum* root rot in hydroponically  
539 grown lettuce and the effect of chemical and biological agents on its control Can. J. Plant Pathol. 22  
540 (2), 138-144.

541 Vallance, D., Guérin-Dubrana, F., Blancard D., Rey, P., 2011. Pathogenic and beneficial  
542 microorganisms in soilless cultures. Agron. Sustain. Dev. 31 (1), 191-203.

543 Van Os, E. A., 1999. Closed soilless growing systems: a sustainable solution for Dutch greenhouse  
544 horticulture. Water Sci. Technol. 39, 105-112.

545 Walters, D.R., Ratsep, J., Havis, N.D., 2013. Controlling crop diseases using induced resistance:  
546 challenges for the future. J. Exp. Bot. 64, 1263-1280.

547 Walker, G.E., 1991. Effect of metalaxyl and phosphonate on incidence of cavity spot in carrots.  
548 Australas. Plant Pathol. 20, 2 1-26.

549 Yandoc-Ables, C. B., Roskopf, E. N., Lamb, E. M., 2007. Management of Phytophthora crown rot  
550 in pumpkin and zucchini seedlings with phosphonates. Plant Dis. 91, 1651-1656.

551 Xu X.-M., Jeffries P., Pautasso M., and Jeger M. J., 2011. Combined Use of Biocontrol Agents to  
552 Manage Plant Diseases in Theory and Practice. Phytopathology, 101, 1025- 1031.

553 Sid Ahmed A., Ezziyyani M., Sánchez C.P., et al., 2003. Effect of chitin on biological control activity  
554 of *Bacillus* spp. and *Trichoderma harzianum* against root rot disease in pepper chili (*Capsicum*  
555 *annuum*) plants. Eur J Plant Pathol. 109, 633–637.

556 Zohara F., Akanda M.A.M., Narayan C.P., Mahfuz R., Islam T., 2016. Inhibitory effects of  
557 *Pseudomonas* spp. on plant pathogen *Phytophthora capsici* *in vitro* and *in planta*. Biocatalysis and  
558 Agricultural Biotechnology 5, 69–77.

559 Jackson TJ, Burgess T, Colquhoun I, Hardy GES, Jackson TJ (2000) Action of the fungicide  
560 phosphite on *Eucalyptus marginata* inoculated with *Phytophthora cinnamomi* . Plant Pathology 49:  
561 147–154.

562

563 **Tables**

564

565 **Table 1.**

566 Main operations carried out during the first set of trials

<b>Operation</b>	<b>Trial 1</b>	<b>Trial 2</b>	<b>Trial 3</b>	<b>Trial 4</b>
Sowing in nursery	30.12.1016	30.01.2017	15.03.2017	27.09.2017
Artificial inoculation with <i>Phytophthora</i> <i>capsici</i>	12.01.2017	9.02.2017	28.03.2017	11.10.2017
Treatments with BCAs and K- phosphite	12.01.2017 16.01.2017 20.01.2017 25.01.2017 30.01.2017 6.02.2017	09.02.2017 15.02.2017 20.02.2017 24.02.2017 01.03.2017 6.03.2017	28.03.2017 03.04.2017 07.04.2017 12.04.2017 18.04.2017 21.04.2017	11.10.2017 17.10.2017 23.10.2017 27.10.2017 02.11.2017 07.11.2017
Transplanting	16.01.2017	15.02.2017	03.04.2017	17.10.2017
End of the trial	13.02.2017	13.03.2017	28.04.2017	14.11.2017

567

568

569



570

571

**Table 2.**

572

Main operations carried out during the second set of trials

Operation	Trials carried out under different disease pressures.								
	Low <sup>a</sup>			Average			High		
	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Artificial inoculation with <i>Phytophthora capsici</i>	16.06.17	08.09.17	08.06.17	13.04.17	09.05.17	30.05.17	05.05.17	15.09.17	05.04.17
Treatments with K-phosphite	16.06	08.09	08.06	13.04	09.05	30.05	05.05	15.09	05.04
	22.06	15.09	13.06	19.04	15.05	05.06	11.05	22.09	10.04
	26.06	20.09	16.06	24.04	19.05	09.06	15.05	27.09	14.04
	30.06	25.09	21.06	28.04	24.05	14.06	19.05	02.10	19.04
	05.07	29.09	26.06	03.05	29.05	19.06	24.05	06.10	24.04
	10.07	04.10	30.06	08.05	02.06	23.06	29.05	11.10	28.04
Transplanting	22.06.17	15.09.17	13.06.17	19.04.17	15.05.17	05.06.17	11.05.17	22.09.17	6.04.17
End of the trial	24.07.17	18.10.17	14.07.17	22.04.17	16.06.17	7-07.17	12.06.17	25.10.17	12.05.17

573

574

<sup>a</sup>Disease severity in the untreated control as average of three trials: low, DS 20.3; average: DS 40.1

575

and high DS 59.1.

576

**Table 3.**

Effect of the experimental BCA treatments on Phytophthora crown rot caused by *P. capsici* on soilless grown zucchini (cv. Genovese) . The data shown are expressed as disease severity (DS0-100) at the end of trials 1-4. Standard errors and the efficacy, compared with the untreated control (E%), are reported.

Treatments	DS 0-100															
	Trial 1				Trial 2				Trial 3				Trial 4			
Untreated control	30.0	±5.6	b <sup>a</sup>	<b>E%<sup>b</sup></b>	46.7	±5.0	b	<b>E%</b>	40.0	±7.2	c	<b>E%</b>	47.9	±2.2	c	<b>E%</b>
<i>Pseudomonas</i> sp. PB26	25.0	±3.7	b	<b>17</b>	25.0	±2.6	ab	<b>47</b>	25.5	±3.6	ab	<b>36</b>	30.2	±3.2	ab	<b>37</b>
<i>Fusarium solani</i> FUS25	23.3	±5.5	b	<b>22</b>	26.7	±3.1	ab	<b>43</b>	36.7	±4.3	bc	<b>8</b>	29.2	±3.9	ab	<b>39</b>
<i>Trichoderma</i> sp. TW2	20.0	±2.0	ab	<b>33</b>	21.7	±3.5	ab	<b>54</b>	35.0	±4.1	b	<b>12</b>	35.4	±4.4	bc	<b>26</b>
<i>Pseudomonas</i> sp. PB26+ <i>F. solani</i> FUS25+ <i>Trichoderma</i> sp. TW2	30.0	±7.3	b	<b>0</b>	25.0	±3.7	ab	<b>47</b>	21.7	±5.7	ab	<b>46</b>	31.8	±4.4	a- c	<b>34</b>
<i>Pseudomonas</i> (FC7,8,9)	18.4	±1.7	ab	<b>39</b>	25.0	±2.5	ab	<b>46</b>	38.3	±7.3	c	<b>4</b>	30.4	±2.5	ab	<b>37</b>
<i>Trichoderma asperellum</i> + <i>T.gamsii</i>	18.3	±4.9	ab	<b>39</b>	26.7	±3.2	ab	<b>43</b>	28.3	±2.0	ab	<b>29</b>	25.5	±4.1	ab	<b>47</b>
K-phoshite (Alexine at 2.5g/l)	1.7	±1.7	a	<b>94</b>	8.3	±1.6	a	<b>82</b>	13.8	±1.8	a	<b>65</b>	18.3	±2.3	a	<b>62</b>

<sup>a</sup> Means in the same column, followed by the same letter, do not differ according to Tukey's Test (P <0.05)

<sup>b</sup>E%: percentage of disease reduction, compared to the untreated control, at the end of the trial.

**Table 4.**

Effect of the K-phosphite, dosage, type of application, number of treatments and their interaction on the disease severity average (DS) for trails under low (trials 5-7), average (trials 8-10) and high (trials 11-13) disease pressure according to the analysis of variance.

Considered factors and their interaction	at P < 0.05
<b>Trials 5-7</b>	0.456
Dosage (1.25 and 2.5 g/l)	<0.0001
Type of application (pot or NS)	0.353
Number of treatment (1, 3 and 6)	0.002
Dosage × Number × type of application	<0.0001
<b>Trials 8-10</b>	0.338
K-Phosphite dosage (1.25 and 2.5 g/l)	<0.0001
Type of application (pot or NS)	0.227
Number of treatment (1, 3 and 6)	<0.0001
Dosage × Number × type of application	<0.0001
<b>Trials 11-13</b>	0.574
K-Phosphite dosage (1,25 and 2,5 g/l)	<0.0001
Type of application (pot or NS)	0.181
Number of treatment (1, 3 and 6)	<0.0001
Dosage × Number × type of application	<0.0001

**Table 5.**

Effect of the dosage (1.125 and 2.5 g/l), type (pot and nutrient solution NS) and numbers of applications (1, 3 and 6) of K-phosphite against *Phytophthora capsici* on zucchini (cv. Genovese). Data shown are mean of three trials each carried out under different disease pressure.

Treatments and dosage (g/l)	Type of Application	Number of applications and intervals between (days)	DS 0-100											
			Trials 5-7				Trials 8-10				Trials 11-13			
Untreated	-	-	20.3	±2.4	b <sup>a</sup>	<b>E%*</b>	40.1	±3.6	c	<b>E%</b>	59.1	±5.3	b	<b>E%</b>
K phosphite, 1.125	Pot	1	12.9	±1.6	ab	<b>37</b>	32.2	±3.7	bc	<b>20</b>	33.9	±5.2	ab	<b>43</b>
K phosphite, 1.125	Pot	6× 5 d.	8.1	±1.9	a	<b>60</b>	20.9	±3.2	ab	<b>48</b>	29.5	±4.7	a	<b>50</b>
K phosphite, 2.5	Nutrient solution	1	13.3	±2.9	ab	<b>35</b>	22.9	±5.0	ab	<b>43</b>	32.1	±5.3	ab	<b>46</b>
K phosphite, 2.5	Pot	1	12.2	±2.4	ab	<b>40</b>	20.3	±0.5	ab	<b>49</b>	35.8	±5.3	ab	<b>39</b>
K phosphite, 2.5	Nutrient solution	3 ×5 d.	10.0	±2.0	a	<b>51</b>	10.4	±3.1	a	<b>74</b>	24.0	±5.1	a	<b>59</b>
K phosphite, 2.5	Pot	3 ×5 d.	5.8	±1.5	a	<b>72</b>	8.2	±2.0	a	<b>80</b>	28.0	±6.1	a	<b>53</b>
K phosphite, 2.5	Nutrient solution	6 ×5 d.	6.0	±2.5	a	<b>71</b>	22.7	±4.7	ab	<b>43</b>	21.0	±6.3	a	<b>64</b>
K phosphite, 2.5	Pot	6 ×5 d.	5.0	±1.4	a	<b>75</b>	8.5	±1.6	a	<b>79</b>	28.1	±6.5	a	<b>53</b>

<sup>a</sup> Means in the same column, followed by the same letter, do not differ according to Tukey's Test (P <0.05)

<sup>b</sup>E%: percentage of disease reduction, compared to the untreated control, at the end of the trial.

**Fig 1.**

Effect of the numbers of applications (1, 3 or 6) of K-phosphite against *Phytophthora capsici* on zucchini (cv. Genovese) under different disease severity pressures in the three set of trials. The data are expressed as the mean values of disease severity in trials 5-7, 8-10 and 11-13.

