

Pathogenicity, anastomosis groups, host range, and genetic diversity of Rhizoctonia species isolated from soybean, pea, and other crops in Alberta and Manitoba, Canada

Authors: Yu, Haitian, Zhou, Qixing, Hwang, Sheau-Fang, Ho, Andrew J., Chang, Kan-Fa, et al.

Source: Canadian Journal of Plant Science, 102(2) : 301-315

Published By: Canadian Science Publishing

URL: https://doi.org/10.1139/CJPS-2021-0039

BioOne Complete (complete.BioOne.org) is a full-text database of 200 subscribed and open-access titles in the biological, ecological, and environmental sciences published by nonprofit societies, associations, museums, institutions, and presses.

Your use of this PDF, the BioOne Complete website, and all posted and associated content indicates your acceptance of BioOne's Terms of Use, available at www.bioone.org/terms-of-use.

Usage of BioOne Complete content is strictly limited to personal, educational, and non - commercial use. Commercial inquiries or rights and permissions requests should be directed to the individual publisher as copyright holder.

BioOne sees sustainable scholarly publishing as an inherently collaborative enterprise connecting authors, nonprofit publishers, academic institutions, research libraries, and research funders in the common goal of maximizing access to critical research.

301

Pathogenicity, anastomosis groups, host range, and genetic diversity of Rhizoctonia species isolated from soybean, pea, and other crops in Alberta and Manitoba, Canada

Haitian Yu, Qixing Zhou, Sheau-Fang Hwang, Andrew J. Ho, Kan-Fa Chang, Stephen E. Strelkov, Yuhua He, Robert L. Conner, and Michael W. Harding

> Abstract: Root rot is a common disease in soybean (Glycine max) and field pea (Pisum sativum), which restrain increased production in Canada. Sixty-seven isolates of Rhizoctonia were recovered from various diseased plants in Alberta, Canada along with three isolates from diseased soybean plants in Manitoba, Canada. According to their anastomosis behavior, 23 (32.9%) of the isolates were identified as anastomosis group (AG) 4 (AG4), 7 (10.0%) were AG2-1, 10 (14.3%) were AG2-2, 7 (10.0%) were AG5, 3 (4.3%) were AG-E and the AGs of the remaining 20 (28.6%) isolates could not be determined. Isolates belonging to AG4 produced typical symptoms of stem rot and root rot on seedlings of soybean and pea and were more aggressive than the AG2-1, AG2-2, AG5 and AG-E isolates. Selected isolates of AG4, AG2-1, AG2-2, AG5 and AG-E were to some degree able to infect common crops in Alberta, which included barley, canola, corn, faba bean, flax, lupin, lentil, pea, potato, soybean, and wheat. The genetic variability among these isolates was evaluated using phylogenetic analysis based on the rDNA ITS sequences and inter-simple sequence repeat (ISSR) markers. For the ITS sequence analysis, a neighbour-joining tree was constructed using the PAUP program, which clustered the Rhizoctonia isolates into five groups (Groups I to V). However, no correlation was observed between AGs, locations, aggressiveness or host origins. For the ISSR analysis, 54 polymorphic ISSR patterns were identified, indicating a high level of diversity among the isolates.

Key words: Rhizoctonia, soybean, pea, pathogenicity, anastomosis group, ITS, ISSR.

Résumé : Le pourridié est une maladie courante du soja (Glycine max) et du pois (Pisum sativum), ce qui en restreint la production au Canada. Les auteurs ont récupéré 67 isolats de Rhizoctonia sur divers plants de soja attaqués par la maladie en Alberta (Canada) et trois isolats sur des plants eux aussi affectés, au Manitoba (Canada). Si l'on se fie aux anastomoses, 23 (32,9 %) de ces isolats se classaient dans le quatrième groupe anastomosique (AG4), sept (10,0 %) dans le groupe AG2-1, dix (14,3 %) dans le groupe AG2-2, sept (10,0 %) dans le groupe AG5, trois (4,3 %) dans le groupe AG-E, le groupe des vingt isolats restants (28,6 %) n'ayant pu être déterminé. Les isolats du groupe AG4 produisent les symptômes typiques du pourridié chez les plantules de soja et de pois. Ils sont aussi plus agressifs que ceux des groupes AG2-1, AG2-2, AG5 et AG-E. Quelques isolats des groupes AG4, AG2-1, AG2-2, AG5 et AG-E parviennent à infecter à un certain degré diverses cultures courantes en Alberta, en l'occurrence l'orge, le canola, le maïs, la fèverole, le lin, le lupin, la lentille, le pois, la pomme de terre, le soja et le blé. Les auteurs ont évalué la variabilité génétique des isolats par analyse phylogénétique des séquences de l'espaceur transcrit interne (ITS) de leur ADNr ainsi que des marqueurs ISSR (inter-simple sequence repeat). Pour analyser les séquences de l'ITS, les

Received 9 February 2021. Accepted 5 July 2021.

H. Yu* and Y. He. Institute of Food Crops, Yunnan Academy of Agricultural Sciences, Kunming, Yunnan 650205, China.

Q. Zhou* and K.-F. Chang. Crop Diversification Centre North, Alberta Agriculture and Forestry, Edmonton, AB T5Y 6H3, Canada.

S.-F. Hwang. Crop Diversification Centre North, Alberta Agriculture and Forestry, Edmonton, AB T5Y 6H3, Canada; Department of Agricultural, Food and Nutritional Science, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB T6G 2P5, Canada.

A.J. Ho and S.E. Strelkov. Department of Agricultural, Food and Nutritional Science, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB T6G 2P5, Canada.

R.L. Conner. Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC), Morden, MB R6M 1Y5, Canada.

M.W. Harding. Crop Diversification Centre South, Alberta Agriculture and Forestry, Brooks, AB T1R 1E6, Canada.

Corresponding author: Sheau-Fang Hwang (email: [Sheau.Fang.Hwang@ualberta.ca\)](mailto:Sheau.Fang.Hwang@ualberta.ca).

*Haitian Yu and Qixing Zhou contributed equally to this research.

© 2021 Authors H. Yu, A.J. Ho, Y. He, S.E. Strelkov, and R.L. Conner, and the Crown. Permission for reuse (free in most cases) can be obtained from [copyright.com.](https://www.copyright.com/search.action?page=simple)

Can. J. Plant Sci. 102: 301–315 (2022) dx.doi.org/10.1139/cjps-2021-0039 Published at <www.cdnsciencepub.com/cjps> on 16 July 2021.

auteurs ont bâti un arbre des séquences voisines et liées avec le logiciel PAUP, ce qui a permis de rassembler les isolats de Rhizoctonia en cinq groupes (numérotés de I à V). Néanmoins, on n'a pu établir de corrélation entre les groupes anastomosiques, l'emplacement, l'agressivité du cryptogame ou l'hôte. En ce qui concerne les marqueurs ISSR, les auteurs ont identifié 54 polymorphismes, ce qui indique un taux de diversité élevé chez les isolats. [Traduit par la Rédaction]

Mots-clés : Rhizoctonia, soja, pois, pathogénicité, groupe anastomosique, ITS, ISSR.

Introduction

Soybean [Glycine max (L.) Merr.] and field pea (Pisum sativum L.) are important leguminous crops that are widely grown in Canada [\(Pesticide Risk Reduction Program 2008](#page-14-0); [Masuda and Goldsmith 2009](#page-13-0); [Gabruch and Gietz 2014\)](#page-13-1). Root rot diseases are important constraints to the expansion of soybean and sustainable production of field pea in Alberta, Canada ([Hwang and Chang 1989;](#page-13-2) [Gossen et al.](#page-13-3) [2016;](#page-13-3) [Chang et al. 2018](#page-12-0)). The root rot pathogens cause damping-off, seedling blight, and root rot of soybean and field pea, which has resulted in large yield losses in Canada [\(Hwang et al. 2007;](#page-13-4) [Xue et al. 2007;](#page-14-1) [Chang et al.](#page-12-0) [2018\)](#page-12-0). The root rot pathogen complex includes Rhizoctonia solani Kühn [teleomorph Thanatephorus cucumeris (Frank) Donk], Fusarium spp., Pythium spp., Aphanomyces euteiches Drechsler, and Sclerotinia sclerotiorum (Lib.) De Bary [\(Xue 2003;](#page-14-2) [Chatterton et al. 2015](#page-13-5); [Gossen et al. 2016](#page-13-3); [Zhou](#page-15-0) [et al. 2018](#page-15-0)).

Among all the pathogens, R. solani is the most frequently isolated fungi from soybean and pea roots with root rot symptoms in western Canada [\(Hwang et al. 2007](#page-13-4); [McLaren et al. 2015](#page-13-6); [Nyandoro et al. 2014](#page-14-3); [Chang et al.](#page-12-0) [2018](#page-12-0)). Rhizoctonia solani has a broad host range that includes pulse crops, canola, cereals, and ornamental crops ([Sneh](#page-14-4) [et al. 1996\)](#page-14-4). In the family of Leguminosae, R. solani caused seedling blight and root rot of beans (Phaseolus vulgaris L.) ([Engelkes and Windels 1996\)](#page-13-7), chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.) ([Hwang et al. 2003\)](#page-13-8), field pea ([Xi et al. 1995](#page-14-5); [Hwang et al.](#page-13-4) [2007\)](#page-13-4), lupin (Lupinus angustifolius L.) [\(Zhou et al. 2009\)](#page-15-1), and soybean [\(Zhao et al. 2005](#page-14-6)). In southern Alberta, the occurrence of root rot of soybean was documented in all of the 29 fields surveyed in 2014 and 2015, and R. solani was shown to be one of the components of the root rot disease complex [\(Nyandoro et al. 2015,](#page-14-7) [2017](#page-14-8)).

Rhizoctonia solani is a species complex with various morphological and physical characters. Based on the characterization of hyphal fusion of the isolates via somatic incompatibility (i.e., anastomosis grouping, AG), Rhizoctonia spp. can be classified into 14 AGs (AG1 to AG13 and AG-BI) ([Sneh et al. 1991](#page-14-9); [Carling 1996](#page-12-1); [Cubeta and Vilgalys 1997;](#page-13-9) [Kuninaga et al. 1997](#page-13-10); [Carling](#page-12-2) [et al. 2002](#page-12-2)a; [Stodart et al. 2007](#page-14-10)). Rhizoctonia isolates belonging to different AG often have different host ranges and differences in aggressiveness [\(Carling et al.](#page-12-2) [2002](#page-12-2)a). Previously, R. solani AG2-1, AG2-2, AG4, AG5, and Rhizoctonia AG-E have been isolated from soybean and pea, causing seedling blight and root rot ([Zhao et al.](#page-14-6) [2005](#page-14-6); [Hwang et al. 2007\)](#page-13-4).

To evaluate genetic variability and to characterize R. solani, numerous genetic markers were applied, which included restriction fragment length polymorphisms (RFLP) ([Rosewich et al. 1999;](#page-14-11) [Ceresini et al.](#page-12-3) [2002](#page-12-3)), random amplified polymorphic DNA (RAPD) ([Cubeta et al. 1991](#page-13-11); [Zhou et al. 2009](#page-15-1); [Dubey et al. 2012](#page-13-12); [Mirmajlessi et al. 2012\)](#page-13-13), amplified fragment length polymorphism (AFLP) ([Taheri et al. 2007\)](#page-14-12), inter-simple sequence repeats (ISSR) ([Sharma et al. 2005](#page-14-13); [Stodart](#page-14-10) [et al. 2007](#page-14-10); [Khodayari et al. 2009;](#page-13-14) [Dubey et al. 2012](#page-13-12); [Zhou et al. 2014\)](#page-15-2), and sequence analysis of internal transcribed spacers (ITS) ([Carling et al. 2002](#page-12-4)b; [Justesen](#page-13-15) [et al. 2003](#page-13-15); [Zhou et al. 2009,](#page-15-1) [2014; Çebi Kiliço](#page-15-2)ğlu and [Özkoç 2010\)](#page-15-2). ISSR employs a dominant inheritance marker and can generate a great number of highly informative and reproducible alleles, which can be used to rapidly differentiate closely related individuals. ISSR analysis can be highly variable within a species and has high repeatability and stability ([Stodart et al.](#page-14-10) [2007\)](#page-14-10). The ITS region of rDNA, which contains the ITS1 spacer, 5.8S rRNA gene, and the ITS2 spacer, has been used to identify various AGs of R. solani ([Boysen et al.](#page-12-5) [1996](#page-12-5); [Kuninaga et al. 1997](#page-13-10)) and evaluate genetic variation within this species [\(Zhou et al. 2009,](#page-15-1) [2014](#page-15-2)).

In the present study, a total of 70 Rhizoctonia isolates were recovered from various pulse and special crops in Alberta and Manitoba. The objectives of the present study were to: (1) characterize the isolates recovered from the infected roots of soybean or pea, (2) determine their pathogenicity to pea and soybean, (3) to evaluate the host range of the major AG types found in Alberta and Manitoba, and (4) to examine the genetic diversity of those isolates and evaluate molecular methods for grouping Rhizoctonia isolates using their ITS sequences and ISSR markers.

Materials and Methods

Isolation of the pathogens

During the summers of 2015 and 2016, disease surveys were conducted across the southern (for soybean fields) and central (for pea isolates fields) regions of Alberta to assess the occurrence and impact of root rot on soybean and pea crops ([Nyandoro et al. 2015,](#page-14-7) [2017\)](#page-14-8). For pathogen isolation, roots of the plants with root rot symptoms were washed under running tap water and cut into small pieces (∼1 cm in length) with a sharp knife. The root pieces were placed in a 0.5% sodium hypochlorite solution for 30 s to 1 min to surface-sterilize the tissue, rinsed three times with sterile distilled water, and then placed

Location	Host ^a	AG group	Isolate ID			
Bow Island	Dry bean	$AG2-2$	R ₁₀₄			
	Dill	$AG2-1$	R98			
		$AG2-2$	R ₁₀₀			
	Soybean	AG4	R57			
		Not determined	R ₁₂ , R ₅₅			
Brooks	Pea	AG4	R71, R73			
		Not determined	R77			
	Mint	$AG2-2$	R ₁₁₃			
	Soybean	$AG2-1$	R01, R07, R38a			
		$AG2-2$	R08, R22, R50			
		AG4	R04, R13, R15, R24, R34, R48, R56, R64			
		AG5	R06, R14b, R19			
		Not determined	R10, R14a, R21a, R27a, R75			
Edmonton	Faba bean	$AG-E$	R97a, R102			
	Lupin	AG4	R21b, R31, R35b, R38b			
Fort Saskatchewan	Soybean	$AG2-1$	R89			
		AG4	R93			
Leduc	Cauliflower	$AG2-2$	R117			
		Not determined	R ₁₂₄ , R ₁₂₇			
Lethbridge	Pea	Not determined	R147, R148, R151, R168			
Morden, Manitoba	Soybean	AG4	R35a, R52, R53			
Namao	Pea	AG4	R92b			
		Not determined	R95, R97b			
Parkland	Soybean	AG4	R ₁₆			
Redwater	Pea	$AG2-1$	R ₁₃₁			
Seven Persons	Soybean	AG5	R70			
Spruce Grove	Alstroemeria	$AG2-2$	R90			
Stettler	Echinacea	AG4	R86			
Strathcona	Soybean	$AG2-1$	R32			
		AG5	R09, R20, R36			
Sturgeon	Soybean	Not determined	R88			
Tofield	Lupin	$AG2-2$	R42			
		AG4	R44			
Vauxhall	Soybean	$AG2-2$	R02			
		AG4	R11			
Westlock	Soybean	$AG2-1$	R ₁₂₆			
		AG4	R91			
		$AG-E$	R92a			

Table 1. Location of sample collection, host, AGs, and isolate ID of Rhizoctonia isolates.

^aScientific names are given below: Alstroemeria (Alstroemeria sp.), bean (Phaseolus vulgaris L.), cauliflower (Brassica oleracea var. botrytis L.), dill [Peucedanum graveolens (L.) C.B. Clarke], echinacea [Echinacea purpurea (L.) Moench], faba bean (Vicia faba L.), field pea (Pisum sativum L.), lupin (Lupinus angustifolius L.), mint (Mentha spicata L.), soybean [Glycine max (L.) Merr.].

on sterile paper towels to remove excess water. The surface-sterilized root pieces were transferred into Petri dishes onto water agar medium (WA) amended with 50 μ g·mL⁻¹ streptomycin sulfate in a laminar flow hood. The Petri dishes were incubated under laboratory conditions at a temperature of 20 $^{\circ}$ C \pm 2 $^{\circ}$ C and an 8 h/16 h light and dark period, and monitored daily for the growth of fungal colonies. A total of 70 Rhizoctonia isolates were collected from diseased soybean, pea plants and other plants in those fields, which are listed in [Table 1.](#page-3-0) A hyphal tip of each isolate was transferred to fresh potato–dextrose agar media (PDA) and incubated for 1 wk at room temperature. All the isolates were stored on PDA at 4 °C.

Identification and anastomosis grouping

The nuclei number of the young hyphal cells, the septa and the branching of the hyphae of Rhizoctonia isolates were examined to identify R. solani [\(Sneh et al. 1991](#page-14-9)). Each Rhizoctonia isolate was paired with tester isolates representing AG1, AG2-1, AG2-2, AG3, AG4, AG5, AG6, AG7, AG8 and binucleate Rhizoctonia AG-E following the protocol of [Zhou et al. \(2009,](#page-15-1) [2014\).](#page-15-2) Testers were obtained from Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutritional Science, at the University of Alberta. When hyphae of the two isolates touched, slides were removed from the Petri dishes and examined under a microscope. The AG type of Rhizoctonia isolate was determined based on the hyphae fusion between the testing isolate and tester isolate. Two slides were prepared for each isolate under investigation. Anastomosis behaviour was determined at a 400× magnification.

Pathogenicity

All of the 70 Rhizoctonia isolates were tested for pathogenicity on the pea cv. Midas and soybean cv.900Y61 in two separate experiments following the protocols of [Zhou et al. \(2009,](#page-15-1) [2014\).](#page-15-2) Plants were grown in 500-mL cups filled with Pro-Mix potting soil (Westgro Horticultural Supplies Inc., Calgary, AB, Canada). To inoculate the soil, Rhizoctonia isolates were grown on PDA plates (90 mm) for 10 d. The cultures with agar were cut into small pieces (\sim 3 mm \times 3 mm) with a sharp knife before inoculation. One-half of a plate of a culture with agar was added in replicate cup. Five replicate cups were used for each crop. Five seeds were planted 2 cm deep along with inoculum. Similar number of cups was included as control where the same amount of PDA pieces was added with the seeds. The experiments were laid out in a randomized complete block design in a greenhouse set for a 20/15 °C day/night regime with a 16-h photoperiod. Pots were watered daily. Seedling emergence was recorded 10 d after seeding. At 21 d after seeding, plant height was recorded. The plants were uprooted and root rot severity (0–4) and total dry biomass were recorded [\(Table 2](#page-5-0)). Root rot severity was assessed on a scale of $0-4$, where; $0 =$ no lesion, $1 =$ small brown lesions on <25% of exterior circumference of tap root, $2 =$ lesions on 25%–49% of tap root, $3 =$ lesions on $50\% - 74\%$ and tap root constricted, and $4 = \text{tap root}$ girdled (75%–100%) and plant wilted or dead ([Zhou et al.](#page-15-1) [2009,](#page-15-1) [2014](#page-15-2)). The experiment was repeated once under the same conditions in a greenhouse. Data were subjected to analysis of variance using the SAS program and, where appropriate, Duncan's new multiple range test at $P \le 0.001$ of significance was performed for means comparison (SAS Institute, Inc., NC, USA).

Host range of Rhizoctonia

Eleven isolates which belonged to R. solani AG2-1, AG2-2, AG4, AG5 and a binucleate Rhizoctonia AG-E were selected for the pathogenicity test following the inoculation protocol described above [\(Table 3](#page-7-0)). Prior to inoculation, each Rhizoctonia isolate was grown on sterilized wheat grains for 12 d, air dried and ground, and incorporated at the time of seeding at the rate of 10 mL per pot. Ten plant species, which were in crop rotations systems in western Canada, were tested as potential hosts of barley (Hordeum vulgare L.), canola (Brassica napus L.), corn (Zea mays L.), faba bean (Vicia faba L.), flax (Linum usitatissimum L.), lentil (Lens culinaris L.), lupin (Lupinus angustifolius L.), pea, soybean, and wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) ([Table 4](#page-8-0)). Ten seeds of each plant species (except for 5 seeds of faba bean per cup) were inoculated with Rhizoctonia inoculum grown in a 500-mL cup (except 5-inch square pot for growing potato) filled with Promix

potting soil (Westgro Horticultural Supplies Inc., Calgary, Canada). The cups (pots) were arranged following a split-plot design with the host crops in the main plots and the isolates in the sub-plots on the bench in a greenhouse set for a 20/15 °C day/night regime with a 16-h photoperiod. Plants were watered daily and fertilized once a week. Four replicate cups were used for each crop. Plant grown with non-inoculated PDA pieces was served as non-inoculated control. To evaluate the aggressiveness of Rhizoctonia isolate on different crops, seedling emergence, height, and disease severity of individual plant were recorded 10, 15 and 21 d after seeding, respectively. At 21 d after seeding, the plants were uprooted and root rot severity (0–4) and total dry biomass were recorded. Root rot severity was assessed on a scale of ⁰–4 as described above.

ITS sequencing and analysis

The genomic DNA of all the Rhizoctonia isolates was extracted from the mycelial mats which grown in potato-dextrose broth for 7 d following the method of CTAB ([Doyle and Doyle 1987\)](#page-13-16). The DNA concentration of each Rhizoctonia isolate was adjusted to 10–20 ng· μ L⁻¹ after estimation with a Thermo Scientific NANODROP™ 1000 Spectrophotometer (Fisher Scientific, Nepean, ON, Canada).

The ITS region was amplified with primers of ITS4 and ITS5 [\(White et al. 1990\)](#page-14-14) in a 25 μL reaction volume containing PCR Master Mix (Promega, Madison, WI, USA), 0.5 ^μM of each primer and 10–20 ng of genomic DNA. The PCR amplification in the thermocycler included initial denaturation at 94 °C for 5 min followed by 35 denaturation cycles of 25 s at 94 °C, annealing for 30 s at 58 °C, and extension for 60 s at 72 °C, with a final extension of 10 min at 72 °C. The amplicons were purified using a Wizard® SV Gel and PCR Clean-Up System (Promega) and transformed into the competent Escherichia coli strain JM109 using the EcoRV-digested and T-tailed pGEM®-T EasyVector System I (Promega). Plasmid DNA containing the insert was extracted with a PureYield Plasmid Miniprep System (Promega) and sequenced in the Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta.

The ITS sequences were analysed and edited with BioEdit, version 7.2.6.1 [\(Hall 1999](#page-13-17)), and then submitted to GenBank (Accession numbers MK084631–MK084700). The 70 ITS sequences and one reference sequence from GenBank (Rhizoctonia zeae KC620581) were aligned using BioEdit. To evaluate the genetic variation among the Rhizoctonia isolates, the best-fit nucleotide substitution model was selected using the program jModelTest 2.1.10 v 20160303 [\(Darriba et al. 2012\)](#page-13-18). Distance tree was produced with PAUP 4.0b10 software ([Swofford 2002\)](#page-14-15) using the neighbour-joining (NJ) approach [\(Saitou and Nei 1987\)](#page-14-16). The NJ tree was rooted by user-specified outgroup and displayed using the TreeViewX version 0.5.0 ([Page 1996\)](#page-14-17).

R70 5.0 30.5 2.5 0.24 0.91 8.0 39.2 1.1 0.99 0.32

Table 2. Pathogenicity of Rhizoctonia isolates and their effects on seedling emergence, plant height, plant biomass and root rot severity on soybean and pea.

Note: Data are the means of 2 trials \times 4 replications. SE, standard error of the means.

Support for groups in the NJ tree was assessed using a bootstrap analysis with 1000 replicates.

ISSR analysis

A total of 100 ISSR primer sequences were obtained from the Biotechnology Laboratory, University of British Columbia (UBC sets 9) and synthesized by Integrated DNA Technologies Inc. (IDT, Coralville, IA, USA) ([Zhou et al. 2014\)](#page-15-2). All 100 primers were screened against a mixture of DNA randomly chosen from the 70 Rhizoctonia isolates from the preliminary experiments. Ten primers that produced 2–10 polymorphic bands were selected for further ISSR PCR procedures with the genomic DNA of the 70 Rhizoctonia isolates ([Table 4\)](#page-8-0).

ISSR PCR was performed in a 25 μL reaction volume containing PCR Master Mix (Promega, Madison, WI, USA), 0.5 μ M of each primer and 10–20 ng of genomic DNA. Amplification conditions in the thermocycler include a 5-min initial denaturation at 94 °C, followed by 35 cycles of 30 s at 94 °C to denature genomic DNA, 45 s for annealing of the primer at 42 °C, and 90 s at 72 °C for primer extension, with a final extension of 10 min at 72 °C. The PCR products were visualized by gel electrophoresis on 2.5% agarose gels in $1 \times$ TAE buffer, at 110 V for 2 h. Gels were photographed with a Gel Doc™ XR System (BIO-RAD, Columbus OH, USA).

In the ISSR analysis, amplified fragments were scored for the presence (1) or absence (0) of homologous bands ([Zhou et al. 2014](#page-15-2)). Only reproducible bands of strong intensity were included in the analysis. The gene frequency, genetic diversity, and genetic distance of 70 Rhizoctonia isolates were calculated. A dendrogram was also constructed for illustration of the phenetic relationships among these isolates ([Zhou et al. 2014](#page-15-2)). All calculations and the dendrogram were generated using the POPGENE program [\(Yeh and Boyle 1997\)](#page-14-18).

Results

Anastomosis grouping

According to the anastomosis behavior with Rhizoctonia tester isolates, seven isolates (10.0%) were R. solani AG2-1 ([Table 1](#page-3-0)). One isolate (R98) was isolated from dill roots [Peucedanum graveolens (L.) C.B. Clark] in Bow Island, the other six isolates were isolated from soybean in Brooks (3), Fort Saskachewan (1), Strathcona (1) and Westlock (1). Ten isolates (14.3%) were AG2-2 of which two isolates from dill (1) and bean roots (1) in Bow Island, four isolates from mint (Mentha spicata L.)

		Barley (Hordeum vulgare)		Corn (Zea mays)		Wheat (Triticum aestivum)		Canola (Brassica napus)		Flax (Linum usitatissimum)	
\rm{AG}	Isolate	CDC Copeland	AAC Synergy	Alto	Espresso	AAC Penhold	5700PR	1950	74-47RR	Prairie Thunder	CDC Neela
Control	${\rm C}{\rm K}$	0.0f	0.00g	$0.00\rm d$	0.00e	0.00c	0.00f	0.00d	0.00f	0.00f	0.00g
$AG2-1$	R07	1.3 _{de}	1.13 cde	1.08c	0.48de	0.74 _b	1.33bcd	4.00a	4.00a	2.20e	1.59ef
$AG2-1$	R ₃₈ a	1.7cde	0.93def	1.60bc	0.58 _{de}	0.95 _b	1.20bcd	4.00a	4.00a	3.31bc	3.30bc
$AG2-2$	R22	2.0 _b	1.46cd	1.59bc	0.99bcd	1.11 _b	1.05cd	4.00a	4.00a	3.68ab	3.21bc
$AG2-2$	R50	1.8bcd	1.20cde	2.14ab	0.51de	0.86 _b	1.18bcd	3.95a	4.00a	3.09с	2.86с
AG4	R24	2.4 _b	1.66с	2.78a	1.93a	1.00 _b	1.68b	3.94a	3.75a	3.88a	3.78a
AG4	R56	2.4 _b	1.30cde	2.41ab	1.25bc	1.03 _b	1.44bc	3.84ab	3.98a	3.83a	3.66ab
AG5	R36	1.1e	0.58f	2.21ab	0.81cd	0.70 _b	0.41ef	1.83c	$0.40\mathrm{e}$	2.26e	1.24f
AG5	R70	1.7cde	0.83ef	1.81bc	1.94a	1.05 _b	0.85de	1.46с	1.43d	2.50de	1.78e
$AG-E$	R92	3.3a	3.41a	1.71bc	1.58ab	3.14a	3.24a	3.65ab	3.20b	2.89cd	2.86с
$AG-E$	R97	3.3a	2.43b	1.79bc	1.90a	2.79a	3.33a	3.31b	2.80c	2.85cd	2.29d
$AG-E$	R ₁₀₂	3.2a	2.44b	1.93abc	1.53ab	2.60a	3.49a	3.40ab	2.58c	3.29bc	3.23bc
		Faba bean (Vicia faba)		Lentil (Lens culinaris)		Lupin (Lupinus angustifolius)		Pea (Pisum sativum)		Soybean (Glycine max)	
				CDC	CDC				CDC		
\rm{AG}	Isolate	Snowbird	Malik	Maxim	Proclaim	Rose	Arabella	Midas	Striker	DKB008-81	900Y61
Control	${\rm C}{\rm K}$	0.00e	0.00e	0.00h	0.00f	0.00e	0.00f	0.00f	0.00f	0.00g	0.00f
$AG2-1$	R07	2.75c	2.80c	1.94f	1.29d	0.68d	0.46e	1.40e	1.23e	1.94e	2.26cd
$AG2-1$	R ₃₈ a	3.88ab	3.98a	3.14cde	2.55c	2.46bc	1.39d	1.65de	1.48de	1.95e	$2.08\mathrm{d}$
$AG2-2$	R22	3.48b	3.93a	2.86e	2.61c	2.61 _b	$2.66b$	1.80de	2.21c	2.73c	2.99b
$AG2-2$	R50	3.78ab	3.95a	3.04de	2.46с	2.05c	1.90c	1.84d	3.20b	1.71e	2.58c
AG4	R24	4.00a	4.00a	3.89a	3.64ab	4.00a	3.98a	3.44c	3.66a	3.26b	3.26b
AG4	R56	4.00a	4.00a	3.88a	3.63ab	4.00a	4.00a	3.71abc	3.81a	3.36b	3.24b
AG5	R36	1.63d	$2.08\mathrm{d}$	1.43g	$0.68\mathrm{e}$	0.61d	0.10f	0.18f	0.25f	0.58f	1.20e
AG5	R70	3.48b	3.25b	1.90f	1.51d	2.05c	2.89b	1.64de	1.78d	2.35d	2.35cd
$AG-E$	R92	3.99a	3.75a	3.69ab	3.74a	3.89a	3.94a	3.94a	4.00a	4.00a	4.00a
$AG-E$	R97	4.00a	3.79a	3.56abc	3.24b	3.88a	3.84a	3.51bc	3.94a	4.00a	4.00a
$AG-E$	R ₁₀₂	4.00a	3.85a	3.35bcd	3.85a	3.83a	3.83a	3.89ab	4.00a	4.00a	4.00a

Table 3. Host range of Rhizoctonia spp. and their effect on root rot severity.

Note: Data are the means of 2 trials \times 2 host cultivars/lines \times 4 replications. Means within a column followed by the same lowercase letter are not significantly different at P \leq 0.05 according to Duncan's new multiple range test.

 ${}^{a}B = (C, G, \text{ or } T); D = (A, G, \text{ or } T).$

(1) and soybean (3) in Brooks, one from cauliflower in Leduc, one from Alstroemeria sp. in Spruce Grove, one from lupin (Lupinus angustifolius L.) in Tofield, and one from soybean in Vauxhall. Twenty-three (32.9%) isolates were identified as AG4 of R. solani, which was the dominate AG in this study. All the isolates belonging to AG4 were isolated from the family of Leguminosae (including field pea, lupin and soybean) in various locations except one isolate from Echinacea sp. in Stettler. Another seven (10.0%) isolates were collected from soybean roots and identified as AG5. These isolates were from Brooks (3), Seven Persons (1) and Strathcona (3). Three isolates were identified as binucleate Rhizoctonia AG-E were also identified from fababean in Edmonton and soybean in Westlock. However, the anastomosis groups of a total of 20 isolates remained un-determined based on anastomosis reactions with the tester strains. These isolates were recovered from field pea, soybean and cauliflower at various locations.

Pathogenicity

Pathogenicity tests revealed that out of 70 isolates of Rhizoctonia isolates, 60 isolates were able to infect soybean ($DS \geq 0.5$), and 55 isolates were able to infect pea ($DS \geq 0.5$) ([Table 2](#page-5-0)). Among the 70 isolates tested on soybean, only six isolates (R24, R55, R56, R92a, R97b and R102) were highly aggressive (DS 3.2–4.0), 32 isolates were moderately aggressive (DS from 1.5 to 2.9), and 22 isolates were weakly aggressive on soybean (DS from 0.5 to 1.5) pathogenic. The other ten isolates were considered as non-aggressive (DS 0.0–0.4). On pea, 30 isolates were highly aggressive (DS from 3.2 to 4.0), 11 isolates were moderately aggressive (DS from 1.5 to 2.9), 13 isolates were weakly aggressive (DS from 0.5 to 1.5), and the other isolates were considered as non-aggressive (DS 0.0–0.5). Generally, the highly aggressive isolates significantly reduced seedling emergence, plant height, root and shoot biomass and increased the disease severity of both pea and soybean compared with the non-inoculated control.

Host range of Rhizoctonia

Ten plant species belonging to four families were infected [\(Table 3\)](#page-7-0). Plant species belonging to families of Brassicaceae (canola), Graminaceae (barley, corn and wheat), Leguminosae (faba bean, lentil, lupin, pea and soybean) and Linaceae (flax) produced typical symptoms of root rot.

Host range studies indicated that 11 of the Rhizoctonia isolates which belonged to R. solani AG2-1, AG2-2, AG4, AG5 and binucleate Rhizoctonia AG-E aggressively infected almost all the plant species ([Table 3](#page-7-0)). Preemergence damping-off, plant height and root and shoot biomass were recorded for the evaluation the aggressiveness (Data not shown). Root rot disease severity (DS) was also recorded at 21 d after inoculation.

Two isolates of AG4 (R24 and R56) were highly aggressive on canola and legume species (DS 3.2–4.0) and moderate aggressive on cereal species (1.0–2.8). The isolates of AG2-1 produced significantly different DS values on some species. The AG2-1 isolate R07 was highly aggressive on both canola cultivars (DS 4.0), moderately aggressive on flax, faba bean, lentil and soybean (DS 1.3–2.8), but less aggressive on the other plant species (0.5–1.4). The other isolate of AG2-1 (R38a) was more aggressive compared with R07 of AG2-1. R38a also was highly aggressive on both cultivars of canola (DS 4.0), faba bean (DS 3.9–4.0), flax (DS 3.3) and one cultivar of lentil (DS 3.1), moderately aggressive on another cultivar of lentil (DS 2.6), soybean (DS 2.0–2.1), lupin (DS 1.4–2.5), pea $(1.5–1.7)$, and one cultivar of barley (DS 1.7), corn (DS 1.6) and weakly aggressive on the other plant species (0.6–1.2). Two isolates of AG2-2 were highly aggressive on canola, flax, faba bean and lentil (DS 2.5–4.0), moderate aggressive on lupin, pea, soybean and barley (DS 1.7–3.2) and weakly aggressive on corn and wheat (DS 0.4–2.1). The isolates that belonged to AG5 varied in aggressiveness on different plant species. R70 of AG5 was highly aggressive on both cultivars of faba bean (DS 3.3–3.5) and moderately aggressive on both cultivars of corn (DS 1.8–1.9), flax (DS 1.8–2.5), lentil (DS 1.5–1.9), lupin (DS 2.1–2.9), pea (DS 1.6–1.8) and soybean (DS 2.4), but weakly aggressive on barley and wheat (DS 0.8–1.7). The other isolate of AG5 (R36) was moderately aggressive on corn cv. 'Alto' (DS 2.2), canola cv. '1950' (DS 1.8), flax cv. 'Prairie Thunder' (DS 2.3), two cultivars of faba bean (DS 1.6–2.1), and weakly aggressive on the other plant species (DS 0.1–1. 5). Three isolates of Rhizoctonia AG-E were highly aggressive on faba bean, lentil, lupin, pea and soybean (DS 3.2–4.0), moderately aggressive to canola, flax and the cereal crops (DS 1.6–3.7).

Sequence analysis of ITS regions

After alignment with the BioEdit program, the ITS fragments from 70 Rhizoctonia isolates were 690 bp in length. Nucleotide frequencies were $A = 0.2736$, $C = 0.2053$, $G = 0.1910$ and $T = 0.3301$. After alignment, the data optimal nucleotide substitution model was applied to the data

Fig. 1. Phylogenetic tree of Rhizoctonia isolates from soybean and other crops in Alberta were conducted using the neighbourjoining method based on ITS sequence data. Trees were rooted with R. zeae (KC620581). Bootstrap values, which are given on the branches, were based on 1000 replicates.

matrix. The best-fit model (TPM2uf+G) was selected using the program jModelTest 2.1.10 v 20160303 [\(Darriba et al.](#page-13-18) [2012](#page-13-18)). Then, a neighbour-joining (NJ) tree was produced

from the ITS sequence data, and the isolates were clustered into five groups (Groups I–V, [Fig. 1](#page-9-0)). Group I was composed of two AG2-1 isolates (R01 and R98), three AG2-2 isolates (R90, R104 and R100), six AG5 isolates (R09, R14b, R36, R19, R20 and R70) and one isolate that had undetermined AG grouping (R75), with a bootstrap value of 98. Group II consisted of three AG2-1 isolates (R07, R38a and R89), four AG2-2 isolates (R22, R117, R50 and R42), one AG4 isolate (R57) and three undetermined AG isolates (R124, R127 and R131), with a bootstrap value of 95. Group III was the largest group, which included one AG2-1 isolate (R32), two AG2-2 isolates (R08 and R113), 21 AG4 isolate, one isolate of AG5 (R06), three isolates of AG-E (R92, R97 and R102) and nine undetermined AG isolates with a bootstrap value of 63. Group IV included one AG2-1 isolate (R126), one AG2-2 isolate (R02), one AG4 isolate (R53) and six undetermined AG isolates, with a bootstrap value of 97. Only one undetermined AG isolate (R55) formed a separate clad as Group V.

ISSR analysis

Of the 100 primers tested, ten primers generated reproducible banding patterns and these were selected for ISSR-PCR ([Table 4\)](#page-8-0). A total of 64 bands were consistently produced in repeated amplifications using the DNA of the 70 Rhizoctonia isolates as templates. All of those bands were polymorphic. The gene frequency of those 54 loci ranged from 0.0143 to 0.9857, and the genetic diversity was 0.3013 ± 0.1697. The genetic distance of these isolates ranged from 0.0000 (between R02, R09, R11, R89, R91, R42, R71 and R104; and between R21a and R131) to 1.2809 (between R07 and R55). The phenetic relationships among the 70 Rhizoctonia isolates were illustrated in a dendrogram $(Fig. 2)$ $(Fig. 2)$. The isolates were clustered into four groups (Groups I–IV). Group I was composed of six isolates including two AG2-1 isolates (R01 and R98), two AG2-2 isolates (R100 and R117) and two undetermined AG isolates (R124 and R127). Group II included five AG2-1 isolates (R89, R32, R126, R08 and R07), six AG2-2 isolates, 16 AG4 isolate, six AG5 isolates, three AG-E isolates (R92, R97 and R102) and 12 undetermined AG isolates. In Group III, one isolate (R38a) belonged to AG-2-1, six isolates belonged to AG4 and the other eight were undetermined AG isolates. Group IV included only the undetermined isolate of R55.

Discussion

Rhizoctonia root rot has been reported as a common disease on soybean and pea in many countries and areas ([Hwang and Chang 1989;](#page-13-2) [Jones and Belmar 1989](#page-13-19); [Yang et al. 1990](#page-14-19); [Muyolo et al. 1993](#page-13-20); [Naito et al. 1995](#page-14-20); [Nelson et al. 1996;](#page-14-21) [Fenille et al. 2002](#page-13-21); [Ajayi-Oyetunde](#page-12-6) [and Bradley 2018](#page-12-6)). In the present study, a total of 70 Rhizoctonia isolates were recovered and some of the isolates were classified as R. solani AG2-1 (7 isolates), AG2-2 (10), AG4 (23), AG5 (7), binucleate Rhizoctonia AG-E (3), but the AG designation of 20 isolates was difficult to determine. Pathogenicity of all the isolates was tested on soybean and pea separately. The tests revealed that out of 70 Rhizoctonia isolates, 60 isolates were able to

infect soybean ($DS > 0.50$), and 55 isolates were able to infect pea ($DS > 0.50$).

Rhizoctonia solani AG2-1 has a broad host range that includes lupin, pea, soybean, canola, wheat, turf grass, potato, tomato, and the ornamental plant Matthiola incana ([Kataria and Verma 1992](#page-13-22); [Nicoletti et al. 1999](#page-14-22); [Hwang et al. 2007](#page-13-4); [Lehtonen et al. 2009](#page-13-23); [Zhou et al.](#page-15-1) [2009,](#page-15-1) [2014;](#page-15-2) [Broders et al. 2014](#page-12-7); [G](#page-13-24)ó[mez et al. 2015](#page-13-24); [Sharma-Poudyal et al. 2015](#page-14-23)). Seven isolates of R. solani AG2-1 were originally collected from dill (1), pea (1) and soybean (5) in the current study, and they were less aggressive on both pea and soybean except one isolate originally from soybean (R32), which was highly aggressive to both soybean and pea.

Rhizoctonia solani AG2-2 also has been reported to have a broad host range that includes beans, lupin, pea, soybean, canola, turf grass, potato, and sugar beet ([Kataria and Verma 1992](#page-13-22); [Engelkes and Windels 1996](#page-13-7); [Aoyagi et al. 1998](#page-12-8); [Lehtonen et al. 2009;](#page-13-23) [Zhou et al.](#page-15-1) [2009,](#page-15-1) [2014\)](#page-15-2). Ten isolates of R. solani AG2-2 in the current study were originally obtained from Alstroemeria (1), bean (1), cauliflower (1), dill (1), lupin (1), mint (1) and soybean (4). All the isolates were non-pathogenic or weakly pathogenic to soybean and pea except R08 (from soybean) and R90 (from Alstroemeria), which were highly and moderate aggressively on pea, respectively.

Rhizoctonia solani AG4 was reported to infect leguminous crops like pea, chickpea, lupin, and soybean ([Hwang et al. 2003,](#page-13-8) [2007;](#page-13-4) [Mathew et al. 2012;](#page-13-25) [Sharma-](#page-14-23)[Poudyal et al. 2015\)](#page-14-23). It also has been recovered from canola, potato, and wheat [\(Mathew et al. 2012;](#page-13-25) [Woodhall](#page-14-24) [et al. 2012](#page-14-24); [Zhou et al. 2014](#page-15-2); [Muzhinji et al. 2015\)](#page-13-26). Twenty-three isolates of R. solani were identified as AG4 making it the dominate AG in the current study. Most isolates were originally collected from leguminous crops including lupin (4), pea (3), and soybean (15). One isolate from Echinacea (R86) was recovered and identified as AG4. All the isolates except R57 (from soybean) and R86 (from Echinacea) were highly aggressive on pea and moderately aggressive on soybean.

Rhizoctonia solani AG5 were reported as pathogens of couch grass [Elymus repens (L.) Gould] ([Woodhall and](#page-14-25) [Lees 2004\)](#page-14-25), stem canker of buckwheat (Fagopyrum esculentum Moench) in Maine, USA ([Zhang et al. 2016\)](#page-14-26) and potato (Solanum tuberosum L.) in UK [\(Yang and Wu 2012](#page-14-27); [Muzhinji et al. 2015\)](#page-13-26), wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) in the UK, Turkey, Canada, and USA ([Woodhall et al. 2012](#page-14-24); [Broders et al. 2014\)](#page-12-7), soybean in Canada and USA [\(Nelson](#page-14-21) [et al. 1996](#page-14-21); [Zhao et al. 2005](#page-14-6)). In fact, R. solani AG5 was most frequently detected in the soil samples from Europe ([Goll et al. 2014](#page-13-27)). In Canada, R. solani AG5 isolates were isolated from soybean in Ontario ([Zhao et al. 2005](#page-14-6)) and from wheat in Alberta and Manitoba ([Broders et al.](#page-12-7) [2014\)](#page-12-7). In the current study, seven isolates of AG5 were originally isolated from soybean in Alberta. These isolates could infect, but were weakly aggressive on soybean and pea except for one isolate (R06), which was

Fig. 2. Phenetic tree of Rhizoctonia isolates from soybean and other crops was constructed using the POPGENE program based on ISSR analysis.

highly aggressive on pea. This appears to be the first report of AG5 from soybean in Alberta.

Three isolates identified as the binucleate Rhizoctonia AG-E were recovered from soybean (R92a) and faba bean (R97b and R102) in the current study. All these isolates were highly aggressive on pea and soybean. AG-E had been reported to infect bean [\(Demirci and Döken 1995\)](#page-13-28), soybean ([Ploetz et al. 1985;](#page-14-28) [Erper et al. 2011](#page-13-29)), but was considered to be moderately or weakly pathogenic.

In the current study, there were 20 Rhizoctonia isolates for which the AG designation could not be determined. These isolates were originally collected from cauliflower, pea, and soybean, whose aggressiveness on soybean and pea also varied. Four isolates (R10, R15, R55 and R151) were highly or moderately aggressive on soybean. The other isolates were non-pathogenic or weakly pathogenic on soybean. When tested on pea, five isolates (R10, R15, R55, R148 and R151) were highly aggressive, five isolates (R12, R14a, R27a, R77 and R88) appeared to be non-pathogenic and the others were weakly or moderately aggressive.

Generally, in Alberta, R. solani most commonly occurs as AG4, AG2-1, AG2-2 in pulse crops [\(Hwang et al. 2003](#page-13-8); [Chang et al. 2005](#page-12-9); [Zhou et al. 2009\)](#page-15-1), wheat, and canola ([Broders et al. 2014](#page-12-7); [Zhou et al. 2014](#page-15-2)), AG5 in wheat ([Broders et al. 2014\)](#page-12-7) and AG9 in soil samples ([Yang et al.](#page-14-29) [1996](#page-14-29)). Also, in pulse crops, AG4 isolates was the dominate AG and highly aggressive on host plants in Alberta ([Hwang et al. 2003](#page-13-8)). The findings of the current study support that AG4 was the dominate AG infecting leguminous crops and causing severe seedling blight and root rot disease.

From the host range study, isolates belonging to AG4 and AG-E were more aggressive than the isolates of other AGs. Isolates belonging to AG2-1 and AG2-2 were moderately aggressive on most host plant species and highly aggressive on canola and faba bean. Isolates of AG5 displayed the lowest aggressiveness to all the plant species except R70, which was highly aggressive on faba bean and moderately aggressive on soybean. From the eleven plant species, canola, faba bean, and flax were more susceptible while potato and wheat were highly resistant to the Rhizoctonia isolates.

To evaluate the genetic variation among all the Rhizoctonia isolates, sequencing and phylogenetic analysis of the ITS regions and the ISSR were used in the current study. Sequencing of ITS regions has been shown to be a reliable method to divide isolates of R. solani into distinct groups, corresponding to the different anastomosis groups ([Boysen et al. 1996](#page-12-5); [Kuninaga et al. 1997](#page-13-10); [Carling et al. 2002](#page-12-4)b). [Lehtonen et al. \(2008\)](#page-13-30) reported that differences in the ITS regions were sufficiently large to reliably differentiate the AGs, but the region could not be used to detect differences between isolates within the same AG. Based on the ITS sequences, all the isolates were clustered to five groups. Unfortunately, there was no delineation between AGs and the clades based on the sequence analysis. Because ISSR markers produced greater polymorphisms with greater reproducibility than RAPD ([Parsons et al. 1997](#page-14-30); [Chowdhury et al. 2002\)](#page-13-31), ISSR was used to analyze the genetic diversity of R. solani and binucleate Rhizoctonia AG-E ([Dubey et al. 2012](#page-13-12); [Zheng](#page-14-31) [et al. 2013;](#page-14-31) [Shu et al. 2014;](#page-14-32) [Zhou et al. 2014](#page-15-2)). Based on the ISSR analysis in the current study, four groups could be recognized, but there was no correlation between the AGs and the clades.

In summary, Rhizotonia was important pathogen, which restrains the production of soybean and pea in Alberta and Manitoba. AG4 was the dominate anastomosis group, followed by AG2-2, AG2-1, AG5 and AG-E, but the AG of 20 isolates could not be determined. Isolates belonged to AG4 were more aggressive on soybean and pea. The selected isolates belonging to AG4, AG2-1, AG2-2 and AG5 were able to infect common crops in Alberta which including barley, canola, corn, faba bean,

flax, lupin, lentil, pea, potato, soybean and wheat. AG4 isolates were more highly aggressive than the isolates of the other AGs. There was no correlation between AGs, location and host origin based on the ITS and ISSR analysis.

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by the Government of Canada through the Agri-Flex Program, Growing Forward 2, and Pest Management and Surveillance Implementation (Pulse Science Cluster of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada), and by the Saskatchewan Pulse Growers and Manitoba Pulse Growers Associations. We would also like to acknowledge the technical support provided by Heting Fu.

References

- Ajayi-Oyetunde, O.O., and Bradley, C.A. 2018. Rhizoctonia solani: taxonomy, population biology and management of rhizoctonia seedling disease of soybean. Plant Pathol. ⁶⁷: 3–17. doi[:10.1111/ppa.12733.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ppa.12733)
- Aoyagi, T., Kageyama, K., and Hyakumachi, M. 1998. Characterization and survival of Rhizoctonia solani AG2-2 LP associated with large patch disease of Zoysia grass. Plant Dis. ⁸²: 857–863.
- Boysen, M., Borja, M., del Moral, C., Salazar, O., and Rubio, V. 1996. Identification at strain level of Rhizoctonia solani AG-4 isolates by direct sequence of asymmetric PCR products of the ITS regions. Curr. Genet. ²⁹: 174–181. doi:[10.1007/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02221582) [BF02221582.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02221582) PMID[:8821665.](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8821665)
- Broders, K.D., Parker, M.L., Melzer, M.S., and Boland, G.J. 2014. Phylogenetic diversity of Rhizoctonia solani associated with canola and wheat in Alberta, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan. Plant Dis. ⁹⁸: 1695–1701. doi[:10.1094/PDIS-02-14-0146-RE.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-02-14-0146-RE) PMID:[30703878.](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30703878)
- Carling, D.E. 1996. Grouping of Rhizoctonia solani by hyphal anastomosis reaction. Pages 37–47 in B. Sneh, S. Jabaji-Hare, S. Neate, and G. Dijst, eds. Rhizoctonia species: taxonomy, molecular biology, ecology, pathology and disease control. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, MA, USA.
- Carling, D.E., Baird, R.E., Gitaitis, R.D., Brainard, K.A., and Kuninaga, S. 2002a. Characterization of AG-13, a newly reported anastomosis group of Rhizoctonia solani. Phytopathology, ⁹²: 893–899. doi:[10.1094/PHYTO.2002.92.8.893.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO.2002.92.8.893)
- Carling, D.E., Kuninaga, S., and Brainard, K.A. 2002b. Hyphal anastomosis reactions, rDNA-internal transcribed spacer sequences, and virulence levels among subsets of Rhizoctonia solani anastomosis group-2 (AG-2) and AG-BI. Phytopathology, ⁹²: 43–50. doi:[10.1094/PHYTO.2002.92.1.43.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO.2002.92.1.43)
- Çebi Kiliçoğlu, M., and Özkoç, İ. 2010. Molecular characterization of Rhizoctonia solani AG4 using PCR-RFLP of the rDNA-ITS region. Turk. J. Biol. ³⁴: 261–269.
- Ceresini, P.C., Shew, H.D., Vilgalys, R.J., and Cubeta, M.A. 2002. Genetic Diversity of Rhizoctonia solani AG-3 from potato n and tobacco in North Carolina. Mycologia, ⁹⁴: 437–449.
- Chang, K.F., Hwang, S.F., Gossen, B.D., Howard, R.J., Lopetinsky, K., and Olson, M. 2005. First report of Rhizoctonia solani AG-4 and AG-2-2 on Lupinus angustifolius in Canada. Plant Dis. 89: 685. doi[:10.1094/PD-89-0685C](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PD-89-0685C). PMID:[30795408.](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30795408)
- Chang, K.F., Hwang, S.F., Ahmed, H.U., Strelkov, S.E., Harding, M.W., Conner, R.L., et al. 2018. Disease reaction to Rhizoctonia solani and yield losses in soybean. Can. J. Plant Sci. ⁹⁸: 115–124. doi:[10.1139/cjps-2017-0053](http://dx.doi.org/10.1139/cjps-2017-0053).
- Chatterton, S., Bowness, R., and Harding, M.W. 2015. First report of root rot of field pea caused by Aphanomyces euteiches in Alberta, Canada. Plant Dis. 99: 288. doi[:10.1094/PDIS-09-14-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-09-14-0905-PDN) [0905-PDN](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-09-14-0905-PDN). PMID:[30699595.](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30699595)
- Chowdhury, M.A., Vandenberg, B., and Warkentin, T. 2002. Cultivar identification and genetic relationship among selected breeding lines and cultivars in chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.). Euphytica, ¹²⁷: 317–325.
- Cubeta, M.A., Echandi, E., Abernethy, T., and Vilgalys, R. 1991. Characterization of anastomosis groups of binucleate Rhizoctonia species using restriction analysis of an amplified ribosomal RNA gene. Phytopathology, ⁸¹: 1395–1400. doi[:10.1094/Phyto-81-1395](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/Phyto-81-1395).
- Cubeta, M.A., and Vilgalys, R. 1997. Population biology of the Rhizoctonia solani complex. Phytopathology, ⁸⁷: 480–484.
- Darriba, D., Taboada, G.L., Doallo, R., and Posada, D. 2012. jModelTest 2: more models, new heuristics and parallel computing. Nat. Methods, 9(8): 772. doi:[10.1038/nmeth.2109.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2109) PMID:[22847109.](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22847109)
- Demirci, E., and Döken, M.T. 1995. Anastomosis groups of Rhizoctonia solani Kühn and binucleate Rhizoctonia isolates from various crops in Türkiye. J. Turk. Phytopathol. 24: ⁵⁷–62.
- Doyle, J.J., and Doyle, J.L. 1987. A rapid DNA isolation procedure for small quantities of fresh leaf tissue. Phytochem. Bull. 19: ¹¹–15.
- Dubey, S.C., Tripathi, A., and Upadhyay, B.K. 2012. Molecular diversity analysis of Rhizoctonia solani isolates infecting various pulse crops in different agro-ecological regions of India. Folia Microbiol. ⁵⁷(6): 513–524. doi[:10.1007/s12223-012-0165-y.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12223-012-0165-y) PMID:[22653790.](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22653790)
- Engelkes, C.A., and Windels, C.E. 1996. Susceptibility of sugar beet and beans to Rhizoctonia solani AG-2-2 IIIB and AG-2-2 IV. Plant Dis. ⁸⁰(12): 1413–1417. doi:[10.1094/PD-80-1413.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PD-80-1413)
- Erper, I., Ozkoc, I., and Karaca, G.H. 2011. Identification and pathogenicity of Rhizoctonia species isolated from bean and soybean plants in Samsun, Turkey. Arch. Phytopathol. Plant Prot. ⁴⁴(1): 78–84. doi:[10.1080/03235400903395427.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03235400903395427)
- Fenille, R.C., de Souza, N.L., and Kuramae, E.E. 2002. Characterization of Rhizoctonia solani associated with soybean in Brazil. Eur. J. Plant Pathol. ¹⁰⁸: 783–792. doi[:10.1023/A:](http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1020811019189) [1020811019189.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1020811019189)
- Gabruch, M., and Gietz, R. 2014. The potential for soybeans in Alberta. [Online]. Available from [https://www1.agric.gov.ab.ca/](https://www1.agric.gov.ab.ca/%24department/deptdocs.nsf/all/bus15100/%24file/soybeans-1.pdf?OpenElement) [\\$department/deptdocs.nsf/all/bus15100/\\$file/soybeans-1.pdf?](https://www1.agric.gov.ab.ca/%24department/deptdocs.nsf/all/bus15100/%24file/soybeans-1.pdf?OpenElement) [OpenElement](https://www1.agric.gov.ab.ca/%24department/deptdocs.nsf/all/bus15100/%24file/soybeans-1.pdf?OpenElement).
- Goll, M.B., Schade-Schutze, A., Swarta, G., Oostendorpa, M., Schotta, J.J., Jaserb, B., and Felsenstein, F.G. 2014. Survey on the prevalence of Rhizoctonia spp. in European soils and determination of the baseline sensitivity towards sedaxane. Plant Pathol. 63: 148-154. doi[:10.1111/ppa.12063.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ppa.12063)
- Gómez, L., Valdeolmillos, E.S., Perkins, K., Henderson, D., Barnes, A.V., and Woodhall, J.W. 2015. First report of Rhizoctonia solani AG2-1 on Matthiola incana in the United Kingdom. New Dis. Rep. 32: 11. doi:[10.5197/j.2044-0588.2015.](http://dx.doi.org/10.5197/j.2044-0588.2015.032.011) [032.011.](http://dx.doi.org/10.5197/j.2044-0588.2015.032.011)
- Gossen, B.D., Conner, R.L., Chang, K.F., Pasche, J.S., McLaren, D.L., Henriquez, M.A., et al. 2016. Identifying and managing root rot of pulses on the northern Great Plains. Plant Dis. 100: ¹⁹⁶⁵–1978. doi[:10.1094/PDIS-02-16-0184-FE.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-02-16-0184-FE) PMID[:30683014.](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30683014)
- Hall, T.A. 1999. BioEdit: a user-friendly biological sequence alignment editor and analysis program for Windows 95/98/ NT. Nucleic Acids Symp. Ser. ⁴¹: 95–98.
- Hwang, S.F., and Chang, K.F. 1989. Incidence and severity of root rot disease complex of field pea in northeastern Alberta in 1988. Can. Plant Dis. Surv. ⁶⁹: 139–141.
- Hwang, S.F., Gossen, B.D., Chang, K.F., Turnbull, G.D., Howard, R.J., and Blade, S.F. 2003. Etiology, impact and control of

Rhizoctonia seedling blight and root rot of chickpea on the Canadian prairies. Can. J. Plant Sci. ⁸³: 959–967. doi:[10.4141/](http://dx.doi.org/10.4141/P02-165) [P02-165.](http://dx.doi.org/10.4141/P02-165)

- Hwang, S.F., Gossen, B.D., Conner, R.L., Chang, K.F., Turnbull, G.D., Lopetinsky, K., and Howard, R.J. 2007. Management strategies to reduce losses caused by Rhizoctonia seedling blight of field pea. Can. J. Plant Sci. ⁸⁷: 145–155. doi[:10.4141/](http://dx.doi.org/10.4141/P04-172) [P04-172.](http://dx.doi.org/10.4141/P04-172)
- Jones, R.K., and Belmar, S.B. 1989. Characterization and pathogenicity of Rhizoctonia spp. isolated from rice, soybean and other crops grown in rotation with rice in Texas. Plant Dis. ⁷³: 1004–1010.
- Justesen, A.F., Yohalem, D., Bay, A., and Nicolaisen, M. 2003. Genetic diversity in potato field populations of Thanatephorus cucumeris AG-3, revealed by ITS polymorphism and RAPD markers. Mycol. Res. ¹⁰⁷: 1323–1331. doi:[10.1017/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0953756203008517) [S0953756203008517.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0953756203008517) PMID:[15000234](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15000234).
- Kataria, H.R., and Verma, P.R. 1992. Rhizoctonia solani damping off and root rot in oilseed rape and canola. Crop Prot. 11: ⁸–13.
- Khodayari, M., Safaie, N., and Shamsbakhsh, M. 2009. Genetic diversity of Iranian AG1-IA isolates of Rhizoctonia solani, the cause of rice sheath blight, using morphological and molecular markers. J. Phytophatol. ¹⁵⁷: 708–714. doi[:10.1111/j.1439-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0434.2009.01541.x) [0434.2009.01541.x](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0434.2009.01541.x).
- Kuninaga, S., Natsuaki, T., Takeuchi, T., and Yokosawa, R. 1997. Sequence variation of the rDNA ITS regions within and between anastomosis groups in Rhizoctonia solani. Curr. Genet. ³²: 237–243. doi:[10.1007/s002940050272.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s002940050272) PMID:[9339350](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9339350).
- Lehtonen, M.J., Ahvenniemi, P., Wilson, P.S., German-Kinnari, M., and Valkonen, J.P.T. 2008. Biological diversity of Rhizoctonia solani (AG-3) in a northern potato-cultivation environment in Finland. Plant Pathol. ⁵⁷: 141–151. doi:[10.1111/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3059.2007.01694.x) [j.1365-3059.2007.01694.x.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3059.2007.01694.x)
- Lehtonen, M.J., Wilson, P.S., Ahvenniemi, P., and Valkonen, J.P.T. 2009. Formation of canker lesions on stems and black scurf on tubers in experimentally inoculated potato plants by isolates of AG2-1, AG3 and AG5 of Rhizoctonia solani: a pilot study and literature review. Agric. Food Sci. ¹⁸: 223–233. doi[:10.2137/145960609790059415.](http://dx.doi.org/10.2137/145960609790059415)
- Masuda, T., and Goldsmith, P.D. 2009. World soybean production: area harvested, yield, and long-term projections. Int. Food and Agribus. Manage. Rev. ¹²: 143–162.
- McLaren, D.L., Henriquez, M.A., Conner, R.L., Chang, K.F., Henderson, T.L., Penner, W.C., and Kerley, T.J. 2015. Soybean root rot and Phytophthora root rot in Manitoba in 2014. Can. Plant Dis. Surv. ⁹⁵: 180–181.
- Mathew, F.M., Lamppa, R.S., Chittem, K., Chang, Y.W., Botschner, M., Kinzer, K., et al. 2012. Characterization and pathogenicity of Rhizoctonia solani isolates affecting Pisum sativum in North Dakota. Plant Dis. ⁹⁶: 666–672. doi:[10.1094/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-02-11-0087) [PDIS-02-11-0087.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-02-11-0087) PMID:[30727512](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30727512).
- Mirmajlessi, S.M., Safaie, N., Mostafavi, H.A., and Mahmoudy, S.B. 2012. Genetic diversity among crown and root rot isolates of Rhizoctonia solani isolated from cucurbits using PCRbased techniques. Afr. J. Agr. Res. ⁷: 583–590. doi:[10.5897/](http://dx.doi.org/10.5897/AJAR11.1453) [AJAR11.1453.](http://dx.doi.org/10.5897/AJAR11.1453)
- Muyolo, N.G., Lipps, P.E., and Schmitthenner, A.F. 1993. Anastomosis grouping and variation in virulence among isolates of Rhizoctonia solani associated with dry bean and soybean in Ohio and Zaire. Phytopathology, ⁸³: 438–444. doi[:10.1094/Phyto-83-438.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/Phyto-83-438)
- Muzhinji, N., Truter, M., Woodhall, J.W., and van der Waals, J.E. 2015. Anastomosis groups and pathogenicity of Rhizoctonia solani and binucleate Rhizoctonia from potato in South Africa. Plant Dis. ⁹⁹: 1790–1802. doi[:10.1094/PDIS-02-15-0236-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-02-15-0236-RE) [RE](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-02-15-0236-RE). PMID:[30699508.](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30699508)
- Naito, S., Mochida, H., Nakajima, T., and Ohto, Y. 1995. Infection with basidiospores of Thanatephorus cucumeris (AG-2-3 of Rhizoctonia solani) and development of soybean foliar blight lesions. Ann. Phytopathol. Soc. Jpn. ⁶¹: 362–368. doi[:10.3186/](http://dx.doi.org/10.3186/jjphytopath.61.362) [jjphytopath.61.362.](http://dx.doi.org/10.3186/jjphytopath.61.362)
- Nelson, B., Helms, T., Christianson, T., and Kural, I. 1996. Characterization and pathogenicity of Rhizoctonia from soybean. Plant Dis. ⁸⁰: 74–80. doi:[10.1094/PD-80-0074.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PD-80-0074)
- Nicoletti, R., Lahoz, E., Kanematsu, S., Naito, S., and Contillo, R. 1999. Characterization of Rhizoctonia solani isolates from tobacco fields related to anastomosis groups 2-1 and BI (AG 2-1 and AG BI). J. Phytopathol. ¹⁴⁷: 71–77. doi:[10.1111/j.1439-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0434.1999.tb03810.x) [0434.1999.tb03810.x.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0434.1999.tb03810.x)
- Nyandoro, R., Chang, K.F., Hwang, S.F., Strelkov, S.E., Turnbull, G.D., Howard, R.J., et al. 2014. The occurrence of soybean root rot in southern Alberta, Canada in 2013. Can. Plant Dis. Surv. ⁹⁴: 198–200.
- Nyandoro, R., Chang, K.F., Hwang, S.F., Ahmed, H., Strelkov, S.E., Turnbull, G.D., and Harding, M.W. 2015. The occurrence of soybean root rot in southern Alberta in 2014. Can. Plant Dis. Surv. ⁹⁵: 182–184.
- Nyandoro, R., Li, N., Chang, K.F., Hwang, S.F., Akter, I., Ahmed, H.U., et al. 2017. The occurrence of soybean root rot in southern Alberta in 2016. Can. Plant Dis. Surv. ⁹⁷: 210–213.
- Page, R.D.M. 1996. TreeView: an application to display phylogenetic trees on personal computers. Comput. Appl. Biosci. 12: ³⁵⁷–358. doi[:10.1093/bioinformatics/12.4.357.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/12.4.357) PMID:[8902363.](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8902363)
- Parsons, B.J., Newbury, H.J., Jackson, M.T., and Ford-Lloyd, B.V. 1997. Contrasting genetic diversity relationships are revealed in rice (Oryza sativa L.) using different marker types. Mol. Breeding, ³: 115–125.
- Pesticide Risk Reduction Program. 2008. Crop profile for field pea in Canada. Pest Management Centre, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada. [Online]. Available from [http://publications.](http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2009/agr/A118-10-3-2009E.pdf) [gc.ca/collections/collection_2009/agr/A118-10-3-2009E.pdf.](http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2009/agr/A118-10-3-2009E.pdf)
- Ploetz, R.C., Mitchell, D.J., and Gallaher, R.N. 1985. Characterization and pathogenicity of Rhizoctonia species from a reduced-tillage experiment multicropped to rye and soybean in Florida. Phytopathology, ⁷⁵: 833–839. doi:[10.1094/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/Phyto-75-833) [Phyto-75-833.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/Phyto-75-833)
- Rosewich, U.L., Pettway, R.E., McDonald, B.A., and Kistler, H.C. 1999. High levels of gene flow and heterozygote excess characterize Rhizoctonia solani AG-1 IA (Thanatephorus cucumeris) from Texas. Fungal Genet. Biol. ²⁸: 148–159.
- Saitou, N., and Nei, M. 1987. The neighbor-joining method: a new method for reconstructing phylogenetic trees. Mol. Biol. Evol. ⁴: 406–425. doi[:10.1093/oxfordjournals.molbev.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.molbev.a040454) [a040454.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.molbev.a040454) PMID[:3447015.](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3447015)
- Sharma, M., Gupta, S.K., and Sharma, T.R. 2005. Characterization of variability in Rhizoctonia solani by using morphological and molecular markers. J. Phytopathol. ¹⁵³: 449–456. doi[:10.1111/j.1439-0434.2005.01000.x](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0434.2005.01000.x).
- Sharma-Poudyal, D., Paulitz, T.C., Porter, L.D., and du Toit, L.J. 2015. Characterization and pathogenicity of Rhizoctonia and Rhizoctonia-like spp. from pea crops in the Columbia basin of Oregon and Washington. Plant Dis. ⁹⁹: 604–613. doi[:10.1094/PDIS-08-14-0803-RE](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-08-14-0803-RE). PMID:[30699678.](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30699678)
- Shu, C.W., Zou, C.J., Chen, J.L., Tang, F., Yi, R.H., and Zhou, E.X. 2014. Genetic diversity and population structure of Rhizoctonia solani AG-1 IA, the causal agent of rice sheath blight, in South China. Can. J. Plant Pathol. ³⁶(2): 179–186. doi[:10.1080/07060661.2014.913685.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07060661.2014.913685)
- Sneh, B., Burpee, L., and Ogoshi, A. 1991. Identification of Rhizoctonia species. American Phytopathological Press, St. Paul, MN, USA. 133 pp.
- Sneh, B., Jabaji-Hare, S., Neate, S., and Dijst, G. 1996. Rhizoctonia species: taxonomy, molecular biology, ecology, pathology, and disease control. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, the Netherlands. 578 pp.
- Stodart, B.J., Harvey, P.R., Neate, S.M., Melanson, D.L., and Scott, E.S. 2007. Genetic variation and pathogenicity of anastomosis group 2 isolates of Rhizoctonia solani in Australia. Mycol. Res. ¹¹¹: 891–900. doi:[10.1016/j.mycres.2007.05.008](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mycres.2007.05.008). PMID[:17707626.](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17707626)
- Swofford, D.L. 2002. PAUP: phylogenetic analysis using parsimony (and other methods). Version 4.0b10. Sinauer, Sunderland, MA, USA.
- Taheri, P., Gnanamanickam, S., and Höfte, M. 2007. Characterization, genetic structure, and pathogenicity of Rhizoctonia spp. associated with rice sheath diseases in India. Phytopathology, ⁹⁷: 373–383. doi[:10.1094/PHYTO-97-3-0373.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO-97-3-0373)
- White, T.J., Bruns, T., Lee, S., and Taylor, J. 1990. Amplification and direct sequencing of fungal ribosomal RNA genes for phylogenetics. Pages 315–322 in M.A. Innis, D.H. Gelfand, J.J. Sninsky, and T.J. White, eds. PCR protocols: a guide to methods and amplifications. Academic Press, New York, NY, USA.
- Woodhall, J.W., and Lees, A.K. 2004. First report of Rhizoctonia solani anastomosis group 5 (AG5) on couch grass in Britain. Plant Pathol. 53: 538. doi[:10.1111/j.1365-3059.2004.01041.x](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3059.2004.01041.x).
- Woodhall, J.W., Laurenson, L., and Peters, J.C. 2012. First report of Rhizoctonia solani anastomosis group 5 (AG5) in wheat in the UK. New Dis. Rep. 26: 9. doi[:10.5197/j.2044-0588.2012.026.](http://dx.doi.org/10.5197/j.2044-0588.2012.026.009) [009.](http://dx.doi.org/10.5197/j.2044-0588.2012.026.009)
- Xi, K., Stephens, J.H.G., and Hwang, S.F. 1995. Dynamics of pea seed infection by Pythium ultimum and Rhizoctonia solani: effects of inoculum density and temperature on seed rot and preemergence damping-off. Can. J. Plant Pathol. 17: ¹⁹–24. doi[:10.1080/07060669509500715.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07060669509500715)
- Xue, A.G. 2003. Biological control of pathogens causing root rot complex in field pea using Clonostachys rosea Strain ACM941. Phytopathology, ⁹³(3): 329–335. doi:[10.1094/PHYTO.2003.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO.2003.93.3.329) [93.3.329.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO.2003.93.3.329) PMID:[18944343.](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18944343)
- Xue, A.G., Cober, E., Morrison, M.J., Voldeng, H.D., and Ma, B.L. 2007. Effect of seed treatments on emergence, yield, and root rot severity of soybean under Rhizoctonia solani inoculated field conditions in Ontario. Can. J. Plant Sci. ⁸⁷: 167–174. doi[:10.4141/P05-192.](http://dx.doi.org/10.4141/P05-192)
- Yang, J., Kharbanda, P.D., Wang, H., and McAndrew, D.W. 1996. Characterization, virulence, and genetic variation of Rhizoctonia solani AG-9 in Alberta. Plant Dis. ⁸⁰: 513–518. doi[:10.1094/PD-80-0513.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PD-80-0513)
- Yang, X.B., Berggren, G.T., and Snow, J.P. 1990. Types of Rhizoctonia foliar blight on soybean in Louisiana. Plant Dis. ⁷⁴: 501–504. doi[:10.1094/PD-74-0501.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PD-74-0501)
- Yang, Y., and Wu, X. 2012. First report of potato stem canker caused by Rhizoctonia solani AG-5 in China. Plant Dis. 96: 1579. doi[:10.1094/PDIS-04-12-0388-PDN](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-04-12-0388-PDN). PMID:[30727329.](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30727329)
- Yeh, F.C., and Boyle, T.J.B. 1997. Population genetic analysis of codominant and dominant markers and quantitative traits. Belg. J. Bot. ¹²⁹: 157–163.
- Zhang, X.Y., Zhang, X.M., Jiang, H.H., and Hao, J.J. 2016. First report of Rhizoctonia solani AG-5 causing stem canker on buckwheat in Maine. Plant Dis. 100(6): 1241. doi:[10.1094/PDIS-09-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-09-15-1060-PDN) [15-1060-PDN.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-09-15-1060-PDN)
- Zhao, G., Ablett, G.R., Anderson, T.R., Rajcan, I., and Schaafsma, A.W. 2005. Anastomosis groups of Rhizoctonia solani associated with soybean root and hypocotyl rot in Ontario and resistance of accession PI 442031 to different anastomosis groups. Can. J. Plant Pathol. ²⁷(1): 108–117. doi:[10.1080/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07060660509507201) [07060660509507201.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07060660509507201)
- Zheng, L., Shi, F., and Hsiang, T. 2013. Genetic structure of a population of Rhizoctonia solani AG 2-2 IIIB from Agrostis

stolonifera revealed by inter-simple sequence repeat (ISSR) markers. Can. J. Plant Pathol. ³⁵(4): 476–481. doi[:10.1080/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07060661.2013.830148) [07060661.2013.830148.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07060661.2013.830148)

- Zhou, Q., Chang, K.F., Hwang, S.F., Strelkov, S.E., Gossen, B.D., and Chen, Y.Y. 2009. Pathogenicity and genetic diversity of Rhizoctonia solani isolates from lupin and other crops in Alberta, Canada. Can. J. Plant Pathol. ³¹: 340–347. doi[:10.1080/07060660909507608](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07060660909507608).
- Zhou, Q., Hwang, S.F., Fu, H., Strelkov, S.E., and Gossen, B.D. 2014. Genetic variation of Rhizoctonia solani isolates from canola in Alberta, Canada. Can. J. Plant Sci. ⁹⁴: 671–681. doi[:10.4141/cjps2012-114](http://dx.doi.org/10.4141/cjps2012-114).
- Zhou, Q., Li, N., Chang, K.F., Hwang, S.F., Strelkov, S.E., Conner, R.L., et al. 2018. Genetic diversity and aggressiveness of Fusarium species isolated from soybean in Alberta, Canada. Crop Prot. ¹⁰⁵: 49–58. doi[:10.1016/j.cropro.2017.11.005.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2017.11.005)