

Document downloaded from:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10251/167742>

This paper must be cited as:

Linhares, CMD.S.; Ambrosio, MMQ.; Castro, G.; Barros Torres, S.; Esteras Gómez, C.; Nunes, GHDS.; Picó Sirvent, MB. (2020). Effect of temperature on disease severity of charcoal rot of melons caused by *Macrophomina phaseolina*: implications for selection of resistance sources. *European Journal of Plant Pathology*. 158(2):431-441.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10658-020-02083-w>



The final publication is available at

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10658-020-02083-w>

Copyright Springer-Verlag

Additional Information

1 **Effect of temperature on disease severity of charcoal rot of melons caused by**
2 ***Macrophomina phaseolina*: Implications for selection of resistance sources.**

3

4 Cheyla Magdala de Sousa Linhares¹, Márcia Michelle Queiroz Ambrósio¹, Gabriel Castro², Salvador Barros
5 Torres¹, Cristina Esteras², Glauber Henrique de Sousa Nunes¹, and Belén Picó^{2*}

6

7 ¹ Department of Plant Sciences, Universidade Federal Rural do Semi-Árido (UFERSA), Av. Francisco Mota, 572,
8 Mossoró CEP 59.625-900, Brazil

9 ² Institute for the Conservation and Breeding of Agricultural Biodiversity (COMAV) of the Universitat Politècnica
10 de València (UPV), Camino de Vera, s/n, 46022 Valencia, Spain

11 *Corresponding author: B. Picó; E-mail: mpicosi@btc.upv.es

12

13 C. M. de Sousa Linhares ORCID ID:

14 M. M. Queiroz Ambrósio ORCID ID:

15 G. Castro ORCID ID:

16 S. Barros Torres ORCID ID:

17 C. Esteras ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8789-4363

18 G. H. de Sousa Nunes ORCID ID:

19 B. Picó ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7761-990X

20

21 **Abstract**

22 *Macrophomina phaseolina* is the causal agent of charcoal rot disease of melons and causes significant losses
23 worldwide and causes significant losses worldwide. The use of resistant cultivars is a desirable method for
24 controlling this disease, but there is no information about the influence of temperature on the resistant behavior
25 found in melon accessions. The purpose of the present study was to assess the effect of temperature on the reaction
26 of six melon accessions selected previously for their resistant response to *M. phaseolina*. They were inoculated
27 with the *M. phaseolina* isolate CMM-1531 and grown under accurately controlled environmental conditions at
28 different temperature regimes (25, 28, 31, and 34 °C) in a replicate experiment. The increase in temperature
29 increased the severity of symptoms in most genotypes, but this effect was less pronounced in the highly susceptible
30 control, the cultivar ‘Piel de sapo’, and in the most resistant accession, the wild African *agrestis* Ag-15591Ghana

31 that remained resistant even at 34°C. The use of several screening temperatures allowed a better characterization
32 of accessions that behaved similarly as highly resistant at 25°C (Con-Pat81Ko, Dud-QMPAfg, Can-NYIsr and Ag-
33 C38Nig), but in which resistance breaking was observed with temperature rise. Temperatures of 28°C and 31°C
34 were sufficient to make Dud-QMPAfg, Ag-C38Nig and Can-NYIsr moderately resistant, whereas Con-Pat81Ko
35 remained highly resistant. All these genotypes were susceptible at 34°C, which suggest that are not suitable for
36 hot-climate growing areas. The most promising accession was Ag-15591Ghana, whose resistance was confirmed
37 in two greenhouse experiments under stressful temperatures (>34°C). The behavior of these sources should be
38 confirmed in naturally infested fields, but the controlled screening methods presented here are essential to
39 characterize new resistance sources and to conduct genetic studies when a high number of plants must be managed
40 under controlled environmental conditions.

41 **Keywords:** soil borne fungus, *Cucumis melo* germplasm, heat stress, host resistance

42

43 **Declarations**

44 **Funding**

45 This work was supported by Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior CAPES (Brazil). This
46 study was also partially supported by the Spanish Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad project AGL2014-
47 53398-C2-2-R, by the Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades project AGL2017-85563-C2-
48 1-R and by the Conselleria d'Educació, Investigació, Cultura i Esports de la Generalitat Valenciana PROMETEO
49 project para grupos de excelencia/2017/078 (cofunded with FEDER funds).

50 **Compliance with ethical standards**

51 **Conflicts of interest/Competing interests**

52 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

53 **Ethics approval. Human participants and /or animals**

54 The present research did not involve any experimentation on humans or animals.

55 **Consent to participate**

56 Not applicable

57 **Consent for publication**

58 All authors approved the version to be published.

59 **Availability of data and material and code availability**

60 All authors assure that all data and materials as well as software application or custom code support the published
61 claims and comply with field standards.

62 **Authors' contributions**

63 Glauber Henrique de Sousa Nunes, Márcia Michelle Queiroz Ambrósio and Belén Picó contributed to the study
64 conception and design. Material preparation, data collection and analysis were performed by Glauber Henrique de
65 Sousa Nunes, Cheyla Magdala de Sousa Linhares, Márcia Michelle Queiroz Ambrósio and Salvador Barros
66 Torres. The first draft of the manuscript was written by Belén Picó, Glauber Henrique de Sousa Nunes and Cristina
67 Esteras. All authors commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final
68 manuscript.

69

70 **Acknowledgments**

71 Authors acknowledge to Gorka Perpiñá and Eva María Martínez for the multiplication of part of the plant material.

72

73 **Introduction**

74 Brazil is the main producer and exporter of melons in South America. In 2017, it produced 540,229 tons in a
75 cultivated area of 23,390 ha (FAO 2019). The Brazilian production is concentrated in the semiarid region (> 95
76 %), especially in the states of Ceará and Rio Grande do Norte, which have excellent environmental conditions for
77 crop development such as high temperatures (> 28° C), low rainfall rate (approx. 600 mm per year), and high
78 luminosity (Nunes et al. 2016).

79 Melon is usually cultivated all year long, without crop rotation, or rotating with another cucurbit, such as
80 watermelon (*Citrullus lanatus* (Thunb.) Matsum. & Nakai). This intensive use of producing fields increases
81 problems with soil borne pathogens. The generalist Ascomycete *Macrophomina phaseolina* (Tassi) Goidanich is
82 one of the most important soil borne fungus affecting melon crop (Cohen et al. 2016a; Nascimento et al. 2018).
83 This species presents high variability (Groenewald and Crous 2014), likely due to its heterokaryotic character, and
84 affects a wide range of hosts species, including more than 500 crops and some weeds that can constitute a problem
85 as important sources of inoculum (USDA 2019). To date, other three *Macrophomina* species, *M. pseudophaseolina*
86 Crous, Sarr and Ndiaye, *M. euphorbiicola* A.R. Machado, D.J. Soares and O.L. Pereira, and *M. vaccinii* Y. Zhang
87 ter and L. Zhao, sp. nov. have been reported affecting a few non-cucurbit species in specific regions such as Brazil,
88 Senegal and China (Sarr et al. 2014; Machado et al. 2018; Zhao et al. 2019).

89 *Macrophomina phaseolina* has been detected infecting melons worldwide, in Mediterranean countries like Spain,
90 Egypt, Israel and Turkey, in American countries like Brazil, Chile, and Honduras, in Near East countries like Iran
91 and Oman, in African countries like Nigeria, and in islands like Australia (Reuveni et al. 1982; Apablaza 1993;
92 Walker 1994; Bruton and Miller 1997; Bankole et al. 1999; García-Jiménez et al. 2000; Edraki and Banihashemi
93 2010; Cohen et al. 2012; Salari et al. 2012; Al-Mawaali et al. 2013; El-Kolaly and Abdel-Sattar 2013; Jacob et al.
94 2013; Ambrósio et al. 2015; Tok et al. 2018; Negreiros et al. 2019). However, it is most problematic in hot, arid
95 regions. In Brazil it is usually isolated from diseased melon plants (Marinho et al. 2002; Andrade et al. 2005;
96 Dantas et al. 2013) and rotative crops, like watermelon, and their associated weeds (Sales-Júnior et al. 2012;
97 Negreiros et al. 2019). It causes a disease known as charcoal rot (Salari et al. 2012). Symptoms of charcoal rot
98 start as depressed dark lesions in the stem. Affected plants show sometimes chlorosis, vine wilt and stem and root
99 rot (Bianchini et al. 2005). Severely infected plants die early due to the effect of toxins produced by the fungus
100 and to the interruption of the xylem flow (Islam et al. 2012).

101 Although several studies have focused on testing different strategies of soil management (Nascimento et al.
102 2018) and on biocontrol using antagonistic bacteria, such as strains of *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* (Bakhshi et al.
103 2018), to control the incidence of root rot in melon fields, one of the most efficient most efficient method to control
104 soil borne pathogens is the use of resistant cultivars. However, there are not commercial varieties resistant to *M.*
105 *phaseolina*, and few scientific studies report efforts to identify sources of resistance. Salari et al. (2012) evaluated
106 the reaction of seven Iranian cultivars and identified two melon sources with partial resistance. More recently,
107 Ambrósio et al. (2015), studying a collection of melons representing the diversity of the species, found different
108 levels of resistance in five accessions belonging to different infraspecific taxa (Pitrat 2017) and from different
109 origins: two African accessions of wild agrestis type, from Ghana and Nigeria, one Korean accession of the Asian
110 conomon group, one dudaim accession from Afghanistan, and the cantaloupe cultivar ‘Noy Israel’. In this study,
111 they used the toothpick method to inoculate the pathogen, the experiment was conducted at an average air
112 temperature of 28 °C and average humidity 65%, and the response was evaluated after 30 days. The response of
113 all these genotypes was determined later in a similar assay, using the same inoculation method in Mossoró (State
114 Rio Grande do Norte, Brazil), with temperatures higher than 35 °C and excellent epidemiological conditions for
115 the development of *M. phaseolina*. In this assay, many plants of most accessions died in the first two weeks after
116 transplanting, except from those of one wild African agrestis. Other studies have focused on the effects and
117 progress of *M. phaseolina* infection on cucurbits like melon and watermelon, testing different inoculation methods
118 such as toothpick or drenching, and growing conditions such as in a naturally infested field or greenhouse (Cohen

119 et al. 2016a). Germplasm screening for watermelon has been also carried out searching for resistant accessions
120 useful as rootstocks for grafting, as an alternative to disease control (Cohen et al. 2016b).

121 It is well known the environmental factors influence host-pathogen interactions. Temperature stands out as the
122 one with major effect on resistance of plants to different pathogens, such as fungi, viruses, bacteria and nematodes
123 (Garrett et al. 2006; Akhtar et al. 2011; Wosula 2017). A classic example that illustrates temperature interference
124 in resistance-breaking are *Mi* genes of tomato. These genes confer resistance to *Meloidogyne incognita* that breaks
125 down at high temperatures (El-Sappah et al. 2019). Also resistance to *tomato spotted wilt virus* conferred by the
126 *Tsw* gene is overcome at high temperatures in pepper (Chung et al. 2018). Previous studies reported an effect of
127 soil temperature on disease severity in melon plants infected by soil borne melon pathogens associated to
128 *Monosporascus* root rot/vine decline (Pivonia et al. 2002). There is no information about the effect of temperature
129 on the reaction of melon accessions to *M. phaseolina*, although previous studies reported 30 to 35 ° C as the
130 optimum temperature range for *in vitro* growing of different *M. phaseolina* isolates (Manici et al. 1995; Akhtar et
131 al. 2011; Tok et al. 2018). Under the current global warming scenario, this thermophilic fungal pathogen is
132 expected to spread to new regions and to cause more severe outbreaks (Bashir 2017). Therefore, there is an urgent
133 need to evaluate the effect of temperature on the reaction of melon accessions with different resistance levels to
134 this pathogen.

135 **Material and Methods**

136 **Germplasm**

137 Six accessions were evaluated: two wild African accessions belonging to *Cucumis melo* subspecies *agrestis*,
138 PI 185111 (Ag-15591Ghana) and CUM 287 (Ag-C38Nig), two Asian melons belonging to the *dudaim*, PI 273438
139 (Dud-QMPAfg), and *chinensis*, Pat 81 (Con-Pat81Ko), groups of *C. melo* subspecies *agrestis*, and two commercial
140 melons belonging to the two main groups of *C. melo* subspecies *melo*, a Piel de sapo type of the *ibericus* group
141 (In-PsPiñSp), and the cultivar ‘Noy Israel’ of the *cantalupensis* group (Can-NYIsr). All these accessions were
142 reported to have different levels of resistance to *M. phaseolina* by Ambrósio et al. (2015), except from the ‘Piel
143 de sapo’ cultivar that was used as susceptible control. PI and CUM accessions were kindly provided by the USDA-
144 NPGS and IPK genebanks, respectively. The other accessions were provided by the COMAV-UPV Genebank.

145 **Inoculum preparation**

146 The CMM-1531 pathogenic isolate (deposited in the Coleção de Culturas de Fungos Fitopatogênicos at the
147 Universidade Federal Rural de Pernambuco, Brazil) was obtained in 2012 from roots and stems of symptomatic
148 muskmelon plants grown in Icapuí-RN, Brazil. The confirmation of the identity of this strain was done by partially

149 sequencing the translation elongation factor 1-alpha gene (GenBank number
150 MN136199), that had 98 to 100% sequence identity with several *Macrophomina phaseolina* isolates from Brazil
151 and China. This isolate was used due to its aggressiveness (Medeiros et al. 2015).

152 Tests were made to prove fungi pathogenicity. The isolate was sown in potato dextrose agar (PDA) + antibiotic
153 (tetracycline 0.05 g/L). Four dishes (5 mm-diameter) of PDA medium with fungal structures were transferred into
154 Petri dishes containing toothpicks in PDA medium. Plates were stored in BOD (Biochemical Oxygen Demand)
155 incubators at $28 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$ for seven days.

156 **Assay conditions**

157 Selected seeds were disinfested in NaClO (1.5 %) and placed in Petri dish with filter paper and damped cotton.
158 Plates were wrapped in aluminum foil and stored in incubator for 24 hours at 37°C . Pots of 0.4 kg of capacity
159 were filled with commercial substrate (Tropstrato[®] HT Hortaliças). Substrate was sterilized in autoclave at 121
160 $^\circ\text{C}$.

161 Two successive experiments were carried out consisting each one in four trials that were conducted
162 simultaneously at the Laboratório de Sementes da UFERSA in Mossoró (State Rio Grande do Norte, Brazil), in
163 four BOD incubators for ten days at constant temperatures of 25, 28, 31, and 34°C , and relative humidity of 60
164 %, with light-period of 12 hours. Temperatures were chosen according to Ambrósio et al. (2015), which reported
165 the average temperature in Mossoró (Brazil) and Valencia (Spain), throughout the study. The four trials were
166 conducted in a randomized block design with 14 replicates in the first experiment, and 10 replicates in the second
167 one. In both cases, the experimental unit was formed by one pot of 0.4 kg of capacity with one plant.

168 Apart from these assays in BOD incubators, two experiments under greenhouse conditions were also carried
169 out in Mossoró (Brazil) (average air temperature of 34.5 and 35.7°C , and average relative humidity of 55.4 and
170 50.4% in experiment 1 and 2, respectively). Seeds of the six accessions germinated in commercial substrate
171 previously autoclaved, and plants were manually irrigated to drainage daily and were not fertilized during the
172 experiment. The experiment was carried out with a total of 15 plants per accession and a completely randomized
173 design with the replication corresponding to one plant.

174 **Plant inoculation and disease assessment**

175 Twenty days after transplanting, the inoculation was conducted *via* direct insertion of a toothpick tip overgrown
176 with mycelia and microsclerotia of the CMM-1531 isolate (method previously tested with good results in melon
177 by Cohen et al. 2016a) at the base of the stem, 1 cm above the soil (Ambrósio et al. 2015), and stored in BOD. Ten
178 days after inoculation, accessions were evaluated for disease severity using a score scale (0 to 5), where 0:

179 asymptomatic, 1: less than 3 % of infected stem tissue, 2: 3 to 10 % of infected stem tissue, 3: 11 to 25 % of
180 infected stem tissue, 4: 26 to 50 % of infected stem tissue, and 5: more than 50 % of infected stem tissue (Ambrósio
181 et al. 2015). The average disease severity was calculated for each accession and classified in five classes of reaction
182 0: immune (I); 0.1 to 1.0: highly resistant (HR); 1.1 to 2.0: moderately resistant (MR); 2.1 to 4.0: susceptible (S);
183 and 4.1 to 5.0: highly susceptible (HS) (Salari et al. 2012).

184 In the greenhouse experiment, seedlings were inoculated 14 days after planting by the toothpick method
185 described above. Non infested and autoclaved toothpicks were used as negative controls. Plants were kept in the
186 greenhouse for 30 days. Disease severity was assessed as previously described.

187 **Statistical analysis**

188 As the variable response considered is not quantitative and the residuals do not present normal distribution, the
189 original nonparametric values were transformed according to the methodology of the Aligned Rank Transform
190 (ART) for Nonparametric Factorial Analyses. The aligned rank transformation allows non-parametric testing for
191 interactions and main effects using standard ANOVA techniques. For the transformation of the original data the
192 software (ARTool) was used (Wobbrock et al. 2011). The ANOVA to study the effects of genotype (accessions),
193 temperature and experiment, and their interactions, was performed with the PROC GLM of SAS 9.2 (SAS Institute
194 Inc., Cary, NC) (Durner 2019). We utilized the methodology described by Scott and Knott (1974) for grouping of
195 accessions mean ranks. The correlation coefficients of Spearman and Gamma were calculated according to Siegel
196 and Castellani Jr. (1988).

197 **Results**

198 Results of the statistical joint analyses performed with the data of the two BOD experiments to study the effect
199 of genotype, temperature and experiment on the response to *M. phaseolina* are shown in Table 1. Genotype and
200 temperature effects were significant ($p < 0.0001$), as well as their interaction ($p = 0.003$). The effect of the
201 experiment was no significant ($p = 0.1068 > 0.05$), so data obtained in both BOD experiments could be pooled
202 and analyzed together (Table 2).

203 Despite the significant temperature x genotype interaction, the main effects of the temperature and genotype
204 were meaningful (Table 2 and Fig. 1). There was a clear effect of genotype. The wild *agrestis* accession from
205 Ghana (Ag-15591Ghana) was the most resistant, and the cultivar ‘Piel the sapo’ (In-PsPiñSp) the most susceptible
206 (with significantly different average disease severity scores: 0.45 (highly resistant) *versus* 4.46 (highly
207 susceptible), respectively). The other accessions displayed an intermediate response (being moderately resistant
208 with average scores between 1.30 and 1.76). According to their average scores they can be ranked as follows from

209 more to less resistant: Con-Pat81Ko≈Can-NYIsr≈Ag-C38Nig>Dud-QMPAfg. There was also a clear main effect
210 of temperature. An increase in the severity of the disease was found with temperature rising (significantly different
211 average scores of 1.09, 1.41, 1.91 and 2.87, at 25, 28, 31 and 34°C, respectively). This relation observed between
212 temperature and severity was also estimated with the Spearman's coefficient ($r_s = 0.53$; $p < 0.01$). The Gamma
213 coefficient between temperature and the resistance classes was positive as well ($\gamma = 0.79$; $p < 0.01$).

214 The temperature increase resulted in more severe symptoms in all genotypes. Fig 1 shows this trend with higher
215 average scores at higher temperatures in both BOD experiments, but the effect was more or less pronounced
216 depending on the genotype. The susceptible control and the most resistant accession were less affected by the
217 temperature rise than the genotypes with intermediate responses (Table 2). The average disease severity scores of
218 'Piel de sapo' cultivar, used as susceptible control, increased from 4.00 (susceptible) to 4.42 (highly susceptible)
219 at 25 and 28°C, and remained highly susceptible at higher temperatures, whereas the resistant accession from
220 Ghana was highly resistant till 31°C (average scores from 0.08 to 0.42) and moderately resistant at 34°C (1.08).

221 The effect of temperature on disease severity was more pronounced in the four genotypes with intermediate
222 resistance (Fig.1), as all started being highly or moderately resistant at 25 and 28°C and became susceptible at
223 higher temperatures, with significantly higher average scores (Table 2). Among these four genotypes, the reaction
224 of Dud-QMPAfg changed from moderately resistant to susceptible at 31°C, whereas this change occurred at 34°C
225 in Can-NYIsr and Ag-C38Nig. Con-Pat81Ko remained highly resistant till 31°C (0.21 to 0.88), occurring the
226 resistance break at 34 °C.

227 An illustration of the resistant/susceptible response of the six accessions at the different temperatures assayed
228 is showed in Fig. 2. The susceptible and resistant responses of 'Piel the sapo' and the wild *agrestis* Ag-
229 15591Ghana, respectively, are evident, as well as the effect of temperature on the response of the genotypes with
230 intermediate resistance.

231 The experiments conducted under greenhouse conditions confirmed the response at the highest temperature
232 (Table 3). Greenhouse experiments were performed at an average temperature of 34.5 and 35.7°C respectively and
233 results show that plants of most accessions died or had disease severity scores higher than 4 (average scores from
234 4.1-5.0). All genotypes behaved as highly susceptible except Ag-15591Ghana that remained moderately resistant
235 30 days after inoculation (average disease score of 1.1) in both assays.

236 Discussion

237 This study evaluated for the first time the response of melon accessions with different resistance levels against
238 the charcoal rot under different temperature regimes. The use of several BOD incubators made it possible to set

239 different temperature regimes, with an accurate temperature control maintaining constant relative humidity and
240 photoperiod, and to replicate the assays to obtain reliable results.

241 The resistance response to *M. phaseolina* found in the genotypes studied was the expected, as the accessions
242 evaluated here and the susceptible control were selected for their differential response to this pathogen in a previous
243 study (Ambrósio et al. 2015). The significant influence of temperature on the reaction of these accessions to this
244 fungus is here described for the first time and is consistent with what was suggested for this pathogen in other
245 crops (Akhtar et al. 2011). Akhtar et al. (2011) carried out a screening for resistance to *M. phaseolina* in sesame
246 germplasm and observed differences in the severity of symptoms likely related to different temperature and rain
247 conditions. The influence of the temperature in the *in vitro* growth rate has been reported in some works using
248 isolates of *M. phaseolina* from different crops, and the optimum temperature for this pathogen has been established
249 between 30-35 °C (Manici et al. 1995; Akhtar et al. 2011). However, to date no study had been focused on the
250 effect of temperature in *M. phaseolina* resistant melon germplasm.

251 Our results show the general effect of the temperature increase on the severity of symptoms caused by *M.*
252 *phaseolina* in seedlings of both susceptible and resistant genotypes, but the occurrence of a significant temperature
253 x genotype interaction evidences the differential effect of the temperature increase on the different genotypes. In
254 fact this effect was less pronounced in the most susceptible and the most resistant genotypes. The high
255 susceptibility of the ‘Piel de sapo’ cultivar was evident at all the temperatures, indicating that all the inoculation
256 assays successfully resulted in a severe *M. phaseolina* infection, and suggesting that this pathogen can be damaging
257 for this type of susceptible melon cultivars even at moderate temperatures. Under these infection conditions that
258 caused severe damage to the susceptible control, Ag-15591Ghana behaved as resistant at all the temperatures,
259 although its response change from highly to moderately resistant at 34 °C. Resistance breaking due to the
260 temperature rise was observed in all the genotypes with intermediate resistance, with Dud-QMPAfg and Pat81Ko
261 showing the resistance breaking at the lowest and at the highest temperature, respectively.

262 According to their response to *M. phaseolina* at different temperature regimes, accessions ranked as follows
263 from more to less resistant: Ag-15591Ghana>Con-Pat81Ko>Can-NYIsr≈Ag-C38Nig>Dud-QMPAfg>In-
264 PsPiñSp. These results partially agree with those reported by Ambrósio et al. (2015) who conducted the screening
265 assay at an average temperature of 28 °C and relative humidity of 65%. In this study, ‘Piel de sapo’ behaved as a
266 susceptible cultivar and the other genotypes displayed all a highly resistant response. Ambrósio et al. (2015) results
267 are similar to those obtained in the two assays of our study performed at 25 and 28 °C, although disease severity
268 was higher in the present study, and Dud-QMPAfg and Ag-C38Nig were classified as moderately resistant at 28

269 °C, and Can-NYIsr, was moderately resistant at 31°C. The use of a wide range of temperatures allowed a much
270 better characterization of the resistant sources, suggesting that these moderately resistant accessions could not be
271 a good option under high temperature conditions. We detected differences among these genotypes with
272 intermediate resistance, and, for example, the *chinensis* genotype Con-Pat81Ko, which behaved as the three
273 previous accessions under moderate temperature, was highly resistant even at 31 °C.

274 The six accessions were also checked in two replicate assays under greenhouse conditions in Mossoró. These
275 greenhouse conditions (with average temperatures > 34°) are similar to those of the open field cultivation of melons
276 in this semiarid region, where temperatures often are over 40°C. The behavior in both greenhouse assays agree
277 with BOD results, being Ag-15591Ghana the only accession that remained moderately resistant under these
278 stressful conditions. The symptoms of the remaining accessions were more severe in the greenhouse, where most
279 of the plants died few days after inoculation. In BOD incubators at 34°C these accessions were susceptible, but
280 plant death was not observed. The higher severity in the greenhouse can be due to differences in relative humidity,
281 greater in BOD incubators than in the greenhouse, and to differences in the thermal amplitude, higher in
282 greenhouses, that make plants more prone to pathogen attacks. Cohen et al. (2016a) reported more severe charcoal
283 rot symptoms in melon and watermelon in their experiment carried out in an infested field than in their greenhouse
284 experiment, probably due to the less controlled growing conditions in field compared to the greenhouse.

285 These results agree with the general knowledge the *M. phaseolina* is more adapted and aggressive in hot and
286 dry climates, with high temperatures and reduced humidity (Bruton and Wann 1996; Akhtar et al. 2011). In this
287 sense, the water stress has also been reported to affect the development of many soil borne diseases (Blanco-López
288 and Jiménez-Díaz 1983). In general, diseases caused by soil borne pathogens, like *M. phaseolina*, are said to be
289 highly influenced by environmental conditions (Miyasaka 2008). For instance, Pivonia et al. (2002) associated the
290 highest rates of Melon root rot and vine decline disease caused by *M. cannonballus* with the hottest season when
291 studying the response of the melon plants grown in a field infested with this pathogen. However, Sales-Júnior et
292 al. (2019) recently reported that high temperature is not the main factor affecting the severity of symptoms caused
293 by *M. cannonballus*, suggesting other factors such as the level of inoculum in soil as more important for the
294 infection, maybe due to the relatively similar high temperatures in the seasons tested.

295 Therefore, our results indicate that the use of different assay temperatures may result in a better
296 characterization of the resistance levels, allowing the selection the sources most appropriated for different climatic
297 conditions. For example, some of the sources with intermediate levels of resistance could be useful in countries
298 with less stressful growing conditions for melon crop, such as Spain or other European countries, but more stressful

299 countries as Brazil, Israel, African or Asian regions would need the use of resistant sources with stable resistance
300 at higher temperatures. This kind of screening assays are very necessary as they allow an accurate control of
301 environmental conditions, highly variable in field, and of the source of inoculum, avoiding the occurrence of
302 different isolates and/or fungal species frequently mixed in naturally infested soils, and allow working with high
303 plant numbers and replicates. The variability of field conditions make impossible to use it for routine screenings
304 and genetic studies, although the behavior of the selected accession should be finally confirmed in in naturally
305 infested fields.

306 The Ag-15592Ghana accession was one of the first melon accessions reported with high level of resistance
307 to *M. phaseolina* (Ambrósio et al. 2015). The present study confirms the high level of resistance in this accession,
308 stable even at high temperature conditions and confirm its potential use as source of resistance in genetic breeding
309 programs with *M. phaseolina*. In order to include this source in breeding programs, the genetics of this resistance
310 should be studied. The effect of the temperature on disease severity should be taken into account during the genetic
311 studies. Also differences in the genetic background should be considered to recover the quality of commercial
312 melon and select against the wild traits of the *agrestis* background during the development of new resistant
313 varieties.

314 **References**

- 315 Abdul-Baki, A. A., Haroon, S. A., & Chitwood, D. J. (1996). Temperature effects on resistance to
316 *Meloidogyne* spp. in excised tomato roots. *HortScience*, 31(1),147–149.
- 317 Akhtar, K. P., Sarwar, G., & Arshad, H. M. I. (2011). Temperature response, pathogenicity, seed infection and
318 mutant evaluation against *Macrophomina phaseolina* causing charcoal rot disease of sesame. *Archives of*
319 *Phytopathology and Plant Protection*, 44(4), 320–330.
- 320 Al-Mawaali, Q. S., Al-Sadi, A. M., Al-Said, F. A., & Deadman, M. L. (2013). Etiology, development and reaction
321 of muskmelon to vine decline under arid conditions of Oman. *Phytopathologia Mediterranea*, 52(3), 457–465.
- 322 Ambrósio, M. M. Q., Dantas, A. C. A., Martínez-Perez, E., Medeiros, A. C., Nunes, G. H. S., & Picó, M. B. (2015).
323 Screening a variable germplasm collection of *Cucumis melo* L. for seedling resistance to *Macrophomina*
324 *phaseolina*. *Euphytica*, 206(2), 287–300.
- 325 Andrade, D. E. G. T., Michereff, S. J., Biondi, C. M., Nascimento, C. W. A., & Sales, R. Jr. (2005). Frequência
326 de fungos associados ao colapso do meloeiro e relação com características físicas, químicas e microbiológicas
327 dos solos. *Summa Phytopathologica*, 31(4), 326–331.
- 328 Apablaza, H. (1993). Charcoal rot of melon and watermelon (*Macrophomina phaseolina* (Tassi) Goidanich) in the

329 metropolitan region of Chile. *Ciencia e Investigación Agraria*, 20(3), 101–105.

330 Bakhshi, E., Safaie, N., & Shams-Bakhsh, N. (2018). *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* as a biocontrol agent improves
331 the management of charcoal root rot in melon. *Journal of Agricultural Science and Technology*, 20, 597–607.

332 Bankole, S. A., Ikotun, B., & Ekpo, E. J. A. (1999). Fungal deterioration of melon seeds stored in jute sacks and
333 polyethylene bags in Ago-Iwoye, southwestern Nigeria. *Mycopathologia*, 146(3), 135–146.

334 Bashir, M. R. (2017). Impact of global climate change on charcoal rot of sesame caused by *Macrophomina*
335 *phaseolina*. *Journal of Horticulture*, 4,1.

336 Bianchini, A., Maringoni, A. C., & Carneiro, S. M. T. P. G. (2005). Doenças do feijoeiro. In H. Kimati, L. Amorim,
337 A. Bergamin Filho, L. E. A. Camargo, & J. A. M. Rezende (Eds.), *Manual de fitopatologia: Doenças das*
338 *plantas cultivadas* (pp 333-349). São Paulo, Brazil: Ceres.

339 Blanco-López, M. A., & Jiménez-Díaz, R. M. (1983). Effect of irrigation on susceptibility of sunflower to
340 *Macrophomina phaseoli*. *Plant Disease*, 67, 1214–1217.

341 Bruton, B. D., & Miller, M. E. (1997). Occurrence of vine decline diseases of melons in Honduras. *Plant Disease*,
342 81(6), 696–696.

343 Bruton, B. D., & Wann, E. V. (1996). Charcoal rot. In T. A. Zitter, D. L. Hopkins, C. E. Thomas (Eds.),
344 *Compendium of Cucurbit Diseases* (pp 49–50). St. Paul, USA: APS Press.

345 Chung, B.N., Lee, J.H., Kang, B., Koh, S.W., Joa, J.H., Choi, K.S., et al. (2018). HR-Mediated defense response
346 is overcome at high temperatures in *Capsicum* species. *The Plant Pathology Journal*, 34(1), 71-77.

347 Cohen, R., Omari, N., Porat, A., & Edelstein, M. (2012). Management of *Macrophomina* wilt in melons using
348 grafting or fungicide soil application: Pathological, horticultural and economical aspects. *Crop Protection*, 35,
349 58–63.

350 Cohen, R., Elkabetz, M., & Edelstein, M. (2016a). Variation in the responses of melon and watermelon to
351 *Macrophomina phaseolina*. *Crop Protection*, 85, 46–51.

352 Cohen, R., Tyutyunik, J., Fallik, E., Oka, Y., Tadmor, Y., & Edelstein, M. (2016b). Phytopathological evaluation
353 of exotic watermelon germplasm as a basis for rootstock breeding. *Scientia Horticulturae*, 165, 203–210.

354 Dantas, A. M. M., Ambrósio, M. M. Q., Nascimento, S. R. C., Senhor, R. F., César, M. A., & Lima, J. S. S. (2013).
355 Incorporation of plant materials in the control of root pathogens in muskmelon. *Revista Agro@ambiente On-*
356 *line*, 7(3), 338–344.

357 Durner, E. (2019). Effective analysis of interactive effects with non-normal data using the Aligned Rank
358 Transform, ARTool and SAS® University Edition. *Horticulturae*, 5, 57.

359 Edraki, V., & Banihashemi, Z. (2010). Phenotypic diversity among isolates of *Macrophomina phaseolina* and its
360 relation to pathogenicity. *Iranian Journal of Plant Pathology*, 46(4), 93–100.

361 El-Kolaly, G. A. A., & Abdel-Sattar, M. A. (2013). The etiology of sudden wilt disease syndrome on melon in
362 Egypt. *Nature and Science*, 11(11), 79–87.

363 El-Sappah, A.H., Islam M. M., El-Awady, H. H., Yan, S., Qi, S, Liu, J., et al. (2019). Tomato Natural Resistance
364 Genes in Controlling the Root-Knot Nematode. *Genes*, 10, 925.

365 FAO. (2019). FAOSTAT: Food and Agriculture Organization Corporate Statistical Database. Available at:
366 <http://faostat3.fao.org/home/S>. Accessed July 8, 2019.

367 USDA. (2019). United States Department of Agriculture (USDA): Fungal Databases, U. S. National Fungus
368 Collections. <https://nt.ars-grin.gov/fungaldatabases/>. Accessed July 10, 2019.

369 García-Jiménez, J., Armengol, J., Sales, R., Jordá, C., & Bruton, B. D. 2000. Fungal pathogens associated with
370 melon collapse in Spain. *EPPO Bull.*, 30(2), 169–173.

371 Garrett, K. A., Dendy, S. P., Frank, E. E., Rouse, M. N., & Travers, S. E. (2006). Climate change effects on plant
372 disease: Genomes to ecosystems. *Annual Review of Phytopathology.*, 44, 489–509.

373 Groenewald, J. Z., & Crous, P. W. (2014). Genetic diversity in *Macrophomina phaseolina*, the causal agent of
374 charcoal rot. *Phytopathologia Mediterranea.*, 53, 250–268.

375 Islam, S., Haque, S., Islam M. M., Emdad, E. M., Halim, A., Hossen, Q. M., et al. (2012). Tools to kill: Genome
376 of one of the most destructive plant pathogenic fungi *Macrophomina phaseolina*. *BMC Genomics*, 13, 493–
377 509.

378 Jacob, C. J., Krarup, C., Díaz, G. A., & Latorre, B. A. (2013). A severe outbreak of charcoal rot in cantaloupe
379 melon caused by *Macrophomina phaseolina* in Chile. *Plant Disease*, 97, 141.

380 Machado, A. R., Pinho, D. B., Soares, D. J., Medeiros-Gomes, A. A., & Pereira, O. L. (2018). Bayesian analyses
381 of five gene regions reveal a new phylogenetic species of *Macrophomina* associated with charcoal rot on
382 oilseed crops in Brazil. *European Journal of Plant Pathology*, 153(1), 89–100.

383 Manici, L. M., Caputo, F., & Cerato, C. (1995). Temperature responses of isolates of *Macrophomina phaseolina*
384 from different climatic regions of sunflower production in Italy. *Plant Disease*, 79(8), 834–838.

385 Marinho, R. E. M., Sales Jr, R., Maracajá, P. B., Silva, G. F., Costa, F. M., & Silva, E. C. (2002). Identificação da
386 microflora associada a raízes de meloeiro nos estados do Rio Grande do Norte e Ceará. *Revista Caatinga*,
387 15(1), 25–28.

388 Medeiros, A. C., Melo, D. R. M., Ambrósio, M. M. Q., Nunes, G. H. S., & Costa, J. M. (2015). Métodos de
389 inoculação de *Rhizoctonia solani* e *Macrophomina phaseolina* em meloeiro (*Cucumis melo*). *Summa*
390 *Phytopathologica*, 41(4), 281–286.

391 Miyasaka, S. (2008). *Manejo da biomassa e do solo visando à sustentabilidade da agricultura brasileira*. São
392 Paulo: Navegar.

393 Nascimento, P. G. M. L., Ambrósio, M. M. Q., Freitas, F. C. L., Cruz, B. L. S., Dantas, A. M. M., Junior, R. S., et
394 al. (2018). Incidence of root rot of muskmelon in different soil management practices. *European Journal of*
395 *Plant Pathology*, 152(2), 433–446.

396 Negreiros, A. M. P., Sales, R., Leon, M., Melo, N. J. D., Michereff, S. J., Ambrósio, M. M. D., et al. (2019).
397 Identification and pathogenicity of *Macrophomina* species collected from weeds in melon fields in
398 Northeastern Brazil. *Journal of Phytopathology*, 167(6), 326–337.

399 Nunes, G. H. S., Aragão, F. A. S., Nunes, E. W. L. P., Costa, J. M., & Ricarte, A. O. (2016). Melhoramento de
400 Melão. In C. Nick, & A. Borém (Eds.), *Melhoramento de Hortaliças* (pp. 331-363). Universidade Federal de
401 Viçosa, Viçosa, Brazil.

402 Pitrat, M. (2017). Melon genetic resources: phenotypic diversity and horticultural taxonomy. In R. Grumet, N.
403 Katzir, & J. Garcia-Mas (Eds.), *Genetics and Genomics of Cucurbitaceae* (pp 25-59). Cham, Switzerland:
404 Springer Nature.

405 Pivonia, S., Cohen, R., Kigel, J., & Katan, J. (2002). Effect of soil temperature on disease development in melon
406 plants infected by *Monosporascus cannonballus*. *Plant Pathology*, 51(4), 472–479.

407 Reuveni, R., Krikun, J., Nachmias, A., & Shlevin, E. (1982). The role of *Macrophomina phaseolina* in a collapse
408 of melon plants in Israel. *Phytoparasitica*, 10(1), 51–56.

409 Salari, M., Panjehkeh, N., Nasirpoor, Z., & Abkhoo, J. (2012). Reaction of melon (*Cucumis melo* L.) cultivars to
410 soil-borne plant pathogenic fungi in Iran. *African Journal of Biotechnology*, 11(87), 15324–15329.

411 Sales-Júnior, R., Oliveira, O. F., Medeiros, E. V., Guimarães, I. M., & Correia, K. C. (2012). Ervas daninhas como
412 hospedeiras alternativas de patógenos causadores do colapso do meloeiro. *Revista Ciência Agronômica*. 43(1),
413 195–198.

414 Sales-Júnior, R., Senhor, R. F., Michereff, S. J., & Negreiros, A. M. P. (2019). Reaction of melon genotypes to the
415 root's rot caused by *Monosporascus*. *Revista Caatinga*, 32(1), 288–294.

416 Sarr, M. P., Ndiaye, M., Groenewald, J. Z., & Crous, P. W. (2014). Genetic diversity in *Macrophomina phaseolina*,
417 the causal agent of charcoal rot. *Phytopathologia Mediterranea*, 53, 250–268.

418 Scott, A. J., & Knott, M. A. (1974). Cluster analysis method for grouping means in the analysis of variance.
419 *Biometrics*, 30(3), 507–512.

420 Siegel, S., & Castellani Jr., N. J. (1988). *Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences*. New York:
421 McGraw-Hill.

422 Tok, F. M, Dervis, S., & Arslan, M. (2018). Host selective virulence, temperature response and genetic diversity
423 in *Macrophomina phaseolina* isolates from sesame and peanut in Southern Turkey. *Fresenius Environmental*
424 *Bulletin*, 27(11), 7374–7380.

425 Walker, G. E. (1994). First report of *Macrophomina phaseolina* associated with vine decline in muskmelon in
426 South Australia. *Plant Disease*, 78(6), 640.

427 Wobbrock, J. O., Findlater, L., Gergle, D., & Higgins, J. J. (2011). The aligned rank transform for nonparametric
428 factorial analyses using only ANOVA procedures. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human*
429 *Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 143-146). New York, USA: ACM.

430 Wosula, E. N. (2017). Effect of temperature on Wheat Streak Mosaic Disease development in winter wheat. *Plant*
431 *Disease*, 101(2), 324–330.

432 Zhao, L., Cai, J., He, W. & Zhang, Y. (2019). *Macrophomina vaccinii* sp. nov. causing blueberry stem blight in
433 China. *MycKeys*, 55, 1–14.

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442 **Tables**

443 Table 1. Mean square, F values and associated probability obtained in joint variance analysis after data alignment
 444 and ranking (Aligned Rank Transform, ART) for the response (score of disease severity) of six melon accessions
 445 inoculated with *M. phaseolina* and grown at four temperature regimes in the two BOD experiments.

446

| Source of variation | df ^a | MS ^b | F | Prob |
|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------|--------|
| Experiment (E) | 1 | 5.610973 | 2.61 | 0.1068 |
| Genotype (G) | 5 | 173.8963 | 80.86 | <.0001 |
| Temperature (T) | 3 | 83.28676 | 38.73 | <.0001 |
| T x G | 15 | 5.035124 | 2.34 | 0.003 |
| E x G | 5 | 0.112624 | 0.05 | 0.9983 |
| E x T | 3 | 0.183041 | 0.09 | 0.9682 |
| E x T x G | 15 | 0.285888 | 0.13 | 1 |
| Error | 528 | 2.150527 | | |

447 df^a = numerator degrees of freedom

448 MS^b: Mean Square.

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465 Table 2. Average and standard deviation for the response (score of disease severity) of six melon accessions
 466 inoculated with *Macrophomina phaseolina* and grown at four temperature regimes in the two BOD experiments.
 467 Joint analysis.

468

| Accession | Temperature | | | | Average |
|---------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | 25°C | 28°C | 31°C | 34°C | |
| Ag-15591Ghana | 0.08±0.28 (139.63) cA | 0.21±0.40 (160.06) cA | 0.42±0.71 (185.33) cA | 1.10±0.65 (282.58) cA | 0.45±0.66 (191.90) d |
| Con-Pat81Ko | 0.21±0.65 (151.27) cB | 0.67±1.23 (197.35) cB | 0.88±1.48 (211.08) cB | 3.46±2.14 (403.88) bA | 1.30±1.94 (240.89) c |
| Can-NYIsr | 0.63±1.37 (183.88) bB | 0.88±1.65 (205.73) bB | 2.00±1.96 (315.23) bA | 2.21±1.50 (353.19) bA | 1.44±1.76 (264.51) c |
| Ag-C38Nig | 0.75±1.42 (208.58) bB | 1.13±1.62 (232.25) bB | 1.54±1.89 (268.65) bB | 2.67±1.81 (361.92) bA | 1.52±1.84 (267.85) c |
| Dud-QMPAfg | 0.83±1.40 (222.21) bB | 1.17±1.44 (257.13) bA | 2.13±1.98 (319.10) bA | 2.92±1.89(375.4) 4 bA | 1.76±1.86 (293.47) b |
| In-PsPiñSp | 4.00±1.57 (443.85) aA | 4.42±1.31 (470.71) aA | 4.57±1.08 (476.35) aA | 4.80±0.65 (497.72) aA | 4.46±1.21 (472.38) a |
| Average | 1.09±1.80 (224.90) D | 1.41±1.93 (253.87) C | 1.91±2.05 (294.70) B | 2.87±1.91 (379.94) A | |

469
 470 Averages in a row followed by the same uppercase letter and in a column by the same lowercase letter do not differ
 471 ($p < 0.05$) according by the Scott-Knott cluster (1974). Data in parentheses correspond to the average ranks. Each
 472 number is the average of 24 plants. The effect of the experiment was no significant (Table 1), so data obtained in
 473 both BOD experiments could be pooled and analyzed together.

474

475

476

477

478 Table 3. Average for the response (disease of disease severity) and reaction of melon accessions inoculated with
 479 *Macrophomina phaseolina* in two replicate greenhouse experiments conducted in Mossoró-RN (Brazil).

480

| Accession | Mossoró (Brazil) (34.5 °C, 55.4% RH) ^a | | Mossoró (Brazil) (35.7 °C, 50.4% RH) ^a | |
|---------------|--|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Disease score | Reaction ^b | Disease score | Reaction ^b |
| Ag-15591Ghana | 1.10 | MR | 1.10 | MR |
| Con-Pat81Ko | 5.00 | HS | 4.80 | HS |
| Can-NYIsr | 5.00 | HS | 5.00 | HS |
| Ag-C38Nig | 5.00 | HS | 4.60 | HS |
| Dud-QMPAfg | 4.60 | HS | 4.10 | HS |
| In-PsPiñSp | 5.00 | HS | 5.00 | HS |

481 ^a RH: average relative humidity

482 ^b 0: immune (I); 0.1-1.0: highly resistant (HR); 1.1-2.0: moderately resistant (MR); 2.1-4.0: susceptible (S) and
 483 4.1-5.0: highly susceptible (HS).

484

485

486 **Figures**

487 **Fig. 1** Severity of charcoal rot as a function of temperature for the six accessions assayed in BOD incubators
 488 (experiments 1 and 2). Average scores of disease severity and genotype reaction: 0: immune (I); 0.1-1.0: highly
 489 resistant (HR); 1.1-2.0: moderately resistant (MR); 2.1-4.0: susceptible (S) and 4.1-5.0: highly susceptible (HS),
 490 are represented

491 **Fig. 2** Effect of toothpick inoculation of *M. phaseolina* in plants of six accessions of melon assayed at four
 492 temperatures in BOD incubators

493

494

495

496

497