

Evaluation of strawberry host plant resistance to powdery mildew in 21 genotypes under greenhouse conditions
S.Z. Simard , K.A. Blauer, and G.J. Holmes

The trial was conducted in a greenhouse at the Cal Poly Crops Unit in San Luis Obispo, CA. Bareroot transplants were planted directly in a greenhouse on 10 Dec 2024 where powdery mildew-infected strawberry plants were present with high levels of sporulation. Transplants were planted in 1-gal plastic nursery pots containing a soilless potting mix with 10 g of Osmocote Plus added to the surface of each pot 28 days after planting (7 Jan). Treatments were replicated four times with each replicate consisting of 3 plants (1 plant/pot), arranged in a randomized complete block design. Disease severity was based on the percent of the upper and lower leaf surfaces covered by visible mycelial growth of each fully emerged trifoliate leaf. Disease incidence was assessed as the percent of trifoliate leaves with at least one powdery mildew lesion. The disease index was calculated by multiplying disease incidence and disease severity for each replicate. Stolons (runners), and flowers were removed from plants once per week.

The first visual symptoms of infection were detected on 24 Dec, 14 days after planting transplants in the greenhouse. Overall, powdery mildew pressure was high, reaching 79.6% incidence and 23.2% severity in ‘Golden Gate, the most susceptible cultivar in the trial (Table 1). ‘088W02’ was the most resistant cultivar in the trial with 5.0% disease incidence and 0.3% disease severity. These results show the dramatic difference in susceptibility to powdery mildew among strawberry genotypes.

Table 1. Cultivars sorted in ascending order by powdery mildew disease index.

Cultivar	Breeding program	Disease index ^z	Powdery mildew (%) on 23 Jan ^y	
			Severity	Incidence ^x
088W02	Good Farms	0.03 f	0.3 g	5.0 g
24-414R	Planasa	0.11 f	0.6 g	8.3 g
24-410R	Planasa	0.28 ef	1.2 fg	14.9 fg
24-407R	Planasa	0.51 ef	1.6 fg	23.9 efg
HW026.029	Driscoll’s	0.69 ef	1.8 efg	27.3 d-g
PE-16.4092.013	Plant Sciences, Inc.	0.74 ef	2.8 efg	25.6 d-g
SB_13_164-030	Plant Sciences, Inc.	0.75 ef	2.5 efg	27.8 d-g
24-415R	Planasa	0.81 ef	2.4 efg	26.5 d-g
PEP-15.1890.010	Plant Sciences, Inc.	1.37 def	3.4 d-g	36.3 c-f
Angelina	Driscoll’s	1.95 c-f	4.7 c-g	40.5 cde
152X15	Good Farms	3.26 c-f	6.3 c-f	58.3 abc
152X18	Good Farms	3.62 c-f	5.4 c-g	47.4 b-e
PS-13.467.089	Plant Sciences, Inc.	4.13 c-f	6.6 b-f	46.0 b-e
Monterey	University of California, Davis	4.51 c-f	7.4 b-e	47.6 bcd
24-413R	Planasa	4.56 c-f	6.6 b-f	38.0 c-f
122X08	Good Farms	4.87 c-f	7.2 b-f	44.7 b-e
UCD_Royal Royce	University of California, Davis	5.21 cde	8.8 bcd	55.8 bc
060z12	Good Farms	6.27 bcd	9.4 bc	58.6 abc
SB_14_028-025	Plant Sciences, Inc.	6.55 bc	7.5 b-e	54.8 bc
Cuyama	Driscoll’s	8.26 bc	11.9 b	67.9 ab
UCD_Golden Gate	University of California, Davis	18.71 a	23.2 a	79.6 a
LSD P=0.05		5.08	5.6	23.7

^y This disease assessment was made 44 days after planting.
^z Disease index calculated by multiplying disease incidence by disease severity for each plot.
^x Cultivars that do not share a letter are significantly different according to Fisher’s LSD mean separation test (α=0.05) calculated using ARM version 2024.2 (Gylling Data Management, Brookings, SD).

