Development, Comparison, and Validation of Real-Time and Conventional PCR Tools for the Detection of the Fungal Pathogens Causing Brown Spot and Red Band Needle Blights of Pine
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ABSTRACT


Dothistroma pini, D. septosporum, and Lecanosticta acicola are fungal pathogens that cause severe foliage diseases in conifers. All three pathogens are listed as quarantine organisms in numerous countries throughout the world and, thus, are subject to specific monitoring. Detection and identification of these pathogens still often relies on cumbersome and unsatisfactory methods that are based upon the morphological characterization of fungal fruiting bodies and conidia. In this study, we present the development of several new molecular tools that enable a rapid and specific in planta detection of each of these pathogens. Several DNA extraction procedures starting from infected needles were compared and four commercial DNA extraction kits provided DNA of satisfactory quality for amplification by polymerase chain reaction (PCR). In addition, we developed several sets of conventional PCR primers, dual-labeled probes (DLPs), and duplex-scorpion probes (DSPs), all of which targeted each pathogen. Their ability to detect the pathogens in a series of naturally infected needle samples was compared. The quadruplex DLP real-time assay proved to be more sensitive than the DSP assay and conventional PCR but the two real-time probe formats yielded identical results in the naturally infected samples. Both real-time assays proved to be significantly superior to the technique of humid chamber incubation, which often failed to produce spores for the accurate identification of the pathogens.

Brown spot needle blight and red band needle blight of pine are serious diseases that affect conifers. The first disease is caused by the ascomycete Mycosphaerella dearnessii M. E. Barr while the second is caused by two cryptic deuteromycete species, Dothistroma septosporum (Dorog.) M. Morelet (teleomorph M. pini Rostr.) and D. pini (teleomorph unknown).

M. dearnessii can be easily identified by microscopic observation of the typical conidiophores of the anamorph stage, (i.e., Lecanosticta acicola (Thüm.) Syd.), which are produced in the conidiomata developing on the infected needles (4,8). The two species, D. pini and D. septosporum, were recently split by Barnes et al. (4) based mainly on morphology and sequence analysis of three nuclear genes. D. pini and D. septosporum can hardly be distinguished by the morphology of their conidiophores, and identification of the two species based only on observation of microscopic features is judged to be almost impossible (4).

Difficulties in pathogen identification may arise when the conidiomata observed on the host tissue fail to produce mature conidia even after incubation in a humid chamber, which is a recommended method (8). In addition, isolation of L. acicola, D. pini, and D. septosporum for identification also is often difficult and time consuming, because these fungi grow very slowly and are easily out-competed by fast-growing saprotrophic or endophytic fungi (8,9).

L. acicola, D. pini, and D. septosporum are listed as quarantine fungi for the European Union (2), and they are subjected to specific surveys and phytosanitary controls. Reliable enforcement of such monitoring depends on the application of rapid, specific, and sensitive detection tools. The availability of molecular-based detection tools would greatly help overcome the problem of identification of these three pathogens on their host. Because L. acicola, D. pini, and D. septosporum share similar host trees and may display similar symptoms on late observation, a molecular tool that enables simultaneous detection of all three pathogens would make it possible to speed up the analytical process and would provide more comprehensive data about the actual distribution of these pathogens in different parts of the world.

Previous studies have shown that the sequences of the β-tubulin 2 (β-tub2) and translation elongation factor (EF1-α) genes may be suitable to differentiate L. acicola, D. septosporum, and D. pini (4) because they displayed significant interspecific intronic polymorphism.

The aims of this present work were to (i) develop molecular tools to be used in either conventional or real-time polymerase chain reaction (qPCR) formats, including a quadruplex assay, for the direct and simultaneous in planta detection of L. acicola, D. pini, and D. septosporum; (ii) compare the efficiency of several DNA extraction procedures starting from naturally infected pine needles, with or without mature conidiomata; and (iii) assess the efficiency of these new tools on a large set of naturally infected samples.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Fungal isolates and pine needle samples. Fungal isolates used in this study, consisting of Dothistroma spp., L. acicola, and other fungi commonly found on pine needles (Table 1), were isolated.
from pine needles collected mainly in France in naturally infected stands using the method described by Barnes et al. (4), for which the needle samples are first frozen at −70°C before plating out the spores from the conidiomata. Fungi were cultured with constant shaking in potato dextrose broth (PDB) (Difco, Beckton, Dickinson and Co., Sparks, MD) for 2 to 3 weeks, after which 50 to 200 mg of fresh mycelium was harvested and transferred into a 2-ml tube. Total DNA was extracted using the DNeasy plant mini kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) following the manufacturer’s instructions. DNA concentrations were estimated using a UV spectrophotometer (BioPhotometer; Eppendorf, Le Pecq, France).

Symptomatic pine needles were collected in 2007 and 2008 by the staff of the French forest health service (Département de la Santé des Forêts) in pine stands infected by *Dothistroma pini* (L. acicola) across France. Immediately after collection, each sample was packed individually and stored at 5 ± 3°C before processing. Each needle sample consisted of several hundred needles collected from 1 to 3 symptomatic pine trees from each location.

**Design of primers, dual-labeled probes, and duplex-scorpion probes.** The β-tub2 and *EF1-α* sequences were obtained using previously described primers (7,10) with a series of six *L. acicola*, five *D. septosporum*, and five *D. pini* isolates of additional geographical origins and were deposited in GenBank (Table 1).

For the two genes, all the available sequences retrieved from GenBank, including isolates from different continents, were then analyzed and compared by multiple alignments, which included orthologous sequences from phylogenetically close species with *Mycosphaerella* spp. as teleomorph, using CLUSTALW (online access: http://npsa-phbil.ibcp.fr/cgi-bin/npsa_automat.pl?page= NPSA/npsa_clustalw.html). A series of forward and reverse primer and probe combinations specific for each of the three fungi were manually designed from several polymorphic regions. Their respective melting temperatures (Tm) and potential secondary structures were evaluated in silico using Beacon Designer software (Premier Biosoft, Palo Alto, CA) in order to select suitable forward and reverse primer combinations. Primers were also designed to amplify very short PCR fragments, because longer fragments may lead to a loss of sensitivity in multiplex reactions, when compared to separate PCR reactions (16). These forward and reverse primers were then evaluated in vitro by real-time PCR with SYBR-green intercalating dye to assess their sensitivity and their propensity to self- or interhybridization. The primers were tested with DNA extracted from a pure culture of *D. pini* (Dp294), *D. septosporum* (Ds293), and *L. acicola* (Md15).

For each of the three pathogens, the primers with the lowest tendency to form secondary structures were then retained for further development of conventional PCR or real-time PCR tools. Retained primers and probes also fulfilled the technical and thermodynamic requirements for a primer/dual-labeled probe (DLP) combination for real-time PCR according to Bustin (6). Their sequence and the reporter/quencher dye combination for the DLPs are indicated in Table 2. A universal primer pair (18S uni-

---

**TABLE 1. Characteristics of the fungal isolates and sequences used in this study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>Isolate</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>GenBank accession number</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Dothistroma pini</em></td>
<td>Dp294‡</td>
<td><em>Pinus nigra</em></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>France (Pyrénées Atlantiques)</td>
<td>FJ467318</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dp9-12‡</td>
<td><em>P. nigra</em></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>France (Ariège)</td>
<td>FJ467321</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dp6-19‡</td>
<td><em>P. nigra</em></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>France (Ariège)</td>
<td>FJ467320</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dp13-2‡</td>
<td><em>P. nigra</em></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>France (Pyrénées Atlantiques)</td>
<td>FJ467304</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dp3.7b</td>
<td><em>P. nigra</em></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>France (Pyrénées Atlantiques)</td>
<td>FJ467319</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15‡</td>
<td><em>P. nigra</em></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>France (Corrèze)</td>
<td>FJ467322</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW6400</td>
<td><em>P. nigra</em></td>
<td>…</td>
<td>United States (Michigan)</td>
<td>AY808271</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW14821</td>
<td><em>P. nigra</em></td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>United States (Nebraska)</td>
<td>AY808270</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW14820</td>
<td><em>P. nigra</em></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>United States (Minnesota)</td>
<td>AY808269</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW14905</td>
<td><em>P. nigra</em></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>United States (Michigan)</td>
<td>AY808268</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW11095</td>
<td><em>P. nigra</em></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>United States (Michigan)</td>
<td>AY808267</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW110930</td>
<td><em>P. nigra</em></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>United States (Michigan)</td>
<td>AY808266</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW23767</td>
<td><em>P. pallasiana</em></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Ukraine (Kherson)</td>
<td>DQ926939</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW24853</td>
<td><em>P. pallasiana</em></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Russia (Rostov)</td>
<td>EF450257</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. septosporum</td>
<td>Ds292‡</td>
<td><em>P. mugo</em></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Germany (Bayern)</td>
<td>FJ467316</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ds293‡</td>
<td><em>P. sylvestris</em></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Germany (Friedhof)</td>
<td>FJ467317</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DsbelF</td>
<td><em>P. nigra</em></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Belgium (Meerwen-Gruitrode)</td>
<td>FJ467313</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ds1-2‡</td>
<td><em>P. nigra</em></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>France (Somme)</td>
<td>FJ467314</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14‡</td>
<td><em>P. nigra</em></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>France (Corrèze)</td>
<td>FJ467315</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW14822</td>
<td><em>P. ponderosa</em></td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>United States (Oregon)</td>
<td>AY808265</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW15077</td>
<td><em>P. ponderosa</em></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>United States (Idaho)</td>
<td>AY808264</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW14823</td>
<td><em>P. contorta var. latifolia</em></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Canada (BC)</td>
<td>AY808263</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW14904</td>
<td><em>P. nigra</em></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Austria (Themenberg)</td>
<td>AY808262</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW14903</td>
<td><em>P. nigra</em></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Austria (Vienna)</td>
<td>AY808261</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW13122</td>
<td><em>P. mugo</em></td>
<td>…</td>
<td>Germany (Bavarian Alps)</td>
<td>AY808260</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW13123</td>
<td><em>P. sylvestris</em></td>
<td>…</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>AY808259</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW13010</td>
<td><em>P. nigra</em></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Poland (Kراكow)</td>
<td>AY808258</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW13007</td>
<td><em>P. nigra</em></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Poland (Kракow)</td>
<td>AY808257</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW13004</td>
<td><em>P. nigra</em></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Poland (Kракow)</td>
<td>AY808256</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW9992</td>
<td><em>P. coulteri</em></td>
<td>…</td>
<td>France (Meurthe et Moselle)</td>
<td>AY808255</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW9920</td>
<td><em>Pinus sp.</em></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Ecuador (Lasso highlands)</td>
<td>AY808254</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW8611</td>
<td><em>P. radiata</em></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Chile (Valdivia)</td>
<td>AY808253</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW9304</td>
<td><em>P. radiata</em></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Chile (Valdivia)</td>
<td>AY808252</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW10247</td>
<td><em>P. radiata</em></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Chile (Bio Bio)</td>
<td>AY808251</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‡ Isolate provided by Dr. Schumacher and Dr. Pehl, JKI.
§ Isolate collected from pine needle and provided by B. Fabre, INRA.
¶ Isolate provided by S. Inghelbrecht, ILVO.
© Isolate provided by C. Saurat and P. Chandelier, LNPV.
¥ Isolate provided by A. Afflertranger, USFS.
F/R) and a DLP (18S uni-P) were also used in this study to target a region of the 18S ribosomal rDNA that is highly conserved throughout a wide range of eukaryotic organisms, including plants and fungi. These primers and probe were selected in order to check the quality of the DNA extracted from any plant or fungal sample and to detect false-negative results that could potentially be caused by inhibition or DNA shearing (14). The reporting dyes were selected to have distinctive fluorescence emission wavelengths in order to avoid any overlapping fluorescence spectra, which makes their simultaneous use in a single PCR tube possible.

For *D. pini* and *D. septosporum*, specific duplex-scorpion probes (DSPs) were designed to target the same loci as for the respective DLP, based upon the technical recommendations of Solinas et al. (19). Scorpion folding was previously assessed using the mfold program (http://frontend.bioinfo.rpi.edu/applications/mfold/cgi-bin/dna-form1.cgi; DNA mfold server: 1996-2009, Michael Zuker, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute). Each of the DSPs used was in real-time PCR with an appropriately designed reverse PCR primer (Table 2).

All primers and probes were custom synthesized by Eurogentec (Seraing, Belgium).

**Conventional and real-time PCR conditions.** PCR and real-time PCR conditions were optimized in order to maximize sensitivity and specificity. The following conditions were used in all subsequent PCR assays.

The conventional PCR reactions were carried out on a GenAmp 9700 thermocycler (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA) in 20-µl reaction volumes. The composition of the reaction mixture was 1× reaction buffer (Hotgoldstar PCR buffer; Eurogentec), 2 mM MgCl₂, 4 × 0.2 mM dNTPs, 0.4 µM each of the forward and reverse primers, 0.5 U of Hotgoldstar (Eurogentec), 2 µl of template DNA (0.8 to 20 ng), and molecular-grade water to 20 µl. The cycling conditions included an initial denaturation step at 95°C for 10 min; followed by 35 cycles of denaturation at 95°C for 30 s, annealing at 60°C for 30 s, and elongation at 72°C for 60 s; and a final extension at 72°C for 10 min.

All real-time PCR reactions were performed with a Rotor-Gene 6500 (Corbett Research, Mortlake, Australia) set with an autogain optimization for each channel that was performed before the first fluorescence acquisition. The cycle threshold (Ct) value for each reaction was determined using the Rotor-Gene software version 1.7.75, setting the threshold line 10× above the mean baseline fluorescence level. Each DNA sample was tested in triplicate and a standard deviation was computed.

For quadruplex DLP real-time assays, the master mix contained equal concentrations of the respective forward and reverse primers, probes for each of the three pathogens, and the probe for the 18S rDNA target. Real-time PCR was carried out in 20-µl reaction volumes using the qPCR core kit No ROX (Eurogentec). The reaction mixture contained molecular-grade water, 1× reaction buffer, 5 mM MgCl₂, 4 × 0.2 mM dNTPs, 0.3 µM each of the four respective forward and reverse primers, 0.1 µM each of the four respective DLPs, 0.5 U of Hotgoldstar, and 2 µl of template DNA (0.8 to 20 ng). The real-time PCR cycling conditions for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>Isolate</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>GenBank accession number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leucosticta acicola</td>
<td>Md14&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>P. muricata</em></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>France (Gironde)</td>
<td>FJ467323, FJ467312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Md15&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>P. radiata</em></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>France (Pyrénées Atlantiques)</td>
<td>FJ467324, FJ467307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Md16&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>P. palustris</em></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>United States (Louisiana)</td>
<td>FJ467325, FJ467311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Md17&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>Pinus sp.</em></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>France (Pyrénées Atlantiques)</td>
<td>FI467326, FI467310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Md18&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>P. radiata</em></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>France (Pyrénées Atlantiques)</td>
<td>FJ467327, FJ467308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Md9&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>P. attenuata x radiata</em></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>France (Landes)</td>
<td>FJ467328, FJ467309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CMW13119</td>
<td><em>P. elliottii</em></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>China (Fujie)</td>
<td>AY808273, AY808238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CMW90985</td>
<td><em>P. radiata</em></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>France (Gironde)</td>
<td>AY808272, AY808237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.** (continued from preceding page)
DLP included an initial denaturation step at 95°C for 10 min followed by 40 cycles of denaturation at 95°C for 15 s and annealing and elongation at 60°C for 55 s. For these quadruplex real-time assays, fluorescence for each of the four fluorescent dyes was monitored simultaneously during the reaction. For routine DLP real-time analyses, a bulk ready-to-use quadruplex primer and probe mix was prepared and used in order to make the preparation of master mix easier and to reduce the risks of pipetting errors. This quadruplex primer and probe mix proved to be stable over time, with constant efficiency and sensitivity of the real-time PCR reaction (data not shown).

The DSP PCR reactions were performed in individual tubes for *D. pini* and *D. septosporum*. Preliminary attempts to simultaneously use the DSP for *D. pini* and *D. septosporum* in the same reaction tube resulted in a significant decrease in the experimental sensitivity. DSP PCR reactions were carried out in 20-µl reaction volumes using the qPCR core kit No ROX (Eurogentec). The reaction mixture contained molecular-grade water, 1× reaction buffer, 5 mM MgCl\(_2\), 4 × 0.2 mM dNTPs, 0.5 µM reverse primer, 0.5 µM specific quenching probe (quenched strand [QS]), 0.1 µM specific primer probe (probe-primer strand [PPS]), bovine serum albumin at 0.6 µg µl\(^{-1}\), 0.75 U of Hotgoldstar, and 2 µl of template DNA (0.8 to 20 ng). The real-time PCR cycling conditions for DSP included an initial denaturation step at 95°C for 10 min, followed by 40 cycles of denaturation at 95°C for 15 s and annealing and elongation at 55°C for 55 s. The fluorescence monitoring temperature during PCR (55°C) was set well below the estimated Tm of the duplex-scorpion PPS/QS pair in the PCR buffer in order to maintain as low as possible the background fluorescence from the unhybridized duplex scorpion that has not yet been converted to an amplexor (19).

All PCR analyses were carried out using standard procedures to avoid cross-contamination of DNA. No-template controls were systematically included in triplicate to check the absence of contamination in all reactions of conventional or real-time PCR.

**Comparison of DNA extraction procedures.** Eighty needle subsamples were prepared with needles originating from 27 pine stands infected by either *D. pini* or *D. septosporum* from different locations across France (1 to 13 subsamples per stand). Each subsample consisted of five 5-mm-long needle pieces (23 to 37 mg) with red band symptoms bearing conidiodinia, and was transferred into an individual 2-ml microcentrifuge tube. The comparison of the DNA extraction procedures was conducted with five sets of 16 subsamples (80 subsamples).

Five DNA extraction protocols were tested and compared. They included the DNeasy plant mini kit (Qiagen), the Nucleospin plant II kit (Macherey-Nagel, Düren, Germany), the PureLink Plant Total DNA purification kit (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA), the

### TABLE 2. Primers, dual-labeled probes, and duplex-scorpion probes designed and tested in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target, primer or probe</th>
<th>Sequence (5′–3′)</th>
<th>Characteristica</th>
<th>DNA regionb</th>
<th>Positionc</th>
<th>Product size (bp)d</th>
<th>Analytical sensitivity (pg)e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. septosporum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DStub2-F</td>
<td>CGAACATGGACTGAGCAAAC</td>
<td>Conventional PCR</td>
<td></td>
<td>24–44</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DStub2-R</td>
<td>GCACCGCTCTTCAATGAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>234–254</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DStub2-F1</td>
<td>CGAACATGGACTGAGCAA</td>
<td>Dual-labeled probe qPCR</td>
<td></td>
<td>24–43</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.2f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DStub2-R1</td>
<td>TGCTTCGTATCTGCAATTTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92–112</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DStub2-P1</td>
<td>ROX-TGGAATCCACAGCGGTCA-BHQ2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56–76</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DStub2-PPS1</td>
<td>ROX-TGACGGAGCTTGATGGATCA-HEG-CAACATGGAGTACGGGCAAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DStub2-QS1</td>
<td>TGGATATCCACAGCGGTCA-DDQ1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24–43/56–75</td>
<td>89g</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DStub2-R2</td>
<td>TGCTTCGTATCTGCAATTTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92–112</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. pini</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPtef-F</td>
<td>ATTTTTCGCTGTGCTGACT</td>
<td>Conventional PCR</td>
<td></td>
<td>52–71</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPtef-R</td>
<td>CAATGTGAGATCTGGCTGAGT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>224–244</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPtef-F1</td>
<td>ACAGAACACCCAACTCTGCC</td>
<td>Dual-labeled probe qPCR</td>
<td></td>
<td>178–196</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.2f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPtef-R1</td>
<td>TCATGTGCTCAATCTGAGATGAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>232–253</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPtef-P1</td>
<td>FAM-CCCCACGCGATTTAACAGGAG-BHQ1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>211–231</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPtef-PPS1</td>
<td>FAM-CGCTCGTGAATCGCGTGG-HEG-AATCACACCCCTGGCAAGC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPtef-QS1</td>
<td>CCCAGCGGGATTACAGGAG-DDQ1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>183–201/211–230</td>
<td>77h</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPtef-R2</td>
<td>TCAGAATCATGTGCTCATTG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>238–259</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L. acicola</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAtet-F</td>
<td>GCAAATTTTTCGCCGTTTATC</td>
<td>Conventional PCR</td>
<td></td>
<td>36–55</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAtet-R</td>
<td>TGTGTTCACCAAGTGGCTGC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>253–272</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAtet-F1</td>
<td>CTCCTCTTCATTTCCCTTC</td>
<td>Dual-labeled probe qPCR</td>
<td></td>
<td>218–237</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAtet-R1</td>
<td>TGTGGGAGATCTGTTTCTCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>277–296</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAtet-P1</td>
<td>Cy5-CAAGACACTTCTGGGAACACACCGC-BHQ3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>254–276</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plant/fungus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18S uni-F</td>
<td>GCAAGGCTGAAAACCTAAAAGA</td>
<td>Dual-labeled probe qPCR</td>
<td>18S rDNA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18S uni-R</td>
<td>CCACCAATCATAGGAAAGA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18S uni-F</td>
<td>JOE-AAGGGAGCCACACCGAGT-BHQ1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BioSprint 96 DNA plant kit used in combination with the BioSprint 96 automated workstation (Qiagen), and a noncommercial DNA extraction procedure using cetyltrimethylammonium bromide (CTAB) as a detergent and phenol-chloroform as organic polar solvents (12). For each of the five procedures, the 16 samples were first ground with the appropriate lysis buffer for 3 min at 30 Hz using two 3-mm sterile steel beads in a beadbeater (TissueLyser; Qiagen). Total DNA was further extracted following each corresponding manufacturer’s instructions or as described by Henrion et al. (12) for the noncommercial protocol. Total DNA concentrations were estimated using a UV spectrophotometer (BioPhotometer; Eppendorf) and all concentrations were normalized to total DNA at 0.5 ng µl⁻¹ per tube.

Two variables were used to compare the five different DNA extraction procedures: the quantity of total DNA extracted from the needle tissue and the mean Ct value for the detection of the target fungal pathogen, which was either D. pini or D. septosporum. A multifactor analysis of variance was performed to evaluate the effect of DNA extraction procedure, with stand location of the sample as covariates, using SAS/STAT 8.1 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC).

Comparative analysis of the detection tools using naturally infected samples. In total, 50 symptomatic needle samples which had yellowing needles with or without conspicuous red band or black spot blight symptoms were analyzed by both classical morphological observation following humid chamber incubation and conventional and real-time PCR. To prevent cross-contamination between needle samples, the analytical process was organized in the laboratory in order to meet the forward flow requirement. In addition, for each series of DNA extraction, a blank control (sterile water) was systematically processed in parallel to check the absence of contamination during the extraction step. Subsamples from each needle sample were incubated for up to 3 weeks in a humid chamber at 22°C with a 12-h light period and then regularly checked for the presence of mature conidiomata bearing typical conidia of either L. acicola, D. pini, or D. septosporum. Given the difficulty in distinguishing D. pini from D. septosporum based only on conidial morphological features (4), the conidiomata of Dothistroma spp. observed on incubated needles were not assigned to one of the two species. For each sample, five symptomatic 5-mm-long needle pieces were transferred into a sterile 2-ml centrifuge tube and total DNA was extracted using the PureLink Plant Total DNA purification kit, as described above. Each DNA extract was tested in triplicate by conventional and real-time PCR assays.

To assess the ability to detect D. pini and D. septosporum on infected needle tissue with red band necrosis but without any conidiomata, 16 additional needle subsamples were prepared and analyzed by multiplex DLP real-time PCR. These 16 subsamples were prepared with needles originating from 11 pine stands across France. Eight subsamples contained needle pieces from pine stands infected with D. septosporum and the other eight from pine stands infected with D. pini. Presence of each pathogen was previously demonstrated by isolation followed by PCR-restriction fragment length polymorphism (RFLP) (4). Each subsample consisted of five 5-mm-long needle pieces with red band symptoms lacking conidiomata in a sterile 2-ml centrifuge tube. Total DNA was extracted using the PureLink Plant Total DNA purification kit, as described above, and each DNA extract was then tested in triplicate by a multiplex DLP real-time PCR assay.

Assessment of the experimental specificity of conventional and real-time PCR. The specificity of the conventional and real-time PCR tests was assessed with naturally infected needle samples following two approaches. First, isolation of the pathogens was performed as described above on symptomatic needle samples collected from 25 pine stands across France. The isolates obtained were assigned to the species by PCR-RFLP according to Barnes et al. (4). The needle samples were also analyzed with the DLP real-time PCR test as described above. Second, during the conventional and real-time PCR tests on environmental samples, randomly selected PCR products were sequenced in both directions and compared with reference sequences available on GenBank to check that the amplified sequence corresponded to the expected target.

Repeatability and reproducibility. Repeatability and reproducibility were calculated for the DLP quadruplex assay. Interassay coefficients of variation (CV% based on mean Ct values) were assessed for each pathogen with a range of standard DNA samples with low target concentrations and with DNA extracts from a naturally infected sample and from a healthy sample. Interassay CVs were calculated from 10 consecutive assays run over a 4-week period. Intraassay CVs were computed for each pathogen on 10 replicates of the same set of DNA samples tested in the same run. All replicates of DNA extract from healthy samples yielded no Ct in all 10 consecutive test runs and in the repeatability test.

RESULTS

Design and evaluation of the PCR primers and real-time PCR probes. Sixteen new partial sequences of the β-tub2 and EF1-α genes were obtained during this study (Table 1). The DNA regions selected as targets for the primers and probes (Table 2) were 100% conserved within each of the three studied species. The analytical specificity of all primer and probe combinations was first confirmed by in silico BLAST analyses with all the publicly available DNA sequences deposited in GenBank (Table 1). In vitro specificity tests were further carried out with a series of fungal species occurring in the same ecological niche as the three targeted pathogens (Table 1), as well as with DNA extracted from healthy-looking pine needles that harbor various endophytic mycobionta (18). Both the in silico and in vitro tests confirmed that the primer and probe combinations were specific for their respective fungal target species (D. pini, D. septosporum, or L. acicola) regardless of their geographical origin.

Analytical sensitivity of conventional PCR, DLP, and DSP real-time PCR assays. The dynamic range for each primer/probe combination was assessed with three independent 10-fold dilution series of D. pini (isolate Dp294), D. septosporum (isolate Ds293), or L. acicola (isolate Md16) genomic DNA in a background of symptomless Pinus nigra needle DNA (31.2 ± 4.8 ng µl⁻¹), which yielded a concentration that ranged from 10 ng µl⁻¹ down to 0.1 pg µl⁻¹. For quadruplex DLP PCR reactions, as well as for DSP PCR reactions, standard curves showed a linear correlation between input DNA and Ct values (Figs. 1 and 2). Standard curve equation (\( y = -3.57x + 22.3 \), reaction efficiency \( E = 90.6% \)) and \( R^2 \) coefficient (0.996) for the 18S rRNA were determined with a serial dilution of P. nigra needle DNA ranging from 10 ng µl⁻¹ to 1 pg µl⁻¹. The analytical sensitivity was the smallest detectable amount of target giving a positive result at least 95% of the time and was assessed for each pathogen with at least 10 replicates for each concentration level. For D. pini and D. septosporum, the DLP real-time assay was found to be more sensitive than either the DSP real-time assay or the conventional PCR test (Table 2). In addition, similar detection thresholds were obtained for each pathogen with monoplex (a single set of specific primers and probe for one species) or quadruplex (a mix of four primer/DLP combinations) DLP real-time reactions (Table 2).

Inter- and intraassay CVs for the DLP quadruplex assay were low, 0.1 to 1.7 and 0.2 to 1.3, respectively (Table 3).

Comparison of the DNA extraction procedures. No statistical difference was observed between the five DNA extraction procedures in respect with the amount of total DNA (\( P = 0.212 \)) (Table 4). None of the target pathogens could be detected following real-time PCR with the DNA samples obtained by the CTAB-
based extraction procedure. On the other hand, the detection of *Dothistroma* spp. was successful with 100% of the DNA samples obtained with the four commercial DNA extraction kits. Slight but significant differences (*P* = 0.024) were observed between the DNA extraction procedures for the mean Ct values, with the PureLink Plant Total DNA purification kit (Invitrogen) yielding the lowest value (mean Ct = 27.9). This kit was retained for the comparison of the detection tools.

**Comparative testing of the detection tools with naturally infected needles.** Out of the 50 naturally infected samples, 12 were found to be negative by all the techniques used. All 12 samples consisted of yellowing needles without conspicuous red band or brown spot (i.e., without typical symptoms of the studied diseases) (Table 5). Three of those DNA samples did not yield a positive signal with internal transcribed spacer (ITS)1/ITS4 PCR or yielded a Ct value of >30 with 18S uni real-time PCR. They were spiked with 2 pg of *D. septosporum* DNA and tested again by the *D. septosporum* conventional and real-time PCR test. Because no positive signal could be obtained with these spiked samples, their DNA was judged to be non- or poorly amplifiable, and these samples were not included in further analysis (Table 5).

On the other hand, nine DNA samples with positive ITS1/ITS4 PCR or yielding a Ct value <25 with 18S uni real-time PCR but yielding no signal with any of the species-specific conventional and real-time PCR tests were also further spiked with 2 pg of *D. septosporum* DNA and tested again by the *D. septosporum* conventional and real-time PCR test. For all nine samples, a *D. septosporum*-positive signal was obtained by conventional and real-time PCR, thus showing that their respective DNA extracts were amplifiable and that the target was absent or below the detection threshold of each PCR test (Table 5).

Averaged over the 47 DNA samples, mean Ct values generated in real-time PCR with the *D. septosporum* DLP and the *D. septosporum* DSP, which were 28.3 ± 3.8 and 29.1 ± 2.9, respectively, were not significantly different (*n* = 26; *t* = −1.6; *P* = 0.054). By contrast, the *D. pini* DLP yielded a significantly lower mean Ct value (25.8 ± 3.7) than the *D. pini* DSP (34.3 ± 4.1) (*n* = 13; *t* = −11.26; *P* = 0.025). However, there was a 100% agreement between the two real-time PCR techniques, because both successfully detected *D. pini* or *D. septosporum* on the same samples (*n* = 37) and yielded negative results for these pathogens with the rest of the samples with amplifiable DNA (*n* = 10).

---

**Fig. 1.** Log-transformed fluorescence curves, standard curves, and correlation coefficients assessed with dilutions of *Dothistroma septosporum*, *D. pini*, and *Lecanosticta acicola* DNA for quadruplex real-time polymerase chain reaction using the dual-labeled probes DSTub2-P1, DPtef-P1, LAtef-P1, and 18S uni-P. Total DNA of the pathogens was diluted in a background of *Pinus nigra* needle DNA to yield final concentrations that ranged from 1 ng µl⁻¹ to 0.1 pg µl⁻¹.
Real-time PCR, conventional PCR, and humid chamber analysis yielded concordant results (positive or negative) in 72.4% of the samples for *D. septosporum* or *D. pini* and 93.7% of the samples for *L. acicola* (Table 6). Real-time PCR yielded significantly more positive results than the humid chamber analysis, in particular for *Dothistroma* spp. ($\chi^2 = 6.36$, $P = 0.012$), whereas not enough positive results were recorded for *L. acicola* to support a significant difference between the two tests ($\chi^2 = 0.34$, $P = 0.562$) (Table 6). No significant differences were observed between real-time PCR and conventional PCR regarding the frequency of positive results ($\chi^2 = 0.35$, $P = 0.554$ for *Dothistroma* spp. and $\chi^2 = 0.29$, $P = 0.592$ for *L. acicola*), although positive results were obtained with real-time PCR for DNA samples that were rated as negative (three samples) or nonamplifiable (two samples) following conventional PCR (Table 6). All the samples rated as positive by the humid chamber analysis were confirmed as positive by both the real-time and conventional PCR tests (Table 6).

In addition, the multiplex DLP real-time PCR successfully detected either *D. pini* or *D. septosporum* in 100% of the 16 samples that consisted of needle tissue with red band symptoms but lacking conidiomata. The mean Ct value of these samples was 27.1 ± 3.0 for *D. pini* and 28.2 ± 3.5 for *D. septosporum*.

**Experimental specificity of the conventional and real-time PCR.** A successful isolation of *Dothistroma* spp. was achieved for only 7 of the 25 needle samples processed. Depending on the needle sample, 1 to 38 isolates could be recovered. All the isolates collected from these seven needle samples could be assigned to one of the two *Dothistroma* spp. by PCR-RFLP analyses. *D. pini* was the only species recovered in five needle samples and *D. septosporum* was the only species recovered in two needle samples. Analysis of these needle samples by DLP real-time PCR and by the isolation procedure yielded identical results for six of the seven needle samples (four samples positive for *D. pini* and two for *D. septosporum*). In the seventh needle sample, the DLP real-time PCR test indicated that both *Dothistroma* spp. were present whereas only *D. pini* could be isolated.

The real-time PCR products obtained with 2 samples of each series of 16 needle samples used for the comparison of DNA extraction procedures were sequenced and the sequences deposited in GenBank (accessions FJ868557 to FJ868564). Additionally, 26 conventional and 31 real-time PCR products were sequenced for 22 naturally infected samples used for the comparari-
TABLE 4. Quantity of total DNA in the needle extract and the mean cycle threshold (Ct) value for each of the five DNA extraction procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DNA extraction procedure&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total DNA in five needle pieces with red band necrosis (ng)</th>
<th>Mean Ct value&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTAB buffer/phenol-chloroform</td>
<td>1.076 (735.0–1417.1)</td>
<td>&gt;40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNasey prot mini kit (Qiagen)</td>
<td>662.7 (339.6–985.8)</td>
<td>28.5 (27.7–29.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nucleospin plant II (Machery-Nagel)</td>
<td>843.8 (596.3–1091.3)</td>
<td>28.7 (27.9–29.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PureLink Plant Total DNA purification kit (Invitrogen)</td>
<td>719.2 (440.8–997.7)</td>
<td>27.9 (27.1–28.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BioSprint 96 DNA plant kit (Qiagen)</td>
<td>496.8 (163.9–829.7)</td>
<td>29.8 (29.0–30.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> CTAB = cetyltrimethylammonium bromide.

<sup>b</sup> Mean values are adjusted for the covariate “geographical origin” (95% confidence interval, n = 16). Mean values labeled with the same letter are not significantly different according to t test pairwise comparison (P > 0.05).

TABLE 5. Comparative analysis of 50 symptomatic samples by humid chamber, conventional polymerase chain reaction (PCR), and quadruplex real-time PCR using dual-labeled probes, targeting Dothistroma septosporum, D. pini, and Lecanosticta acicola

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Symptoms&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Humid chamber&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>LAcica&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Dsepto&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Dpini&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>DNA quality&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LAcica&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Dsepto&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Dpini&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ITS1/18Suni&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FAcica&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Fsepto&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Fpini&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>FAcica&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LAcica&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Dsepto&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Dpini&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ITS1/18Suni&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> YN = yellowing needles, RB = red bands, Pyc = pycnidia, and BS = brown spots.

<sup>b</sup> Neg. = sample for which no typical symptom was observed, n.a. = not applicable.

<sup>c</sup> Conventional PCR = DNA samples were tested in duplicate and were rated as positive or negative based on the presence or the absence of the expected band following electrophoresis of the conventional PCR product; real-time PCR = cycle thresholds were computed with each DNA sample tested in triplicate. Standard deviation is indicated between parentheses; n.a. = nonamplifiable.

<sup>d</sup> ITS = internal transcribed spacer. Quality of the DNA extract was assessed in conventional PCR using universal fungal PCR primers (21).

<sup>e</sup> Randomly selected samples for which identity of the PCR or real-time PCR product was confirmed by sequencing. All the sequences were deposited in GenBank (accessions FJ868500–FJ868556).
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son of the detection tools, and all the sequences were deposited in GenBank (Table 5). BLAST analyses of the sequences showed that 100% of the sequences corresponded to the expected target species.

**DISCUSSION**

During this work, a set of new tools for the molecular detection of the brown spot and red band needle blight pathogens was developed using intronic regions of the \(\beta\)-tub2 (\(D.\ septosporum\)) and EF1-\(\alpha\) (\(D.\ pini\) and \(L.\ acicola\)) genes, which contain sufficient interspecific but no intraspecific polymorphisms.

The experimental specificity of the PCR assays was demonstrated by sequencing the PCR products obtained with a large set of naturally infected samples and isolating the pathogens from a subset of the samples. Because our study used naturally infected samples, we did not determine the diagnostic sensitivity of the tests. However, DLP real-time PCR proved to be significantly more sensitive than the humid chamber test that is one of the recommended methods for routine detection of the pathogen (8). The PCR tests had two other significant advantages over the humid chamber analysis because it enabled the detection of the two \(Dothistroma\) spp. on needles without conidiomata—or without mature conidiomata—and could also differentiate infections by \(D.\ pini\) from infections by \(D.\ septosporum\). To our knowledge, although no molecular test is available for the detection of \(L.\ acicola\), two molecular tests have been described in the literature for \(D.\ pini\) and \(D.\ septosporum\). Barnes et al. (4) developed a PCR-RFLP procedure to distinguish \(D.\ pini\) from \(D.\ septosporum\) but this test requires a prior isolation of the fungus in pure culture. Groenewald et al. (11) recently designed two couples of mating-type-specific PCR primers which were shown to be specific for \(D.\ pini\) or \(D.\ septosporum\), respectively, and can be used in a duplex PCR reaction, and Barnes et al. (3) developed a series of microsatellite primers that could potentially be used for species discrimination. Unfortunately, these primers were not yet assessed for in planta detection and no analytical sensitivity data was provided.

In the present study, although conventional PCR showed equivalent ability to detect the three pathogens in naturally infected needles samples, the more practical technique was the multiplex DLP real-time assay targeting \(D.\ pini\), \(D.\ septosporum\), and \(L.\ acicola\) simultaneously. This assay also included a primer/probe combination that targeted a highly conserved region of \(\alpha\) DNA, which serves as an internal DNA quality control and limits the risk of false negatives that may occur when testing environmental samples by PCR as a result of PCR inhibition or insufficient DNA quality or quantity (13,22).

Compared with conventional PCR, real-time PCR is faster and less prone to cross- and self-contamination, because the tubes are kept closed after the amplification and no post-amplification processing steps are required. The use of species-specific probes also provides additional specificity to the real-time tests. In this study, the real-time PCR tools showed a lower analytical sensitivity than conventional PCR, and the quadruplex DLP real-time PCR assay was demonstrated to be more sensitive and versatile than the DSP real-time PCR assay, although the same locus was targeted. The herein-described multiplex DLP real-time protocol makes it possible to detect each of the three pathogens in a single tube without apparent loss of sensitivity and with a smaller cost than separate monoplex assays. In addition, the ability to prepare and store ready-to-use stock solutions of premixed primers and DLP makes the real-time PCR mastermix preparation straightforward and minimizes the risk of pipetting errors.

Stem-loop scorpion probes have already been developed for a few fungal plant pathogens (15,17), and were shown to be more sensitive than conventional PCR assays. This study compared an improved version of scorpion probes using a duplex format with another real-time chemistry, such as DLP, and with conventional PCR, all targeting the same loci. DLP was found to be less sensitive than hydrolysis probes, based upon the experimental detection threshold that was determined with pure fungal DNA. This observation correlates with similar experiments that involved similar real-time chemistries that targeted the plant pathogen \(Phytophthora\ ramorum\) (20). However, the DSP assay was judged to be as sensitive as the DLP assay with the set of naturally infected samples we tested. Unlike DLP real-time PCR systems, the DSP format is not dependent on enzymatic cleavage and, therefore, rapid PCR cycling is possible. Rapid cycling conditions were successfully tested with the DSP described herein, which reduced the turnaround time by a factor of two (R. Ioos, *unpublished data*).

For diagnosis laboratories that are not yet equipped with real-time PCR devices, conventional PCR using the species-specific PCR primers described here may still be a good alternative, because they proved to be specific and offered sufficient sensitivity to detect the target pathogen, although sensitivity was slightly lower than the DLP test. Although this study only used individual standardized samples consisting of 5 needle pieces each, samples prepared with up to 10 to 15 symptomatic needle pieces in a single tube can still be routinely processed, and this may partially alleviate the lower sensitivity of conventional PCR.

Several DNA extraction procedures, which started from symptomatic needles, were also evaluated. In this study, the CTAB/phenol-chloroform DNA extraction was found to be unsuitable to recover amplifiable fungal DNA starting from infected needles, probably due to the co-extraction of PCR-inhibiting compounds. The four commercial DNA extraction kits that were assessed all proved efficient in their ability to produce high-quality fungal DNA, although slight, significant differences were observed. This contrasts with previous findings of significant differences between commercial DNA extraction kits for the detection of  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target fungus</th>
<th>Real-time PCR</th>
<th>Conventional PCR</th>
<th>Humid chamber</th>
<th>No. of samples</th>
<th>Samples (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Dothistroma septosporum</em>/<em>D. pini</em></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lecanosticta acicola</em></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a n.a. = Nonamplifiable.*
Fusarium circinatum in Pinus seed (14) or Puccinia horiana in Chrysanthemum leaves (1). This, therefore, indicates that such a comparison should be carried out for each matrix/pathogen couple.

In this study, analysis by DLP real-time PCR of naturally infected samples collected across Europe also offered a new insight of the raw geographical distribution of the studied pathogens. D. pini was so far only reported in the United States, Ukraine, and Russia (5). This study demonstrated that this newly described species has a widespread presence in France. Because previously used methods such as the humid chamber fail to differentiate D. pini from D. septosporum, the current distribution of this pathogen in Europe might be much larger than previously thought. In addition, our PCR results showed that two of the three target species could be simultaneously detected in a single needle subsample. Surprisingly, D. pini was also detected from two needle samples with brown spot symptoms, more typical of the presence of L. acicola. These results support the need to resort to specific molecular techniques to investigate the prevalence of all three pathogens in different parts of the world as well as to improve the knowledge about their epidemiology. These aspects are particularly important, because all three pathogens are regarded as quarantine fungi for numerous plant protection organizations throughout the world.
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