

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

The science, development, and commercialization of postharvest biocontrol products

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1581075> since 2017-05-12T14:24:45Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1016/j.postharvbio.2016.04.006

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)

This Accepted Author Manuscript (AAM) is copyrighted and published by Elsevier. It is posted here by agreement between Elsevier and the University of Turin. Changes resulting from the publishing process - such as editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms - may not be reflected in this version of the text. The definitive version of the text was subsequently published in POSTHARVEST BIOLOGY AND TECHNOLOGY, None, 9999, 10.1016/j.postharvbio.2016.04.006.

You may download, copy and otherwise use the AAM for non-commercial purposes provided that your license is limited by the following restrictions:

- (1) You may use this AAM for non-commercial purposes only under the terms of the CC-BY-NC-ND license.
- (2) The integrity of the work and identification of the author, copyright owner, and publisher must be preserved in any copy.
- (3) You must attribute this AAM in the following format: Creative Commons BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.en>), 10.1016/j.postharvbio.2016.04.006

The publisher's version is available at:

<http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0925521416300655>

When citing, please refer to the published version.

Link to this full text:

<http://hdl.handle.net/None>

1 **The science, development, and commercialization of postharvest biocontrol**
2 **products**

3
4
5 Samir Droby^{a,*}, Michael Wisniewski^b, Neus Teixidó^c, Davide Spadaro^d, and Haissam Jijakli^e
6
7

8 *^aDept. Postharvest Science, Institute of Postharvest and Food Sciences, ARO, the Volcani Center,*
9 *P.O. Box 6, bet Dagan 50250, Israel.*

10 *^bUSDA-ARS, Appalachian Fruit Research Station, Kearneysville, WV 25430, USA.*

11 *^cIRTA, XaRTA-Postharvest, Edifici FRUITCENTRE, Parc Científic i Tecnològic Agroalimentari*
12 *de Lleida, 25003 Lleida, Catalonia, Spain.*

13 *^dDept. Agricultural, Forestry and Food Sciences (DISAFA) and AGROINNOVA Centre of*
14 *10 Competence for the Innovation in the Agroenvironmental Sector, University of Torino, Largo*
15 *11 Braccini 2, 10095 Grugliasco (TO), Italy.*

16 *^eIntegrated and Urban Plant Pathology Laboratory, Gembloux Agro-Bio Tech, ULg., Passage des*
17 *Déportés, 2, 5030 Gembloux, Belgium*

18
19
20 *corresponding author: Tel: +972 3 9683615, E-mail address: samird@volcani.agri.gov.il (S.
21 Droby)
22
23

24 Key words: Postharvest biological control, Yeast, Bacteria, Mode of action, Commercialization,
25 Biopesticide, Microbiome, synthetic microbial community
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70

ABSTRACT

Postharvest biological control agents as a viable alternative to the use of synthetic chemicals have been the focus of considerable research for the last 30 years by many scientists and several commercial companies worldwide. Several antagonists of postharvest pathogens have been identified and tested in laboratory, semi-commercial, and commercial studies and were developed as commercial products. The discovery and development of all these antagonists to a product followed the paradigm in which a single antagonist isolated from one commodity is expected to be effective as well on other commodities that vary in their genetic background, physiology, postharvest handling, and pathogen susceptibility. In most cases, products development was successful but their full commercial potential has not been realized. The low success rate of postharvest biocontrol products has been attributed to several factors among which mass production, formulation, physiological status of the commodity, its susceptibility to specific pathogen and application constrains played major role in the reduced and inconsistent performance under commercial conditions. Although studies on the mode of action of postharvest microbial antagonists have investigated for the last 30 years, our understanding is still very incomplete. In this regard, a systems approach should be employed to investigate the network of interactions that takes into account all the components of the biocontrol system. Very little is known about the overall diversity and composition of microbial communities on harvested produce and how these communities vary across produce types , their function, the factors that influence the composition after harvest and during storage, and the distribution of individual taxa. In light of the progress made in recent years in metagenomic technologies, this technology should be used to characterize the composition of microbial communities on fruits and vegetables. Information on the dynamics and diversity of microbiota may be useful to adopting new paradigm in postharvest biocontrol that is based on constructing synthetic microbial communities to provide superior control of pathogens.

71 1. Introduction

72
73 Biological control agents as a viable alternative to the use of synthetic chemicals has been the focus
74 of considerable research for the last 30 years by many scientists and several commercial companies
75 worldwide. This effort has been based on the need to reduce the use of synthetic fungicides to
76 control postharvest pathogens on harvested agricultural commodities. The withdrawal of key
77 fungicides, development of resistance biotypes, along with environmental and health considerations
78 have been among the drivers for developing alternative disease management technologies that are
79 safe and effective.

80 The potential use of epiphytic microbial antagonists to control postharvest pathogens was first
81 reported back in the mid-eighties (Wilson and Pusey, 1985) and was later highlighted in several
82 reviews that offered guidelines for isolating and selecting postharvest biocontrol agents (Wilson and
83 Wisniewski, 1989; 1994). A key rationale used to support this approach was that, in contrast to
84 field- and soil-based biocontrol, the postharvest environment and the disease etiology was more
85 conducive to applying the antagonist to a commodity and maintaining its population due to
86 controlled environmental conditions. The purpose of the current review is to evaluate the paradigms
87 that have developed in the field of postharvest biocontrol over the past 30 years and assess their
88 validity. More specifically, this review is aimed at reviewing the progress that has been made,
89 examining the reasons why developed products have had such limited commercial success, and
90 reflect on future prospects and trends. The current state of the science of postharvest biological
91 control is discussed, challenges and obstacles are identified, and the relevance of recent advances in
92 omics, and their implication on postharvest biocontrol research is presented.

93 Numerous microbial antagonists (yeasts and bacteria) of postharvest pathogens have been
94 identified in both laboratory, semi-commercial, and commercial studies (Droby et al., 2009).
95 Several of these antagonists reached advanced levels of development and commercialization.
96 Among the first generation of biocontrol products registered and made commercially available were
97 Aspire™ (based on *Candida oleophila*) (Blachinsky, et al., 2007), Yieldplus™ (based on
98 *Cryptococcus albidus*) (Janisiewicz and Korsten, 2002), Candifruit™ (based on *Candida sake*)
99 (Teixidó, et al., 2011), and Biosave™ (*Pseudomonas syringae* Van Hall) (Janisiewicz and Jeffers,
100 1997). Aspire™, Yieldplus™ and Candifruit™ were commercialized for some years but
101 discontinued due to business and marketing-related. Biosave™, however, still has limited use in
102 the US market for application on fruit crops, potatoes, and sweet potatoes (Janisiewicz and

103 Peterson, 2004). Avogreen™ was introduced in South Africa for the control of *Cercospora* spot, a
104 postharvest disease of avocado, but did not achieve commercial success due to inconsistent results
105 (Demoz and Korsten, 2006). More recently, Nexy™ (based on *C. oleophila*) was developed in
106 Belgium, and submitted for regulatory approval in 2005 for postharvest application against wound
107 pathogens on pome fruits, citrus, and banana (Lahlali et al. 2011). Nexy™, manufactured by
108 Lesaffre, Inc., received registration approval throughout the European Union in 2013 (Massart and
109 Jijakli, 2014). BoniProtect™ (based on the yeast-like fungus *Aureobasidium pullulans*), developed
110 in Germany, has a suggested use as a preharvest application to control wound pathogens on pome
111 fruit develop during storage (Lima et al, 2015). Another product, "Pantovital" (based on *Pantoea*
112 *agglomerans* CPA-2) effective against the major postharvest pathogens of pome and citrus fruits
113 (Cañamás et al., 2008; Plaza et al., 2004; Teixidó et al., 2001) was formulated but was not
114 commercialized (Torres et al., 2014). Shemer™ (based on *Metschnikowia fructicola*) registered in
115 Israel for both pre- and postharvest application on various fruits and vegetables, including apricots,
116 citrus fruit, grapes, peaches, peppers, strawberries, and sweet potatoes represents a more successful
117 example of a postharvest biocontrol product. Shemer™ was acquired by Bayer CropScience
118 (Germany) and then sublicensed to Koppert (Netherlands) (Hershkovitz et al., 2013).

119 Interestingly, the vast majority of reported postharvest biocontrol agents and products are
120 yeasts. Yeasts, in general, have high tolerance to the stressful environmental conditions prevailing
121 before and after harvest (low and high temperatures, desiccation, wide range of relative humidity,
122 low oxygen levels, pH fluctuations, UV radiation) and are uniquely adapted to fruit the micro-
123 environment (high sugar concentration, high osmotic pressure, and low pH) present in wounded
124 fruit tissues. Additionally, many yeast species can grow rapidly on inexpensive substrates in
125 fermenters and are therefore easy to produce in large quantities (Spadaro et al., 2010). Moreover, in
126 contrast to filamentous fungi, they do not produce allergenic spores or mycotoxins, and have simple
127 nutritional requirements that enable them to colonize dry surfaces for long periods of time.

128

129 **2. The postharvest biocontrol paradigm - looking back to move forward**

130

131 Research on biocontrol of postharvest diseases has mainly focused on isolating
132 microorganisms that are antagonistic to wound pathogens that infect a commodity during harvest
133 and subsequent handling. Typically, pathogen spores germinate very rapidly (within 24 hours) and

134 colonize wounds that are rich in sugars and other nutrients. Therefore, it is necessary to interfere
135 with spore germination and/or germ-tube growth in a rapid time frame in order to prevent or inhibit
136 infections.

137 The discovery and development of postharvest biocontrol has been mainly pursued by plant
138 pathologists. Early investigations to identify potential biocontrol agents, basically adopted the same
139 strategy used for finding biocontrol agents against foliar and soil-borne diseases where isolation and
140 screening program was designed to identify single potent antagonists. Several features of an ideal
141 antagonist were defined by Wilson and Wisniewski (1989) and have served as the basis for many
142 other biocontrol research programs, past and present. Rapid growth and colonization of fresh
143 wounds by the biocontrol agent was one of the main features indicated. Following this logic,
144 Wilson et al. (1993) designed a rapid method for screening and identifying successful antagonists.
145 Antagonists that produced secondary metabolites inhibitory to the targeted pathogens in *in vitro*
146 assays were excluded based on the assumption that indications of antibiotic production would be
147 problematic in the registration process. Another essential feature that was defined was that the level
148 of survival and rate of growth of the biocontrol agent on intact and injured fruit surfaces had to be
149 sufficiently great enough to prevent pathogens from becoming established. This premise, however,
150 neglected the fact that the introduced antagonist was not the only "player" present on the harvested
151 commodity. Additionally, very little attention was given to the impact of different postharvest
152 treatments on the population of antagonists and other resident microflora. Interactions between the
153 resident microflora and the antagonists, as they were individually impacted by the other postharvest
154 treatments, were rarely studied and therefore poorly understood.

155 Droby et al. (2009) raised several reservations about the relevance of the existing paradigm
156 for identifying antagonists that are expected to perform under "real world" situations where a wide
157 range of wounds, that serve as an infection court, exist. In the current postharvest biocontrol
158 paradigm it is expected that a single antagonist isolated from one commodity will be effective on
159 other commodities that vary in their genetic background, physiology, postharvest handling, and
160 pathogen susceptibility. Perhaps this expectation is not realistic given the advances in our
161 knowledge of microbial ecology and plant microbiomes that have been accomplished through
162 metagenomic approaches.

163
164

165 3. Constraints and shortcoming of existing biocontrol systems

166
167 Several registered postharvest biocontrol products have been developed jointly by researchers
168 working with commercial companies. Although product development was successful, their full
169 commercial potential has not been realized, which can be measured by its acceptance and widespread
170 use. The low success rate of postharvest biocontrol products has been attributed to several factors
171 among which is inconsistent performance under commercial conditions. Efficacy of these products
172 must be similar to that achieved by chemical fungicides, which is in the range of 98-100% disease
173 control. This level, is seldom attained with biological control products when they are used as a
174 stand-alone treatment. Therefore, it is imperative to discuss the variables that are critical in product
175 development, performance, and viability. A schematic description of a possible pipeline for the
176 development of postharvest biocontrol products is presented in Fig. 1.

177 *Mass production and fermentation:* Economical production of large quantities of a
178 microorganism in a formulation that ensures reasonable shelf life and maintains efficacy during
179 large-scale testing are fundamental steps in the process of developing a commercial biocontrol
180 product. Production and formulation processes are often conducted directly or in association with
181 private companies and all the related research and development data is usually protected under
182 confidentiality agreements leading to a lack of scientific references on these essential subjects.

183 The Mass Production process requires two essential steps: 1) developing an economical
184 culture medium that provides an adequate supply of nutrients and energy for cellular metabolism,
185 growth, and population stability, and 2) optimization of growth conditions (temperature, agitation,
186 aeration, and pH). Current commercial production methods utilize either solid- or liquid-phase
187 fermentations. In general, liquid-phase cultures are used for bacteria and yeasts and solid-phase
188 cultures are used for most fungi. Optimized mass production systems have been described for some
189 postharvest biocontrol agents, including bacteria such as *Pantoea agglomerans* CPA-2 (Costa et
190 al., 2001), *P. agglomerans* PBC-1 (Manso et al., 2010) or *Bacillus subtilis* CPA-8 (Yáñez-
191 Mendizábal et al., 2012b), yeasts such as *Candida sake* CPA-1 (Abadias et al., 2003a),
192 *Aureobasidium pullulans* (Mounir et al., 2007), or *Rhodotorula minuta* (Patiño-Vera et al., 2005),
193 and fungi such as *Penicillium frequentans* 909 (De Cal et al., 2002), and *Epicoccum nigrum* (Larena
194 et al., 2004).

195 Downstream processing of cultured microorganisms involves various steps, such as cell
196 separation from medium, drying, addition of volume materials (inert ingredients), adhesives,
197 emulsifiers and adjuvants. All these actions may adversely affect the properties of the selected
198 biocontrol agent. The need of reasonable shelf-life and preserving efficacy requires the stabilization
199 of cell viability, which can be achieved by the product being made available in a: i) liquid state
200 usually requiring refrigeration; ii) a freeze-dried state that requires the use of cryo-protectant
201 substances during preparation, and; iii) dehydrating (drying) the cultures. The latter two types of
202 formulations can then be stored at ambient temperatures.

203 *Formulation:* Typically, formulated product consists of an antagonistic microorganism (the
204 active ingredient), an inert material that serves as a carrier, and adjuvants, such as nutrients and/or
205 compounds, that enhance the survival of the antagonist cells or help protect them from
206 environmental stresses such as desiccation, osmotic stress, UV radiation and low and high
207 temperature. In practice, very little literature has been reported about the formulation of postharvest
208 biocontrol agents, and often upscaling, stabilization, and the entire formulation process in general is
209 viewed as an art rather than a science. This is unfortunate since improvements in the formulation of
210 biocontrol products may increase their performance under commercial conditions, and significantly
211 increases the shelf life of the product.

212 Different dehydration processes have been used for formulating biocontrol agents. Freeze-
213 drying has the advantage of maintaining high cell viability but is much more costly than other
214 drying processes. Freeze-drying has been used to prepare BIOSAVE (*Pseudomonas syringae*), *P.*
215 *agglomerans* (Costa et al., 2000), *C. sake* CPA-1 (Abadias et al., 2001a, 2001b), *Cryptococcus*
216 *laurentii* (Li and Tian, 2006), *Metschnikowia pulcherrima* (Spadaro et al., 2010), and *Pichia*
217 *anomala* (Melin et al., 2011).

218 Spray-drying is another drying method that can be used to preserve biocontrol agents in a dry
219 state and has the advantage of being able to dry large quantities of cultures in a short time and at
220 low cost. Only a small number of microorganisms, however, are able to survive the high
221 temperatures used in this drying process. Only biocontrol agents that are able to produce heat-
222 resistant endospores, such as *B. subtilis* CPA-8, are suitable for spray drying (Yáñez-Mendizábal et
223 al., 2012a). Fluidized bed-drying is a cost-effective method of drying that can be used to dry heat-
224 sensitive microorganisms because the drying temperatures are relatively low. Fungi such as *E.*
225 *nigrum* (Larena et al., 2003) and *P. frequentans* (Guijarro et al., 2006), the yeast-like fungus,

226 *Aureobasidium pullulans* (Mounir et al., 2007), and the yeast, *C. sake* CPA-2 (Usall et al., 2009)
227 have all been successfully dried using fluidized bed-drying. Liquid formulations are the simplest
228 way to stabilize the viability of microbial cells. This formulation involves storing cells in water- or
229 oil-based solutions with different protectants and additives, typically at low temperatures. Isotonic,
230 liquid formulations of *C. sake* CPA-1 have been reported to be a suitable alternative to solid
231 formulations (Abadias et al., 2003b; Torres et al., 2003). Liquid formulations have also been tested
232 with *R. minuta* (Patiño-Vera et al., 2005), *Cryptococcus laurentii* (Liu et al., 2009), and *P. anomala*
233 (Melin et al., 2011).

234 *Range of activity:* The narrow range of activity (hosts and pathogens) of many biocontrol
235 agents is a serious limitation to their commercial success. In the case of postharvest biocontrol
236 products, this problem becomes even more critical because the postharvest market is very limited
237 and typically only one application of the product is necessary. It would be beneficial to be able to
238 broaden the spectrum of action of these products, in terms of hosts and pathogens, and if possible
239 extend their use to pre-harvest conditions. Different approaches could be used to extend the target
240 range of a biocontrol product. For example, different preparations of the same biocontrol agent
241 could be specifically formulated for each situation. The products Boni Protect, Blossom Protect, and
242 Botector utilize this approach as they represent different formulations of the same biocontrol agent,
243 *A. pullulans*. These products are specifically formulated to control postharvest diseases on pome
244 fruit, fire blight, and *Botrytis cinerea* on grapes, respectively. Enhancing the stress tolerance of
245 biocontrol agents has also been reported to enhance the viability of biocontrol agents during the
246 formulation process and broaden their spectrum of action (Teixidó et al. 2011; Sui et al., 2015). In
247 the case of *C. sake* CPA-1, it was originally developed to control postharvest diseases and later was
248 physiologically improved to be more tolerant to osmotic stress conditions, which allowed it to be
249 applied under field conditions and successfully control *B. cinerea* on grapes (Cañamás et al. 2011).
250 Genetic manipulation of antagonists is also a potential approach for improving biocontrol agents
251 and broadening their use, however, regulatory hurdles and public concern about the use of
252 genetically-modified-organisms (GMOs) represent a monumental hurdle to this approach.

253 *Performance and consistency:* Acceptable and consistent performance under commercial
254 conditions is critical to the success of any biocontrol agent. Numerous reports have been published
255 on various strategies and approaches that can be used to enhance the efficacy and reliability of
256 postharvest biocontrol agents. As reviewed in the introduction to this special issue (Wisniewski et

257 al., 2016), these include combining biocontrol agents with use of salts and organic acids (Droby et
258 al., 1997; Karabulut et al., 2001), glucose analogs (El Ghaouth et al., 2000), food additives (Droby
259 et al., 2002b; Karabulut et al., 2003; Teixidó et al., 2001), and various physical treatments (Porat et
260 al., 2002; Zhang et al., 2008). In most cases, enhanced efficacy was demonstrated using these
261 approaches, however, each commodity–pathogen system has its own unique features and so specific
262 protocols will need to be commercially evaluated.

263

264 **4. An industry perspective**

265

266 Concerns about food safety issues, including chemical residues and environmental impact, over
267 the past twenty years have resulted in substantial regulatory changes on the use of pesticides
268 (<http://www2.epa.gov/pesticide-tolerances>; <http://www.ecpa.eu/page/food-safety>). Regulatory
269 restrictions on the use of a variety of chemical fungicides used to manage postharvest pathogens is
270 increasing. Several products have been lost from the market due to the unwillingness of companies
271 to maintain registration. Resistant biotypes of pathogens have also evolved, decreasing the efficacy
272 of some of the existing chemicals.

273 In recent years, the interest of multinational chemical companies and microbial industries
274 (such as yeast producers) in biological control technologies, including postharvest uses, has grown
275 substantially. This is reflected in the number of acquisitions made by large, mainstream companies
276 of small and medium sized companies specializing in development of green technologies for
277 controlling plant diseases (CPM, 2010). In the case of microbial industries associated with
278 producing yeast for bakery, brewery, and wine fermentation, an interest in novel applications of
279 their microorganisms to expanded markets is a logical extension of their business. The real question
280 is why a multinational company would be interested in a biological control product that targets a
281 small niche market like postharvest biocontrol. The answer is rather complex and the underlying
282 reasons for acquiring a particular biocontrol product are difficult to determine. Given their
283 responsibility to stakeholders, multinational chemical companies are usually driven by two
284 strategies: pesticide resistance and the objective of achieving zero residues on commodities.
285 Furthermore, they want to offer to their clients (distributors and subsequently growers) a full
286 portfolio of existing protection tools, including both conventional and ‘green’ products.

287 The most difficult stage in the development of a biocontrol product is its commercialization.
288 Commercialization is the management process that provides structure in developing and bringing a
289 new product to market. Effective implementation of this process is needed to coordinate the
290 gathering of information and the establishment of a project plan. The early commercialization
291 phase is often long and fraught with a variety of difficulties, involving scientific, regulatory,
292 business management, and marketing issues. Companies require ample information about a variety
293 of aspects, such as market demand, market size, profit margin, and time to market, to effectively
294 handle these issues (Bailey et al., 2009). A report published by a working group within the EU
295 project ENDURE (Nicot et al, 2012) that was charged with analyzing the factors associated with
296 the success of field-based biocontrol technologies against arthropod pests, diseases and weeds,
297 stated that profit after taxes, provisions and amortization was 18% of sales for a chemical pesticide
298 and only 2% for a biocontrol product. In the case of the postharvest market, the profit margins can
299 be assumed to be even lower. In Europe, the size of the microbial biocontrol product market was
300 estimated to be 52 Mio Euro in 2012. Currently, the biopesticide market is valued at 1.5 - 2.5 billion
301 US dollars compared to 60 billion US dollars for the traditional pesticide market
302 (http://www.researchandmarkets.com/research/7bvbnf/global_pesticide)

303 Fifty-two chemical active ingredients were registered in the EU between 1996 to 2000,
304 whereas only 10 biocontrol agents were approved during the same span of time. In the past five
305 years, however, 22 biocontrol agents were authorized in the EU and only 20 chemical pesticides. In
306 general, there has been a significant increase in the biopesticide market worldwide, with the highest
307 increase in Europe, which is expected to pass North America as the largest market for biocontrol
308 products by 2018 (Anonymous, 2014). The annual worldwide increase in market growth (2012-
309 2020) is estimated to reach 12.3% for biopesticides versus 5 % for chemical pesticides. Among the
310 recently approved biocontrol products within the EU, three specifically target postharvest
311 pathogens: *Metschnikowia fructicola* strain 277 (Shemer™), *Aureobasidium pullulans* strains DSM
312 14940 and DSM 14941 (BoniProtect), and *Candida oleophila* strain O (Nexy™). This trend will
313 further stimulate the development and registration of biocontrol products in Europe. Companies that
314 have invested in these products will design marketing strategies that will increase market sales and
315 market share in order to achieve a good profit margin. This may include adding both additional
316 postharvest applications and/or preharvest applications registered uses for the product.

317 Companies may also enlarge the application of their registered product by adapting their
318 biopesticide to new applications. For example, Nexy™ was originally developed for postharvest
319 dipping and drenching application to fruit. In case of pome fruits, these application methods were
320 popular when submitting the registration dossier in 2005. When the EU approval was received in
321 2013, however, most growers had abandoned postharvest dipping and drenching treatments in favor
322 of preharvest treatments. Thus, nebulization of the product in fruit storage chambers could be a new
323 postharvest method of treating pome fruits, which may require an adjustment in the formulation of
324 the product and further education of packinghouses on how to adopt this method.

325

326 **5. Mechanisms of action involved in biocontrol systems**

327

328 Understanding the mode of action of postharvest biocontrol agents is a prerequisite for
329 product development and registration. In general, research on postharvest yeasts and bacterial
330 antagonists followed the traditional studies conducted on antagonists of foliar and soil borne
331 pathogens. These studies ascribed biocontrol activity to four major modes of action: 1) competition
332 for nutrients and space, 2) antibiotic production, 3) induction of host resistance, and 4) direct
333 parasitism (Bélanger et al., 2012; Janisiewicz and Korsten, 2002). The different modes of action
334 were recently reviewed by Spadaro and Droby (2015) and by Liu et al., (2013). Both reviews
335 highlight important additional features of successful antagonists, including biofilm formation,
336 quorum sensing, production of diffusible and volatile antimicrobial compounds, competition for
337 iron, the role of oxidative stress, alleviation of oxidative damage, and the production of ROS by the
338 antagonist. Until recently, the vast majority of studies on the mode of action of either yeast or
339 bacterial antagonists followed an approach that examined each possible mechanism separately. This
340 approach, however, raises some critical questions: (1) what are the effects of antagonists on wound
341 healing and host resistance? (2) how important and widespread are the direct effects of antagonists
342 on pathogens (3) how do incidental microorganisms or mixtures of antagonists affect
343 pathogen/antagonist interactions, and (4) how does the nutrient/chemical composition at the wound
344 site affect the antagonist, other microflora, the infection process, and the wound response? As
345 initially described by Droby et al. (2009) and expanded on by Jia et al. (2013), the performance of a
346 biocontrol agent can be seen as the result of complex mutual interactions between all the biotic
347 (organisms) and abiotic (environmental) components of the system. Although these interactions

348 have been the subject of postharvest biocontrol research for 30 years, our understanding is still very
349 incomplete. When studying mechanisms of action, a system approach should be employed to
350 investigate the network of interactions. Such an approach, that takes into account all the
351 components of the system, may provide the greatest understanding of biocontrol systems.

352 The availability of more cost-efficient, high throughput DNA/RNA and proteomic
353 technologies, along with bioinformatics, has provided new opportunities and tools to obtain deeper
354 insights into the mechanisms and interactions that have already been established (Kwasiborski et
355 al., 2014; An et al., 2014). Developments in deep sequencing, transcriptomics, MS-MS proteomics,
356 metagenomics, comparative and functional genomics can be utilized to determine changes in the
357 physiological status of biocontrol agents, and the effect of environmental stress on its intracellular
358 machinery (Herschkovitz et al., 2013; Sui et al., 2015). Changes in the level of expression of
359 "biocontrol genes" during mass production, formulation and storage, or in response to exposure and
360 contact with host plant tissue after application can now be more readily investigated. Massart and
361 Jijakli (2007) reviewed the molecular techniques that have been used to understand the mechanism
362 of action of biocontrol agents and discussed the strategies used to study the role of various genes
363 believed to be involved in the mechanisms of action. They concluded that the majority of studies
364 aimed at elucidating the genetic basis and traits important for antagonistic action have focused on
365 *Trichoderma*. Genes related to the production of antibiotics have been mainly studied in bacteria,
366 such as *Bacillus subtilis* and *Pseudomonas* spp. Very few genes involved in induction of resistance
367 mechanisms in host plants or competition for nutrient and space have been identified in biocontrol
368 agents. More recently, the impact of the -omic technologies for understanding the various modes of
369 action of biocontrol agents against plant pathogens was comprehensively reviewed by Massart et al.
370 (2015). Whatever the -omic technique used (genomic, transcriptomic or proteomic), studies of
371 postharvest biocontrol agents have been sparse and it is expected that greater details about
372 interactions in the entire biocontrol system will be forthcoming.

373

374 **6. The role of the microbiome in fruit health and disease – a new perspective**

375

376 Microbial communities resident on and in plants can have negative, neutral, or beneficial
377 effects on plant health and development (Berg et al., 2015; Mendes et al., 2013; Philippot et al.,
378 2013). These communities colonize all parts of a plant through its entire lifecycle and marked

379 diversity exists in communities associated with different hosts. Research on this topic is slowing
380 moving from just describing the composition of these communities to elucidating the mechanisms
381 involved in their assembly and function (Waldor et al., 2015).

382 Studies on plant microbiomes (phytobiomes) in both the phyllosphere and rhizosphere
383 indicate that plants should be considered as “super organisms” where very diverse microbial
384 communities provide specific functions and traits to plants (Vorholt, 2012; de Bruijn, F., 2013).
385 These functions include five key features: (i) improving nutrient acquisition and growth, (ii)
386 sustaining plant growth under biotic and/or abiotic stress, (iii) inducing resistance against
387 pathogens, (iv) interacting with plant or human pathogens, and (v) interacting with other trophic
388 levels, such as insects. It is well established that soil type and plant genotype are the major
389 parameters influencing the rhizosphere microbiome (Berg and Smalla, 2009, de Bruijn, 2013)
390 whereas plant species and genotype are the major factors involved in defining the composition of
391 the phyllosphere microbiome (Massart et al., 2015b). Whipps et al. (2008) published a
392 comprehensive review of phyllosphere microbiology with special reference to microbial diversity
393 and plant genotypes. The authors stressed the need for studies on the functional consequences of
394 changes in microbial community structure and the mechanisms by which plants control the
395 microbial populations on their aerial plant surfaces. The composition of microbial populations in the
396 phyllosphere are also influenced by environmental factors, such as, UV, humidity, temperature,
397 geographical location (Rastogi et al., 2012, Rastogi et al., 2013; Vorholt, 2012), nitrogen
398 fertilization (Ikeda et al., 2011), and pesticide treatments (Moulas et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2009).

399 Previous studies, using plating and low-throughput molecular techniques, reported that the
400 introduction of a biocontrol agent or a pathogen to the system had a marked impact on the plant
401 microbiome (Buddrus-Schiemann et al., 2010; Chowdhury et al., 2013; Teixidó et al., 1998; Yin et
402 al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2008). Erlacher et al. (2014) demonstrated shifts in the microbiota of lettuce
403 as a result of introducing a pathogen (*R. solani*) and/or a biocontrol agent. The result of these
404 studies suggest a novel mode of action for biocontrol agents, i.e. compensation for the impact of a
405 pathogen on plant-associated microbiota. The authors speculated that this effect could originate
406 directly from the impact of the biocontrol agent on the composition of the microbiota or indirectly
407 by the impact of biocontrol agent on a pathogen. Compared to the application of a single species,
408 co-inoculation with two different species of biocontrol agents caused a more pronounced impact on

409 the microbial community structure of the cucumber rhizosphere, resulting in increased evenness and
410 better biocontrol of *R. solani* (Grosch et al., 2012).

411 Harvested fresh fruits and vegetables can harbor large and diverse populations of
412 microorganisms including bacteria, filamentous fungi, and yeasts, either as epiphytes or
413 endophytes. Most of the work on microorganisms associated with fresh harvested commodities,
414 however, has focused on a relatively small number of microbial species that can be easily cultured.
415 As a result, very little is known about the overall diversity and composition of microbial
416 communities on harvested produce and how these communities vary across produce types. Based on
417 recent studies on this topic (Leff and Fierer, 2013; Ponce et al., 2008; Rastogi et al, 2012; Rudi et
418 al., 2002; Ottesen et al., 2009), a few key patterns are emerging: (1) different produce types and
419 cultivars can harbor different levels (abundances) of specific microbial groups (Critzler and Doyle,
420 2010), (2) farming and storage conditions can influence the composition and abundances of
421 microbial communities found on produce, and (3) non-pathogenic microbes can interact with and
422 inhibit microbial pathogens found on produce surfaces (Critzler and Doyle, 2010; Shi et al., 2009;
423 Teplitski et al., 2011). Despite this recent body of work, we still have a limited understanding of the
424 diversity of produce-associated microbial communities, their function, the factors that influence the
425 composition of these communities after harvest and during storage, and the distribution of
426 individual taxa (particularly those taxa that are difficult to culture) across different commodities.

427 In light of the progress made in recent years in metagenomic technologies, this technology
428 should be used to characterize the composition of microbial communities on fruits and vegetables.
429 Metagenomic analyses are based on the amplification and sequencing of the 18S rRNA and ITS, for
430 eukaryotes, and 16S rRNA, for bacteria. This technology, however, can still be problematic due to
431 problems associated with PCR amplification, such as sensitivity to inhibitory compounds, primer
432 mismatch sensitivity, lack of quantitative information and the amplification of interfering plant
433 organelle derived RNA sequences (Berlec, 2012).

434 In recent years, the use of natural and synthetic microbial communities/consortia represents
435 an emerging frontier in the field of bioprocessing (focusing on fuel production), synthesis of high-
436 value chemicals, bioremediation, and medicine and biotechnology (Hays et al, 2015). Microbial
437 consortia are mixtures of interacting microbial populations that can be found in many diverse
438 environmental niches, and can be grouped into two types: natural or synthetic. The use of a
439 consortium has several advantages over single species, such as efficiency, robustness, resilience to

440 environmental stress, and modularity. Microbial consortia often have the ability to complete tasks
441 that would be too difficult for one organism to accomplish (Pandhal and Noirel, 2014).

442 Massart et al. (2015a) suggested the use of microbiota-derived products or the microbiota
443 itself, directly or indirectly, to develop novel tools for the protection of plants against pathogens. An
444 initial approach could be the use of a synthetic or natural consortium (Gopal et al., 2013) that could
445 be applied to a harvested commodity to see if it results in better disease control due to the
446 expression of a variety of modes of action against the pathogen. Maintaining the right balance and
447 diversity inside the consortium before and maybe after its application, however, may prove to be
448 difficult. The difficulty of the registering a consortium, composed of multiple microorganisms, as a
449 biocontrol product may also be very difficult. Thus a simpler tool could consist in identifying and
450 selecting a 'helper' microbial strain from the microbiota (Massart et al., 2015a). A 'helper' strain
451 may have no biocontrol capacity but rather enhances the antagonistic activity of existing known
452 biocontrol agent by enhancing its establishment and survival on the targeted commodity. Finally,
453 the use of biochemical compounds derived from the culturing of a consortium that limits the
454 development of plant pathogens could also be considered as another potential tool that may be
455 easier to register, manufacture and apply.

456

457 **7. Concluding remarks**

458

459 After more than three decades of research, the field biocontrol of postharvest decay has
460 reached a crossroads and previous approaches need to be seriously evaluated, and evolving new
461 directions need to be considered for future research and development. A review of the existing
462 information makes it obvious that a significant gap still exists between basic research involving the
463 discovery of biocontrol agent and its development and implementation under commercial
464 conditions. In recent years, a considerable volume of published research articles fall under the
465 category of "re-inventing the wheel". In order to move a biocontrol agent from the laboratory to the
466 market place requires many different disciplines and people with a variety of expertise.

467 Overall, commercial implementation of biological control products developed for the control
468 of postharvest diseases has been very limited and only comprise very small share of the potential
469 market. Although, the need for alternatives to chemical fungicides is still valid and the outlook for
470 microbial biocontrol products is still very promising. In order for a biocontrol product to be viable,

471 however, it must perform effectively and reliably, be widely accepted, have intellectual property
472 protection (patent), and profitable to the company that has invested the money in its development,
473 registration, and marketing.

474 Significant progress has been made in understanding the various aspects related to the ability
475 of biocontrol agents to inhibit or prevent pathogen development. Collectively, the available
476 information indicate the lack of a single universal mechanism of action common to all the reported
477 antagonists. While dissecting and characterizing mechanisms of action involved in each biocontrol
478 system is critical for the success of developing reliable products, the question is how this knowledge
479 be utilized to develop more effective products?

480 Biological interactions are dynamic, with dramatic changes occurring when thresholds in
481 signaling or population levels are reached. The physiological status of the host/pathogen/ biocontrol
482 agent/other microbiota, environmental conditions, and postharvest handling all have significant but
483 largely unknown effects on fruit/vegetable interactions with microbial communities (Fig. 2). The
484 realization that the microbiome is an integral and active component of harvested fruits and
485 vegetables that is being influenced by various biotic and abiotic stressors is very important for
486 understanding all the factors involved in the assembly and composition of a specific microbiome.
487 The multitrophic interactions involved in postharvest biocontrol systems and the potential use of
488 synthetic microbial communities for biocontrol of postharvest diseases should be explored. In order
489 to overcome the scientific and technical challenges associated with developing novel biocontrol
490 technologies re based on a holistic approach, the collaboration between a wide variety of scientific
491 disciplines is imperative. Finally, collaboration between scientific researchers and companies that
492 develop products is essential if these new technologies are to become commercially viable and
493 relevant.

494
495
496

497 **8. References**

- 498
- 499 Abadias, M., Benabarre, A., Teixidó, N., Usall, J., Viñas, I., 2001a. Effect of freeze drying and
500 protectants on viability of the biocontrol yeast *Candida sake*. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* 65, 173-
501 182.
- 502 Abadias, M., Teixidó, N., Usall, J., Benabarre, A., Viñas, I., 2001b. Viability, efficacy, and storage
503 stability of freeze-dried biocontrol agent *Candida sake* using different protective and
504 rehydration media. *J. Food Protect.* 64, 856-861.
- 505 Abadias, M., Teixidó, N., Usall, J., Viñas, I., 2003a. Optimization of growth conditions of the
506 postharvest biocontrol agent *Candida sake* CPA-1 in a lab-scale fermenter. *J. Appl.*
507 *Microbiol.* 95, 301-309.
- 508 Abadias, M., Usall, J., Teixidó, N., Viñas, I., 2003b. Liquid formulation of the postharvest
509 biocontrol agent *Candida sake* CPA-1 in isotonic solutions. *Phytopathology* 93, 436-442.
- 510 An, B., Chen, Y., Li, B., Qin, G., Tian, S., 2014. Ca²⁺-CaM regulating viability of *Candida*
511 *guilliermondii* under oxidative stress by acting on detergent resistant membrane proteins. *J.*
512 *Proteomics*, 109, 38-49.
- 513 Anonymous, 2014. Biopesticides - Global Strategic Business Report. Global Industry Analyst, Inc.,
514 p 215.
- 515 Bailey, K.L., Boyetchko, S.M., Längle, T., 2009. Social and economic drivers shaping the future of
516 biological control: a Canadian perspective on the factors affecting the development and use of
517 microbial biopesticides. *Biol. Cont.* 52, 221-229.
- 518 Bélanger, R.R., Labbé, C., Lefebvre, F., Teichmann, B., 2012. Mode of action of biocontrol
519 agents: all that glitters is not gold, *Can. J. Plant Pathol.* 34, 469-478.
- 520 Berlec, A., 2012. Novel techniques and findings in the study of plant microbiota: search for plant
521 probiotics. *Plant Sci.* 193–194, 96–102.
- 522 Berg, G., Rybakova, D., Grube, M., Köberl, M., 2015. The plant microbiome explored: implications
523 for experimental botany. *J. Exp. Bot.* doi:10.1093/jxb/erv466
- 524 Berg, G., Smalla, K., 2009. Plant species and soil type cooperatively shape the structure and
525 function of microbial communities in the rhizosphere. *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.* 68, 1-13.
- 526 Blachinsky, D., Antonov, J., Bercovitz, A., Elad, B., Feldman, K., Husid, A., Lazare, M., Marcov,
527 N., Shamai, I., Keren-Zur, M., Droby, S., 2007. Commercial applications of “Shemer” for the
528 control of pre- and postharvest diseases. *IOBCWPRS Bull.* 30, 75–78.
- 529 Buddrus-Schiemann, K., Schmid, M., Schreiner, K., Welzl, G., Hartmann, A., 2010. Root
530 colonization by *Pseudomonas* sp. DSMZ 13134 and impact on the indigenous rhizosphere
531 bacterial community of barley. *Microb. Ecol.* 60, 381–393.
- 532 Cañamás, T. P., Viñas, I., Torres, R., Usall, J., Solsona, C., Teixidó, N., 2011. Field applications of
533 improved formulations of *Candida sake* CPA-1 for control of *Botrytis cinerea* in grapes. *Biol.*
534 *Cont.* 56, 150-158.
- 535 Cañamás, T. P., Viñas, I., Usall, J., Torres, R., Anguera, M., Teixidó, N., 2008. Control of
536 postharvest on citrus fruit by preharvest application of the biocontrol agent *Pantoea*

537 *agglomerans* CPA-2. Part II. Effectiveness of different cell formulations', Postharvest Biol.
538 Techno., 49, 96-106.

539

540 Chowdhury, S.P., Dietel, K., Randler, M., Schmid, M., Junge, H., Borriss, R., Hartmann, A.,
541 Grosch, R., 2013. Effects of *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 on lettuce growth and health
542 under pathogen pressure and its impact on the rhizosphere bacterial community. PLoS One 8,
543 e68818. doi:10.1371.

544 Costa, E., Usall, J., Teixidó, N., García, N., Viñas, I., 2000. Effect of protective agents,
545 rehydration media and initial cell concentration on viability of *Pantoea agglomerans* strain
546 CPA-2 subjected to freeze-drying. J. Appl. Microbiol. 89, 793-800.

547 Costa, E., Teixidó, N., Usall, J., Atarés, E., Viñas, I., 2001. Production of the biocontrol agent
548 *Pantoea agglomerans* strain CPA-2 using commercial products and by-products. Appl.
549 Microbiol. Biot. 56, 367-371.

550 Critzer, F.J., Doyle, M.P., 2010. Microbial ecology of foodborne pathogens associated with
551 produce. Curr. Opin. Biotechnol. 21, 125-130.

552 CPM, 2010. Bayer acquires biofungicide from Agrogreen. CPM, January 30 2010: 14.

553 De Bruijn, F., 2013. Molecular Microbial Ecology of the Rhizosphere. Wiley-Blackwell.

554 De Cal, A., Larena, I., Guijarro, B. and Melgarejo, P., 2002. Mass production of conidia of
555 *Penicillium frequentans*, a biocontrol agent against brown rot of stone fruits. Biocont. Sci.
556 Techn. 12, 715-725.

557 Demoz, B.T., Korsten, L., 2006. *Bacillus subtilis* attachment, colonization, and survival on avocado
558 flowers and its mode of action on stem-end rot pathogens. Biol. Cont. 37, 68-74.

559 Droby, S., Wisniewski, M.E., Cohen, L., Weiss, B., Touitou, D., Eilam, Y., Chalutz, E., 1997.
560 Influence of CaCl₂ on *Penicillium digitatum*, grapefruit tissue and biocontrol activity of *Pichia*
561 *guilliermondii*. Phytopathology 87, 310-315.

562 Droby, S., Vinokur, V., Weiss, B., Cohen, L., Daus A., Goldschmid, E., Porat, R., 2002. Induction of
563 resistance to *Penicillium digitatum* in grapefruit by the yeast biocontrol agent *Candida*
564 *oleophila*. Phytopathology 92, 393-399.

565 Droby, S., Wisniewski, M., Macarisin, D., Wilson, C., 2009. Twenty years of postharvest biocontrol
566 research: is it time for a new paradigm? Postharvest Biol. Technol. 52, 137-145.

567 El Ghaouth, A., Smilanick, J.L., Wisniewski, M., Wilson, C.L., 2000. Improved control of apple and
568 citrus fruit decay with a combination of *Candida saitoana* and 2-deoxy-d-glucose. Plant Dis.
569 84, 249-253.

570 Erlacher, A., Cardinale, M., Grosch, R., Grube, M., Berg, G., 2014. The impact of the pathogen
571 *Rhizoctonia solani* and its beneficial counterpart *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* on the indigenous
572 lettuce microbiome. Front. Microbiol. 5, 1-5.

573 Gopal, M., Gupta, A., Thomas, G.V., 2013. Bespoke microbiome therapy to manage plant diseases.
574 Front. Microbiol. 4, 1-5.

575 Gram, L., Ravn, L., Rasch, M., Bruhn, J.B., Christensen, A.B., Givskov, M., 2002. Food spoilage-
576 interactions between food spoilage bacteria. Int. J. Food Microbiol. 78, 79-97

577 Grosch, R., Dealtry, S., Schreiter, S., Berg, G., Mendonca-Hagler, L., Smalla, K., 2012. Biocontrol
578 of *Rhizoctonia solani*: complex interaction of biocontrol strains, pathogen and indigenous
579 microbial community in the rhizosphere of lettuce shown by molecular methods. *Plant Soil*
580 361, 343-357.

581 Guijarro, B., Larena, I., Melgarejo, P., De Cal, A., 2006. Effect of drying on viability of
582 *Penicillium frequentans*, a biological control agent against brown rot disease caused by
583 *Monilinia* spp. *Biocont. Sci Techn*, 16, 257-269.

584 Hershkovitz, V., Ben-Dayana, C., Raphael, G., Pasmanik-Chor, M., Liu, J., Belausov, E., Aly, R.,
585 Wisniewski, M., Droby, S., 2011. Global changes in gene expression of grapefruit peel tissue
586 in response to the yeast biocontrol agent *Metschnikowia fructicola*. *Mol. Plant Pathol.* 13,
587 338-349.

588 Hershkovitz, V., Sela, N., Taha-Salaime, L., Liu, J., Rafael, G., Kessler, C., Aly, A., Levy, M.,
589 Wisniewski, M., Droby, S., 2013. De-novo assembly and characterization of the
590 transcriptome of *Metschnikowia fructicola* reveals differences in gene expression following
591 interaction with *Penicillium digitatum* and grapefruit peel. *BMC Genomics*, 14,168-182.

592 Hays, S. G., Patrick, W. G., Ziesack, M., Oxman, N., Silver, P.A., 2015. Better together:
593 engineering and application of microbial symbioses. *Cur. Opinion Biotechnol.* 36, 40-49.

594 Ikeda, S., Anda, M., Inaba, S., Eda, S., Sato, S., Sasaki, K., Tabata, S., Mitsui, H., Sato, T.,
595 Shinano, T., Minamisawa, K., 2011. Autoregulation of nodulation interferes with impacts of
596 nitrogen fertilization levels on the leaf-associated bacterial community in soybeans. *Appl.*
597 *Environ. Microbiol.* 77, 1973-1980.

598 Janisiewicz, W.J., Jeffers, S. N., 1997. Efficacy of commercial formulation of two biofungicides
599 for control of blue mold and gray mold of apples in cold storage, *Crop Prot.* 16, 629-633.

600 Janisiewicz, W.J., Korsten, L., 2002. Biological control of postharvest diseases of fruits. *Ann. Rev.*
601 *Phytopathol.* 40, 411-441.

602 Janisiewicz, W.J., Peterson, D.L., 2004. Susceptibility of the stem pull area of mechanically harvested
603 apples to blue mold decay and its control with a biocontrol agent. *Plant Dis.* 88, 662-664.

604 Karabulut, O. A., Cohen, L., Wiess, B., Daus, A., Lurie, S., Droby, S., 2002. Control of brown
605 rot and blue mold of peach and nectarine by short hot water brushing and yeast
606 antagonists. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 24, 103-111.

607 Karabulut, O. A., Smilanick, J. L., Gabler, F. M., Mansour M., Droby S., 2003. Near-harvest
608 applications of *Metschnikowia fructicola*, ethanol, and sodium bicarbonate to control
609 postharvest diseases of grape in central California. *Plant Dis.* 87, 1384-1389.

610 Kwasiborski, A., Bajji, M., Renaut, J., Delaplace, P., Jijakli, H., 2014. Identification of Metabolic
611 Pathways Expressed by *Pichia anomala* Kh6 in the presence of the pathogen *Botrytis cinerea*
612 on apple: New possible targets for biocontrol improvement. *PLoS ONE*, 9, e91434.
613 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0091434.

614 Larena, I., De Cal, A., Liñán, M., Melgarejo, P., 2003. Drying of *Epicoccum nigrum* conidia for
615 obtaining a shelf-stable biological product against brown rot disease. *J. Appl. Microbiol.*
616 94, 508-514.

617 Larena, I., De Cal, A., Melgarejo, P., 2004. Solid substrate production of *Epicoccum nigrum*
618 conidia for biological control of brown rot on stone fruit. *Int. Food Microbiol.* 94, 161-167.

619 Leff, J.W., Fierer, N., 2013. Bacterial Communities Associated with the Surfaces of Fresh Fruits
620 and Vegetables. PLoS ONE 8, e59310. doi:10.1371/ journal.pone.0059310

621 Lahlali, R., Raffaele, B., Jijakli, M.H., 2011. UV protectants for *Candida oleophila* (strain O), a
622 biocontrol agent of postharvest fruit diseases. Plant Pathol. 60, 288-295.

623 Lima, G., Sanzani, S.M., De Curtis, F., Ippolito, A., 2015. Biological control of postharvest diseases.
624 In: Advances in Postharvest Fruit and Vegetable Technology. R.B.H Wills, J.Golding (Eds).
625 CRC Press. Pages 65-81.

626 Li, B., Tian, S.P., 2006. Effects of trehalose on stress tolerance and biocontrol efficacy of
627 *Cryptococcus laurentii*. J. Appl. Microbiol. 100, 854-61.

628 Liu, J., Sui, Y., Wisniewski, M., Droby, S., Liu, Y., 2013. Utilization of antagonistic yeasts to
629 manage postharvest fungal diseases of fruit . Int. J. Food Microbiol. 167, 153-160.

630 Liu, J., Tian, S. P., Li, B. Q., Qin, G. Z. 2009. Enhancing viability of two biocontrol yeasts in
631 liquid formulation by applying sugar protectant combined with antioxidant. Biol. Control
632 54, 817-824.

633 Manso, T., Nunes, C., Raposo, S., Lima-Costa, M. E., 2010. Production of the biocontrol agent
634 *Pantoea agglomerans* PBC-1 in a stirred tank reactor by batch and fed-batch cultures. World
635 J. Microbiol Biotechnol. 26, 725-735.

636 Massart, S., Jijakli, H.M., 2007. Use of molecular techniques to elucidate the mechanisms of action
637 of fungal biocontrol agents: A review. J. Microbiol. Methods 69,229–241

638 Massart, S., Jijakli, M.H., 2014. *Pichia anomala* and *Candida oleophila* in Biocontrol of
639 Postharvest Diseases of Fruits: 20 Years of Fundamental and Practical Research. D. Prusky,
640 M.L. Gullino (eds.). In: Post-Harvest Pathology, Plant Pathology in the 21st Century, 7 : 111-
641 122

642 Massart, S., Martinez-Medina M., Jijakli M. H., 2015a. Biological control in the microbiome era:
643 Challenges and opportunities. Biol. Cont. 89, 98–108

644 Massart, S., Perazzolli, M., Höfte M., Pertot, I., Jijakli M. H., 2015b. Impact of the omic
645 technologies for understanding the modes of action of biological control agents against plant
646 pathogens. BioCont. 60, 725–746

647 Melin, P., Schnürer, J., Hakansson, S., 2011. Formulation and stabilisation of the biocontrol yeast
648 *Pichia anomala*. Antonie van Leeuwenhoek, 99, 107-112.

649 Mendes, R., Garbeva, P., Raaijmakers, J.M., 2013. The rhizosphere microbiome: significance of
650 plant beneficial, plant pathogenic, and human pathogenic microorganisms. FEMS Microbiol.
651 Rev. 37, 634-663.

652 Moulas, C., Petsoulas, C., Rousidou, K., Perruchon, C., Karas, P., Karpouzas, D.G., 2013. Effects
653 of systemic pesticides imidacloprid and metalaxyl on the phyllosphere of pepper plants.
654 BioMed. Res. Int. 2013.

655 Mounir, R., Durieux, A., Bodo, E., Allard, C., Simon, J. P., Achbani, E. H., El Jaafari, S., Douira,
656 A., Jijakli, M. H., 2007. Production, formulation and antagonistic activity of the biocontrol
657 like-yeast *Aureobasidium pullulans* against *Penicillium expansum*. Biotechnol. Lett. 29, 553-
658 559.

659 Nicot, P. C., Alabouvette, C., Bardin, M., Blum, B., Köhl, J., Ruocco, M., 2012. Review of factors
660 influencing the success or failure of biocontrol: technical, industrial and socio-economic
661 perspectives. *Biological Control of Fungal and Bacterial Plant Pathogens IOBC-WPRS*
662 *Bull.* Vol. 78, 2012 pp. 95-98.

663 Pandhal, J., Noirel, J., 2014. Synthetic microbial ecosystems for biotechnology. *Biotechnol. Lett.*
664 36, 1141–1151

665 Patiño-Vera, M., Jiménez, B., Balderas, K., Ortiz, M. Allende, R., Carrillo, A., Galindo, E., 2005.
666 Pilot-scale production and liquid formulation of *Rhodotorula minuta*, a potential biocontrol
667 agent of mango anthracnose. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* 99, 540-550.

668 Plaza, P., Usall, J., Smilanick, J.L., Lamarca, N., Viñas, I., 2004. Combining *Pantoea agglomerans*
669 (CPA-2) and curing treatments to control established infections of *Penicillium digitatum* on
670 lemons. *J. Food Protect.* 67, 781-786.

671 Ponce, A.G., Agüero, M.V., Roura, S.I., del Valle, C.E., Moreira, M.R., 2008. Dynamics of
672 indigenous microbial populations of butterhead lettuce grown in mulch and on bare soil. *J.*
673 *Food Sci.* 73, M257-M263.

674 Porat, R., Daus, A., Weiss, B., Cohen, L., Droby, S., 2002. Effects of combining hot water, sodium
675 bicarbonate and biocontrol on postharvest decay of citrus fruit. *J. Hort. Sci. Biotechnol.* 77,
676 441-445

677 Ottesen, A.R., White, J.R., Skaltsas, D.N., Newell, M.J., Walsh, C.S., 2009. Impact of organic and
678 conventional management on the phyllosphere microbial ecology of an apple crop. *J. Food*
679 *Prot.* 72, 2321–2325

680 Rastogi, G., Sbodio, A., Tech, J.J., Suslow, T.V., Coaker, G.L., Leveau, J.H., 2012. Leaf
681 microbiota in an agroecosystem: spatiotemporal variation in bacterial community composition
682 on field-grown lettuce. *ISME J.*, 6, 1812-1822

683 Rastogi, G., Coaker, G.L., Leveau, J.H., 2013. New insights into the structure and function of
684 phyllosphere microbiota through high-throughput molecular approaches. *FEMS Microbiol.*
685 *Lett.* 348, 1-10.

686 Rudi, K., Flateland, S.L., Hanssen, J.F., Bengtsson, G., Nissen, H., 2002. Development and
687 evaluation of a 16S ribosomal DNA array-based approach for describing complex microbial
688 communities in ready-to-eat vegetable salads packed in a modified atmosphere. *Appl.*
689 *Environ. Microbiol.* 68: 1146–1156.

690 Shi, X., Wu, Z., Namvar, A., Kostrzynska, M., Dunfield, K., Warrine, K., 2009. Microbial
691 population profiles of the microflora associated with pre- and postharvest tomatoes
692 contaminated with *Salmonella typhimurium* or *Salmonella montevideo*. *J. Appl. Microbiol.*
693 107, 329–338.

694 Spadaro, D., Ciavarella, A., Zhang, D., Garibaldi, A., Gullino, M.L., 2010. Effect of culture
695 media and pH on the biomass production and biocontrol efficacy of a *Metschnikowia*
696 *pulcherrima* strain to be used as a biofungicide for postharvest disease control. *Can. J.*
697 *Microbiol.* 56, 128-137.

698 Spadaro, D., Droby, S., 2015. Development of biocontrol products for postharvest diseases of fruit:
699 The importance of elucidating the mechanisms of action of yeast antagonists, Trends in Food
700 Sci. Technol. 47, 39-49.

701 Sui Y, Wisniewski, M., Droby, S., Liu J., 2015. Responses of yeast biocontrol agents to
702 environmental stress. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 81, 2968–2975.

703 Sylla, J., Alsanius, B.W., Kruger, E., Reineke, A., Strohmeier, S., Wohanka, W., 2013. Leaf
704 microbiota of strawberries as affected by biological control agents. Phytopathol. 103, 1001-
705 1011.

706 Teixidó, N., Torres, R., Viñas, I., Abadías, M., Usall, J., 2011. Biological control of postharvest
707 diseases in fruit and vegetables, in: Lacroix, C. (Ed.), Protective cultures, antimicrobial
708 metabolites and bacteriophages for food and beverage biopreservation. Woodhead Publishing
709 Series in Food Science, Technology and Nutrition No. 201, Cambridge, pp. 364–402.

710 Teixidó, N., Usall, J., Gutiérrez, O., Viñas, I., 1998. Effect of the antagonist *Candida sake* on apple
711 surface microflora during cold and ambient (shelf life) storage. Eur. J. Plant Pathol. 104, 387-
712 398.

713 Teixidó, N., Usall, J., Palou, L., Asensio, A., Nunes, C., Viñas, I., 2001. Improving control of green
714 and blue molds on oranges by combining *Pantoea agglomerans* (CPA-2) and sodium
715 bicarbonate. Eur. J. Plant Pathol. 107, 685-694.

716 Teplitski, M., Warriner, K., Bartz, J., Schneider, K.R., 2011. Untangling metabolic and
717 communication networks: interactions of enterics with phytobacteria and their implications in
718 produce safety. Trends Microbiol. 19, 121-127.

719 Torres, R., Usall, J., Teixidó, N., Abadías, M., Viñas, I., 2003. Liquid formulation of the biocontrol
720 agent *Candida sake* by modifying water activity or adding protectants. J. Appl. Microbiol.
721 94, 330-339.

722 Torres, R., Solsona, C., Viñas, I., Usall, J., Plaza, P., Teixidó, N., 2014. Optimization of packaging
723 and storage conditions of a freeze-dried *Pantoea agglomerans* formulation for controlling
724 postharvest diseases in fruit. J. Appl. Microbiol. 117, 173-184.

725 Usall, J., Teixidó, N., Abadías, M., Torres, R., Cañamás, T., Viñas, I., 2009. Improving formulation
726 of biocontrol agents manipulating production process. In: Prusky, D. and Gullino, M. L.,
727 *Post-harvest Pathology*, Vol 2, The Netherlands, Springer, 149-170.

728 Vorholt, J, A., 2012. Microbial life in the phyllosphere. Nature Rev. Microbiol. 10,828–840.

729 Waldor, M.K., Tyson, G., Borenstein, E., Ochman, H., Moeller, A., Finlay, B.B., Kong, H.H.,
730 Gordon, J.I., Nelson, K.E., Dabbagh, K., Smith, H., 2015. Where next for microbiome
731 research? PLoS Biology 13, e1002050.

732 Wilson, C.L., Wisniewski, M., 1989. Biological control of postharvest diseases of fruits and
733 vegetables: an emerging technology. Ann. Rev. Phytopathol. 27, 425–441.

734 Wilson, C.L., Pusey, P.L., 1985. Potential for biological control of postharvest plant diseases. Plant
735 Dis. 69, 375–378.

736 Wilson, C.L., Wisniewski, M., Droby, S., Chalutz, E., 1993. A selection strategy for microbial
737 antagonist to control postharvest diseases of fruits and vegetables. Sci. Hort. 53, 183–189

738 Wilson, C.L., Wisniewski, M., 1994. Biological Control of Postharvest Diseases: Theory and
739 Practice. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 182 pp.

740 Whipps, J.M. Hand, P., Pink, D., Bending, G.D., 2008. Phyllosphere microbiology with special
741 reference to diversity and plant genotype. J. Appl. Microbiol. 105, 1744–1755.

742 Yáñez-Mendizábal, V., Viñas, I., Usall, J., Torres, R., Solsona, C., Abadias, M., Teixidó, N. 2012a.
743 Formulation development of the biocontrol agent *Bacillus subtilis* strain CPA-8 by spray-
744 drying. J.Appl. Microbiol. 112, 954-965.

745 Yáñez-Mendizábal, V., Viñas, I., Usall, J., Torres, R., Solsona, C., Teixidó, N., 2012b. Production
746 of the postharvest biocontrol agent *Bacillus subtilis* CPA-8 using low cost commercial
747 products and by-products. Biol. Cont. 60, 280-289.

748 Yin, D., Wang, N., Xia, F., Li, Q., Wang, W., 2013. Impact of biocontrol agents *Pseudomonas*
749 *fluorescens* 2P24 and CPF10 on the bacterial community in the cucumber rhizosphere. Eur. J.
750 Soil Biol. 59, 36–42.

751 Zhang, B., Bai, Z., Hoefel, D., Tang, L., Yang, Z., Zhuang, G., Yang, J., Zhang, H., 2008.
752 Assessing the impact of the biological control agent *Bacillus thuringiensis* on the indigenous
753 microbial community within the pepper plant phyllosphere. FEMS Microbiol. Lett. 284, 102–
754 108.

755 Zhang, B., Bai, Z., Hoefel, D., Tang, L., Wang, X., Li, B., Li, Z., Zhuang, G., 2009. The impacts of
756 cypermethrin pesticide application on the non-target microbial community of the pepper plant
757 phyllosphere. Sci. Total Environ. 407, 1915– 1922.

758
759

760

761 Fig. 1: Pipeline for development of postharvest biocontrol products.

762

763

764 Fig. 2: Diagram of multiple interactions between the antagonist, the host, the pathogen and
765 natural resident fruit microbiota.

766