

# DEVELOPING SUSTAINABLE SYSTEMS FOR NEMATODE MANAGEMENT

*Kenneth R. Barker and Stephen R. Koenning*

Plant Pathology Department, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina  
27695-7616; e-mail: kenneth\_barker@ncsu.edu

KEY WORDS: biological control, cropping systems, cultural practices, food webs, induced host  
resistance

---

## ABSTRACT

Early researchers identified key concepts and developed tactics for multiple-option management of nematodes. Although the emphasis on integrated pest management over the past three decades has promoted strategies and tactics for nematode management, comprehensive studies on the related soil biology-ecology are relatively recent. Traditional management tactics include host resistance (where available), cultural tactics such as rotation with nonhosts, sanitation and avoidance, and destruction of residual crop roots, and the judicious use of nematicides. There have been advances in biological control of nematodes, but field-scale exploitation of this tactic remains to be realized. New technologies and resources are currently becoming central to the development of sustainable systems for nematode-pest-crop management: molecular diagnostics for nematode identification, genetic engineering for host resistance, and the elucidation and application of soil biology for general integrated cropping systems. The latter strategy includes the use of nematode-pest antagonistic cover crops, animal wastes, and limited tillage practices that favor growth-promoting rhizobacteria, earthworms, predatory mites, and other beneficial organisms while suppressing parasitic nematodes and other plant pathogens. Certain rhizobacteria may induce systemic host resistance to nematodes and, in some instances, to foliage pathogens. The systems focusing on soil biology hold great promise for sustainable crop-nematode management, but only a few research programs are currently involved in this labor-intensive endeavor.

---

## INTRODUCTION

There is an extensive literature on the management of plant-parasitic nematodes, their management in sustainable and subsistence agriculture (28), and current options for their management (54, 55). This review, however, focuses on developing strategies and the tactics available for nematode management in intensive agriculture, soil biology-based sustainable and conventional production systems. We plan to follow the operational definitions of sustainable agriculture offered by Benbrook (16); "Sustainable agriculture is the production of food and fiber used in a system that increases the inherent productive capacity of natural and biological resources in step with demand. At the same time, it must allow farmers to earn adequate profits, provide consumers with wholesome, safe food, and minimize adverse impacts on the environment." Sustainable agriculture aims to avoid depletions or losses of the earth's resources, while also rebuilding the reproductive capacity of agricultural soils (41). In contrast, conventional agriculture encompasses the practices, methods, and systems predominant within a given region, although these practices may vary over time and according to soil, climate, and other environmental factors (16). Although the goal of sustaining any production system can be questioned, even conventional practices may be fully sustainable when deployed properly, and they will continue to play important roles in food and fiber production in the future (16). A sustainable agricultural system must meet human needs without incurring long-term damage to the natural resources (125).

Expanding world population and pressure for improved living standards are the impetus to increased agricultural productivity. Intensively managed agroecosystems presently produce more than adequate food and fiber supplies needed in industrial societies with only about 2% of the populace being employed in agricultural production. This high productivity and related inputs for cereals and potato in developed countries contrasts sharply with the subsistence agriculture common in most developing countries (Figure 1) (28, 125), where the greater portion of the world's population lives. The shift from subsistence to intensive agriculture occurred through the application of new technology and exploitation of biotic and abiotic natural resources. Many improvements in productivity are attributable to increased inputs of energy (Figure 2), largely in the form of chemical energy used for mechanization, irrigation, fertilizers, and pesticides. The expenditure of chemical energy is generally viewed as underpinning the stability of intensive agroecosystems (183, 184). Selection of plant populations for agroecosystems has resulted in greater uniformity, and consequently a narrowing in the genetic base of some crop species (30, 75, 184). Recognition of the fact that Earth's resources are finite has raised concern about the stability and sustainability of our agricultural systems (183). Furthermore,




Figure 1 Comparative cereal yields from seven countries and predicted yield from levels of pesticides used in cropping systems (55) and potato yields from the selected countries and predicted yield based on potash consumption/unit land within a country for 1994 [data from *FAO Production Yearbook*, Vol. 48 (1994) and *Fertilizer Yearbook*, Vol. 44 (1994)].




Figure 2 Comparative components of subsistence and intensive agroecosystems.

Annu. Rev. Phytopathol. 1998.36:165-205. Downloaded from arjournals.annualreviews.org by Universidad de Costa Rica on 03/24/08. For personal use only.

there is widespread apprehension that many practices utilized in intensive systems contribute to environmental degradation.

The new information and technology forthcoming from research programs involving the genetic engineering of crop plants and microorganisms, ecology, and soil biology-based integrated crop and pest management should contribute to the goals of sustainability of crop-pest management (128). The striking promise for new strategies and tactics for nematode management likely to be deployed during the next decade is in sharp contrast to the lack of change in existing management methods to prevent losses caused by plant-parasitic nematodes (54). However, emerging technologies coupled with concurrent loss of effective and economic nematicides should accelerate change. New strategies and tactics must focus on systems for managing nematodes that minimize the use of energy-intensive technologies, increase the productivity of agroecosystems, and yet enhance the durability of our genetic resources.

The relationships between plant-parasitic nematodes, their hosts, and environment vary greatly with nematode-host combination, geographic region, and given field characteristics. In addition to the direct effects of environment on nematode-host interactions, the expression of host resistance can be influenced by temperature. Root-knot-resistant bean, tomato, tobacco, and other crops may support nematode reproduction at an elevated temperature of 28°C or greater (114). Plant-parasitic nematodes also often limit crop productivity by predisposing plants to attack by fungi and/or bacteria and by serving as vectors of a number of plant viruses (1). In general, the initial numbers of nematodes present when an annual crop is established are inversely related to crop yield for that year, but this relationship is more complex with perennial crops (17, 55). Also, total abundance of nematodes, including beneficial species and the trophic-group structure, may be positively related to the productivity of some pasture/grass ecosystems (177).

Yield losses worldwide to plant-parasitic nematodes have been estimated to range from 5% to 12% annually (143). These losses, however, are influenced greatly by both the production systems and management options utilized. For example, small-scale and subsistence farmers often use traditional management methods that may prevent the build-up of damaging nematode populations; the development of a serious nematode problem is a warning that this farming system has become unsustainable (28). Bridge (28) states that the overriding principle sustaining traditional and subsistence agriculture is that the operational systems were designed to conserve the essential goodness of the land, including beneficial organisms. Long-term monoculture in Poland, in contrast to rotations, resulted in yield losses up to 60–70% or more when population densities of damaging parasitic nematodes were present (185). Yield losses incurred in

*Globodera rostochiensis*–susceptible potato averaged 38% (12–76%), as compared to 18.3% (12–34%) in resistant potato. Losses were high in fiber flax (43–78%) and field bean (25–61%) under monoculture, whereas winter rape (–31–17%) and maize (0–18%) were more tolerant. In addition to plant-parasitic nematodes, the presence of inhibitory compounds, shifts in weed communities, and the general condition of the crop were related, in part, to these yield losses. The continuous production of susceptible crops in the sandy soils of the southeastern coastal plains of the United States and other similar regions also often result in devastating losses to nematodes, especially *Meloidogyne* and *Heterodera* species.

The rapid growth in world population and expansion of global trade are making sustainable crop and pest management systems and related pest quarantines increasingly important. Although nematode reproduction and survival are dependent upon a suitable soil type, presence of a host plant, temperature, and soil moisture (117, 159), increased shipment of equipment and agricultural products will likely result in new infestations of diverse nematode species in many regions of the world. In the United States, federally mandated quarantines apparently have succeeded in restricting the spread of the potato cyst nematodes, *Globodera* spp., but were unsuccessful in limiting the dispersal of the soybean cyst nematode, *Heterodera glycines*. Currently, European Union members and other countries regulate various agricultural and forest products, including the importation of pine and other coniferous logs, chips, and sawn wood. The regulation on coniferous timber is to protect their forests from the insect-vectored pinewood nematode, *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* (56).

## SYNOPSIS OF STRATEGIES/TACTICS FOR NEMATODE MANAGEMENT

### *Historical*

Early nematologists provided an exceptionally strong conceptual framework for the development of advanced, integrated pest management (IPM) systems for plant-parasitic nematodes. In 1889, Atkinson (6) discussed a range of tactics for nematode management that are surprisingly similar to those available today: sterilization of soil by starvation, including the use of nonhost plants, the potential of trap crops, compost, nematicides, and soil amendments such as hardwood ashes and potash. The early work of Cobb (37) on sampling nematode communities provided a basis for the development of improved tactics and strategies essential for integrated nematode-pest management. Tyler, in 1933, offered recommendations for monitoring root-knot nematodes as well

as for their management (162); "A well-planned combination of practices will go much further for controlling nematodes than any of the recommended treatments alone." She further indicated that the presence of nematodes (root-knot) in any soil can be determined by examining the roots of susceptible plants that have been growing for at least 3 weeks in warm, moist conditions. For attempted eradication of root-knot nematodes, she suggested the following: (a) burning crop residues two or three times if possible, each preceded by a spading or plowing; (b) dry fallowing, frequent plowing; (c) one or more well-irrigated trap crops completely destroyed 2 or 3 weeks after sprouting; (d) moist fallow during warm weather, without weeds; (e) resistant crops in rotation, kept free of weeds; and (f) repetition of (d) and (e). Tyler (162) also emphasized that root-knot nematodes enhanced the susceptibility of crops to such other diseases as cotton wilt, black shank of tobacco, and *Rhizoctonia* disease of peanuts. These strategies/tactics were based, in part, on much earlier recommendations offered by Atkinson (6) in 1889 and Bessey (18) in 1911.

The specific concepts of integrated pest management (IPM) are a relatively recent development in pest control (19). The principles of IPM have been extensively reviewed (19, 54, 55, 172), and therefore are not discussed in detail here. Three key facets on which IPM is based include (a) determining how the biology of a pest must be modified to reduce its density; (b) combining current technology with biological knowledge to effect modifications; and (c) developing new or improved technologies for control that are compatible with economic circumstances and environmental requirements (54). Over the past two decades, IPM has been incorporated into low-input sustainable agriculture (LISA), alternative agriculture, integrated management or farming, and now sustainable agriculture (19, 21, 41, 57, 90, 186). [For discussion on currently available strategies and tactics for nematode management, related nematode-population and nematode-host response models, interested readers are referred to Duncan & Noling (54, 55).]

### *Strategies/Tactics*

For an operational framework, IPM may be divided into several components: biological monitoring, environmental monitoring, decision-making, the decision-support system, the decision, procedure implementation, and the system (19). In this framework, primary strategies for nematode management include exclusion-avoidance, reduction of initial population numbers, suppression of nematode reproduction, and restriction of current and/or future crop damage (Table 1). Most of these strategies and tactics can be related to Vanderplank's (164) epidemiological parameters  $r$  (the reproductive rate of the pathogen or rate of disease increase) and  $x$  (the initial amount of disease or, in the case of nematodes, initial inoculum level or  $P_i$ ).

**Table 1** Relative efficacy of nematode- and crop-management strategies and tactics<sup>a</sup>

Strategy <sup>b</sup>	Tactic	Relative efficacy*
1. Exclusion-avoidance	<u>Quarantine</u>	M–H
2. Reduce initial population density	(a) <u>Eliminate established foci</u>	L–M
	(b) <u>Cultural</u>	
	Use of clean planting stock	H
	Crop rotation	L–H
	Inter- and intracropping	L–M
	Cover/trap crops (and antagonistic plants)	L–M
	Soil amendments	L–M
	Fallow or grass fallows (weed-free)	L–H
	Timing of planting/harvesting	L–M
	Farm hygiene and general culture	M–H
	Weed-host control	
	(c) <u>Vertical resistance</u>	H
	(d) <u>Chemical nematicides<sup>c</sup></u>	
	Fumigants	M–H
	Nonfumigants	L–H
	(e) <u>Biological</u>	
	Natural	L–H
	Introduced, including engineered organisms	L–H
	Organic amendments	L–H
	(f) <u>Physical</u>	
	Tillage, including residual root destruction	L–M
	Heat, including solarization	L–M
	Flooding	L–M
3. Suppress nematode reproduction	(a) <u>Resistance</u> (Horizontal/quantitative)	L–M
	(b) <u>Protection</u> with supplemental chemical nematicides	L–M
	(c) Organic amendments	L–H
	(d) Biology-based crop production systems	M–H
4. Restrict current and/or future crop damage	(a) <u>Tolerant</u> cultivars	L–H
	(b) One or more of <u>tactics</u> under 1–3	M–H
	(c) Biology-based crop production systems (Bridge, 28)	—

<sup>a</sup>In part after Roberts (135); Bridge (28).

<sup>b</sup>Strategies 2 and 3 after Vanderplank (164).

<sup>c</sup>Chemical nematicides often result in high carry-over population densities.

\*Abbreviations: L, low; M, moderate; H, high.

Most damage functions and much nematological literature on annual root crops focus on nematode Pi as the primary predictor of nematode damage. Perennial crops and some annual crops such as potato (132) or carrot (134) pose a greater challenge since nonchemical tactics to suppress the rate of reproduction or disease progress are not yet available. Most management tactics listed in Table 1 rely on reduction of initial population density (Pi). Tactics commonly used in intensive agriculture include cultural practices such as crop rotation and destruction of residual crop roots, resistant cultivars, and chemical soil treatments. Bridge (28) outlines and discusses four different strategies for specific nematodes and some other pests in sustainable and subsistence agricultural systems:

1. preventing the introduction and spread of nematodes by the use of nematode-free planting materials;
2. using nonchemical, cultural, and physical control methods, particularly crop rotation and soil cultivation;
3. encouraging naturally occurring biological control agents by understanding of cultivation methods and appropriate use of soil amendments;
4. maintaining or enhancing the biodiversity inherent in traditional farming systems that use multiple cropping and multiple cultivars to increase the available resistance or tolerance to nematodes.

These cultural and low-input techniques for nematode management can be employed by subsistence and small-scale farmers, but adapting some of them to intensive agriculture remains a challenge. As is discussed later, the development of new technologies and improved information on soil biology, including nematode diversity as related to nutrient cycling and soil health, should facilitate ecologically sound and more sustainable nematode–pest management in cropping systems that is applicable to intensive and traditional agriculture.

### *Integrated Pest-Crop Management*

As indicated by Tyler (162), Bridge (28), and Roberts (135), the combination of two or more management tactics can provide highly effective nematode control. The more effective, inexpensive chemical soil treatments have been withdrawn from the market, and frequent usage has resulted in microbial decomposition of other nematicides (153). Furthermore, nematicide contamination of groundwater continues to be a major concern (38). Thus, greater attention is being paid to integrating available tactics and maximizing the potential of cropping systems while limiting nematicide use (120, 135). For example, the application of certain technologies was associated with greatly increased yields of peanut,






Figure 3 Peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) yields in Alabama relative to changes in production practices during the past 50 years [after Rodríguez-Kábana & Cannullo (138)].

but the removal of dibromochloropropane (DBCP) and ethylene dibromide (EDB) fumigants is apparently related to recent lower yields in some regions (138) (Figure 3). Until recently, most IPM-nematology research has focused on nematode-population biology, host phenology, modeling, damage functions, and overall pest management decision-making (19, 54, 135). Progress in these areas has clearly facilitated the development of better management programs and has enhanced our understanding of nematode-host interactions. Nevertheless, the integration and assessment of combinations of potentially compatible nematode-management strategies and tactics have received much less attention, in large part because of excessive reliance on the use of nematicides and rotations, when practical, and resistant cultivars, where available (54).

Integrating compatible or complementary tactics, such as host resistance/tolerance and nematicides with biological control, should minimize potential problems associated with the loss of efficacy of specific nematicides or the appearance of nematode biotypes that attack resistant cultivars. Integration of nematode management may be considered at two levels, within nematology, and across pathogen/pest disciplines. Within the context of nematodes, Roberts (135) indicated that multiple management tactics may be applied over time, simultaneously, or both. The temporal approach focuses on season-to-season or year-to-year integration of tactics relevant to cropping cycles. The cycle of integration of tactics might focus on crop rotations within nonhost, resistant cultivars, or both, adding tactics such as nematicides, cultural practices, or biocontrol as they may be available. This approach could involve different

control tactics or different crops for given years. The second approach described by Roberts (135) for integrating nematode-control components involves simultaneous use of two or more tactics, which of course requires compatibility among the tactics to be deployed. Finally, the deployment of combinations of tactics must be pragmatically evaluated at the regional and local levels. A tactic effective in one area may be impractical elsewhere or may be unsuitable if deployed regionally. For instance, nematicide usage may be restricted in some locales by soil type, organic amendments may have to be transported over prohibitively long distances, or markets for rotational crops may not be accessible.

Numerous examples of single- and multiple-pest/pathogen management successes can be cited (54, 55, 135). A combination of host resistance and tolerance, nematicides, and rotations involving resistant and susceptible potato crops with nonhost rotation between potatoes provided a successful integrated management program for the potato cyst nematode (135). A very different system focusing on host resistance, crop rotation, residual root destruction immediately after harvest, followed by seeding a cover crop, and an appropriate chemical soil treatment, where warranted, has proven highly effective for *Meloidogyne* species and certain fungi, bacteria, viruses, insects, and weeds on tobacco in North Carolina (111). This approach was successful for a high-value commodity like tobacco, whereas its potential utility and grower acceptance might be questionable for low-value crops such as cereals.

Roberts (135) also offered a theoretical but practical framework for integrating nematode management tactics that are only partially effective. Information would be needed on the damage threshold for target nematodes and the efficacy of specific integrated management tactics to determine how many of these types of treatments would be necessary to achieve satisfactory crop yields. For highly aggressive damaging nematode species such as *Meloidogyne arenaria* on peanut, many of these types of management tactics would likely be required to achieve an acceptable level of control. Clearly, more information on the potential interactions of available management tactics (whether antagonistic, synergistic or simply additive effects) is needed for nematode strategies and tactics to be successfully integrated.

## SOIL BIOLOGY IN NEMATODE-CROP MANAGEMENT

Information emerging on soil biology, nematode diversity, the role of nematodes in nutrient cycling, the associated effects of microflora-microfauna on beneficial and plant-parasitic nematodes, and the impact of rhizobacteria in growth promotion and pest/pathogen suppression in various cropping systems has tremendous potential for facilitating development of new strategies and

tactics for nematode management and sustainable production systems, as well as for improving the efficacy of currently available options.

### *Food Webs and Nutrient Cycling*

Until recently, the attention of plant nematologists centered almost exclusively on plant-parasitic and entomophilic nematode species. Questions regarding sustainability of crop-production systems and related demands for alternative options for nematode management have impelled researchers into a more holistic approach to fundamental research on plant parasites (21, 27, 57, 62, 87, 108, 186). Research now ranges from characterizing the general diversity of nematode species in given habitats and cropping systems, the role of nematodes in nutrient cycling, to the genetic diversity of different species of plant-parasitic nematodes and other organisms on specific crops. The development of molecular markers for host resistance and nematode virulence (parasitism) genes, DNA probes, and genetically engineered host resistance, including characterizing and cloning genes of resistance, all enter into this picture of exciting research, with promise for new methods of nematode management in the future (32, 34, 39, 43, 52, 81, 122, 173, 174).

Traditionally, the strategies for nematode management in food and fiber crops focused on the exclusion, reduction of initial infestation densities of key plant-parasitic species, and/or suppression of the rate of reproduction. In recent years, however, the ecosystem framework being addressed in soil and plant health is being broadened to encompass all trophic groups of nematodes (plant parasites, bacterivores, fungivores, omnivores, and predators) (21, 63, 65, 176–178). In some instances, more than 100 species of nematodes coexist in specific soils (51, 93). Although measuring of nematode communities is useful in differentiating the effects of tillage, chemical inputs, and general environment (26, 118), difficulties may still be encountered in evaluating the ecological conditions of soils among regions, counties, or fields (116). New molecular techniques such as the arbitrarily-primed polymerase chain reaction (ap-PCR) now greatly facilitate the study of ecological interactions of unique nematode genotypes in soil habitats (93).

To understand, develop, and deploy sustainable nematode management, the scope of related studies must be extended beyond the interaction between plant-parasitic nematodes, their hosts, and the physical environment. For example, a typical soil food web (Figure 4) comprises the plant roots, plant-parasitic nematodes, other trophic groups of nematodes, and fungi, bacteria, mites, insects, amoebas, and earthworms (49). A recent study on the population dynamics in the below-ground food webs in a conventional versus an integrated agricultural system provided a very striking contrast of the biomass of various trophic groups. Nematodes constituted only 0.24% and 0.26% of the total biomass in




Figure 4 Diagram of various components of a typical soil food web.

the conventional and integrated systems, respectively (186). In contrast, the bacterial biomass constituted 94% and 75% of the total biomass in these systems, respectively. The bacterial biomass varied between 5 and 20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup>, whereas the fungal mass was much smaller and ranged from 0.025 to 0.4 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup>. Protozoans constituted 4.9% and 5.9% of the biomass in the conventional and integrated systems, respectively. Earthworms were completely absent in the conventional system and constituted 17.6% of the total biomass in the integrated system.

Although nematodes constituted a relatively small portion of the soil biomass in that study, their importance in regulating the soil environment must not be underestimated (26, 103, 119, 177). The relative importance of various groups of organisms in the soil in regulating soil processes is a source of considerable debate (49, 69, 83, 186). Some researchers propose that protozoans are crucial in regulating bacterial populations (49), whereas others focus on nematodes (83, 166). The relative importance of a given group of organisms is likely related to soil properties and the plant type present. Bacterivorous nematodes are more capable of promptly migrating to given substrates than are protozoans (69, 73, 139), and thus may be more important bacterial grazers in coarse-textured soils. Nematodes are functional at more trophic levels than these other organisms (Figure 4) since they act as primary consumers (phytophagous), secondary consumers (bacteriophagous and myceliophagous), and

tertiary consumers (omnivorous and predaceous). Bacterivorous nematodes made up 48% of the total nematode population in the conventional system versus 40% in the integrated system. Upon soil fumigation, bacterivorous nematodes decreased sharply but regained their initial population density by the following autumn (186). Repeated use of the fumigant methyl bromide, however, may kill most of the soil microflora and fauna (ER Ingham, personal communication).

Nematodes play an important role in the decomposition of organic matter and mineralization of plant nutrients, and they also constitute an important energy pathway from primary production and detritus to higher trophic groups (103). The primary decomposition of organic matter is effected by bacteria and fungi, which, in turn, are grazed upon by microbivorous nematodes and by protozoa and other organisms. Because these nematodes consume bacteria and assimilate more nitrogen than needed, the excess nitrogen is excreted as ammonia (101). It should be emphasized that nutrient cycling is a complex process involving many groups and species of fauna and microflora. Although nematodes are important consumers of bacteria, protozoa are much more efficient consumers (146). The relative importance of these two groups may vary with soil type in that protozoans tend to be more abundant in fine-textured soils, where nematode activities may be limited by pore size (139, 154).

Numerous comparative studies of conventional versus alternative or sustainable cropping systems in regard to pest control, crop productivity, soil structure, and soil processes are currently under way at various locations (57, 62, 186). Microbivorous nematodes, bacteria, and protozoans often reach very high biomasses in the period after harvest in conventional as well as alternative farming systems (186). Since all three groups of organisms are trophically directly related to each other and play a dominant role in nutrient mineralization, their high population densities after harvest may increase the risk of nitrogen leaching during such periods when no crops are present (49). However, increasing the abundance, biomass, and activity of bacterivorous nematodes in the spring in concert with incorporating organic matter (fall-previous season) could reduce nitrogen stress (62). The potentially detrimental effect of microbial nitrogen mineralization can be exploited by establishing appropriate cover crops that may also suppress or reduce the population densities of plant-parasitic nematodes. Compared to conventional farming, sustainable cropping systems (sometimes referred to as alternative management practices or integrated farming) should help resolve the problems of contamination of groundwater by nitrate and pesticides (186). Crop growth theoretically becomes more dependent on biological processes within the soil, including the mineralization and immobilization of nutrients.

Soil amendments such as animal wastes, including cattle slurry (123; R Bulluck et al, personal communication; KR Barker & SR Koenning, unpublished), result in rapid increases in microbivorous nematodes. This augmented nematode activity apparently stimulates N mineralization. In the absence of plants, mineralization increases  $\text{NO}_3^-$  concentrations in soil (123). Studies of the mineralization of C, N, and P in coniferous forest soils (146) underline the importance of mutual relationships among soil fauna in the decomposition processes. For example, the release of water-soluble N and P was lowest with bacteria-feeding nematodes alone. However, microbivorous nematodes may play a lesser role in the soil ecosystem than other groups, including earthworms, microarthropods, bacteria, and protozoa (57).

In a study of the effects of bacterivorous nematodes and the nematophagous fungi on carbon and nitrogen mineralization, Bouwman et al (27) found that the presence of nematodes enhanced carbon mineralization during the first month, then followed a decline. N mineralization was increased during the first two months and then also diminished. Nematodes affect carbon mineralization indirectly by their effect on bacterial activity, whereas N mineralization is apparently determined by nematodes mineralizing bacterial biomass (27). Because of different temperature optima, certain nematode species within a nematode community may be adapted to predominance at different times and/or soil depths. This overlapping of niches between species within a specific trophic level may determine their relative contribution to N mineralization (61, 165). Similarly, protozoans and nematodes likely occupy different microniches within the soil on temporal, physical, and spatial scales, because moisture availability and type of substrate cause shifts in bacterivore nematode communities (149).

Myceliophagous nematodes also may regulate mineralization in soils and may enhance nutrients available for plants (154). Fungi are efficient mineralizers themselves, and fungivorous nematodes may restrict the rate of fungal growth and hence mineralization (154). The relative ratios of fungivorous to bacterivorous nematodes and the change in this ratio over time may indicate whether a particular system is bacteria-based or fungus-based in decomposition (82). In one study, mycophagous nematodes were more abundant in conventional than in organic plots during periods of organic matter decomposition (62). Soil amendments often enhance rapid build-up of bacterivorous nematodes, and this is followed by a build-up of fungivores.

### *Emerging Soil-Biology Information as Related to Nematode Management*

The relationships of various trophic groups of nematodes with a highly diverse fauna and microflora of soil are a recent object of study, whereas the concept of biological control of nematodes has long attracted the attention of researchers.

A wide range of nematode-trapping fungi, antagonistic bacteria, predaceous nematodes, and other soil fauna have great potential for suppressing the activity of plant-parasitic nematodes (151). Although progress in developing effective biological controls of plant-parasitic nematodes has been slow and, at best, incremental, basic information on the interaction of plant-parasitic nematodes and their antagonists has increased rapidly in recent years. The simplistic food web depicted in Figure 4 indicates only a few possible interactions. Nevertheless, more basic information about soil biology is required to successfully implement biological control of plant-parasitic nematodes (151). For example, predatory nematode species and predatory mites may depress microbivorous nematodes in addition to plant-parasitic nematodes (146). Although predaceous nematodes have received considerable attention, in-depth research on their potential in suppressing plant-parasitic nematodes has been limited. *Allodorylaimus americanus* and *Discolaimus silvicolus* proved to be active predators of *M. incognita* and other endoparasites, but failed to attack ectoparasitic species (88). Recent research has shown that enchytraeids may suppress nematode-parasitic fungi (84).

Certain bacterivorous nematodes may interact with rhizobacteria to enhance plant growth and yield. The bacterivorous nematode tentatively identified as *Diplogaster iheritieri* feeds and reproduces on a number of bacteria associated with the soil around potato roots (89). Three of these bacteria, *Leuconostoc mesenteroids* ss *cremoris*, *Pseudomonas fluorescens* type A, and an unidentified species, enhanced tuber development (dry weight per plant) by as much as two- to more than fourfold over untreated plants under laboratory conditions. *Bacillus cereus* strain S18 circumvented the negative effects of *M. incognita* on the growth of tomato (78). In the field, this bacterium enhanced tomato yields by 18% to 20% over a two-year field test that was free of *M. incognita*.

In a comprehensive study on the interactions of protozoa and the bacterivorous nematode *Pellioditis pellio* and earthworms, Alpei et al (2) showed that the growth of the grass *Hordelymus europaeus* was increased by about 8% in the presence of the nematode and by some 21% by the presence of the protozoa. The nematodes and protozoa apparently enhanced plant growth by nonnutritional means, possibly as a result of increased bacterial activity in response to grazing pressure, whereas the earthworms increased nutrient availability for the grass. The highly diverse soil invertebrates are important in determining the suitability of given soils for sustainable production of crop plants (154). Nematodes regulate soil microbial populations both directly and indirectly, impacting soil health. While grazing/predation of microorganisms regulates population size, nematodes may also vector these organisms in the soil and thus maintain microbial composition and diversity. Fungivorous nematodes may keep plant-parasitic fungi such as *Rhizoctonia solani* in check (91).

A number of antagonistic plants and/or associated rhizobacteria show promise for suppressing plant-parasitic nematodes while enhancing plant growth (71, 77, 78, 92, 148). One hypothesis to explain how antagonistic plants limit crop damage caused by nematodes is via the direct effect of associated toxic compounds; an alternative explanation focuses on the indirect effects on nematodes via selecting for microorganisms detrimental to nematodes (92, 171). A strain of the fluorescent pseudomonad *Pseudomonas aureofaciens* inhibited *Criconebella* egg hatch and suppressed population densities of this nematode in the greenhouse (171). Kloepper and associates (92) showed that 4 to 6 times as many isolates of bacteria from antagonistic plants (velvet bean, castor bean, Abruzzi rye, or sward bean) restricted disease caused by *M. incognita* and *H. glycines* as compared to those from the test crop, soybean. Furthermore, the bacteria isolated from soybean were largely *Bacillus* spp., whereas those from antagonistic plants included very different taxa such as *Pseudomonas cepacia* and *P. gladioli*. The overall number of bacterial genera also was the lowest for soybean (two) and reached a high of 16 in sward bean. *Pseudomonas chlororaphis* may depress populations of *Pratylenchus penetrans* on strawberries and apple while stimulating the growth of some plants, including strawberries and raspberries (71). The rhizospheres of other legumes (*Crotalaria juncea* and *Vicia villosa*) enhance the population growth of certain bacterivorous nematodes, whereas those of other plants (*Tagetes patula*, *Eragrostis curvula*, *Sesamum indicum*) had no effect on the nematodes tested (166). Other studies on rhizobacteria that suppress plant-parasitic nematodes are summarized by Sikora and Hoffmann-Hergarten (78, 148). Proposed mechanisms of action for this suppression include production of metabolites that interfere with hatch and attraction and/or degradation of specific root exudates that control nematode behavior.

The vasicular-arbuscular mycorrhizal (VAM) fungi increase the capacity of plants to absorb phosphorus, other nutrients, and water. VAM fungi also may limit crop-yield losses to nematodes and other pathogens by improving the availability of phosphorus within the host and/or by antagonistic interactions with the pathogens (147). Inoculations of pigeonpea with *Glomus fasciculatum*, *Bradyrhizobium japonicum*, and/or *Bacillus subtilis* suppressed *Heterodera chajani* and *Fusarium udum* on this plant (147). The presence of the mycorrhizal fungus *Glomus* species may limit the damage caused by *Meloidogyne* species on some plants by increasing host tolerance (80).

One approach to exploit nematode antagonists is to develop highly efficient, mass production systems and application technologies suitable for modern agriculture (152). A second approach is the application of amendments that have inherent nematode-suppressive characteristics and that possibly enhance the activity of nematode antagonists. For example, neem extracts and residue cakes



have considerable nematicidal activity (44). Clandosan, a chitin-urea formulation originally produced by Igene Biotechnology, Inc., Columbia, MD, was placed on the market as a biologically based nematicide a decade ago. Interest in soil amendments has been intense; over 220 publications were cited from 1982–1995 (44). While the combinations of soil amendments and improved delivery systems to introduce antagonists have given some encouraging results (112, 152), the goal of readily deployable biological controls of nematodes in a sustainable production system remains elusive. Adapting this technology to intensive systems is restricted by the huge amounts of material needed to effect reductions in nematode numbers. This barrier can be overcome by producing the mass of organic matter through the use of suitable cover crops.

Although attempts to develop axenic cultures of the obligate mesophilic parasite *Pasteuria penetrans* have been only partially successful, our understanding of its pathogenesis on nematodes, life cycle, and ecological requirements is much improved (35). For example, the surface of infective juveniles of *Meloidogyne incognita* apparently contain carbohydrate recognition domains, and these interact within N-acetylglucosamine moieties on the bacterial spore surface (47). Storage of this bacterium for 11 years resulted in decreased levels of infection, but did not affect its ability to attach to juveniles of *M. javanica* (67). *Pasteuria penetrans* also is moderately heat tolerant; preheating spores to 60°C enhances attachment but depresses infection (67). The narrow host-specificity of given strains of this bacterium, the population density-dependent nature of effective control, and often low degrees of parasitism on nematodes such as *Xiphinema diversicadatum* pose challenges (36, 152). Endotoxins from selected strains of *Bacillus thuringiensis* (BT) have been found to be nematicidal (102). The nematicidal effects of these toxins varied with the bacterial isolate examined; most endotoxins have no or little nematicidal activity. Nevertheless, BT-engineered insect-resistant plants could be developed that also suppress the activity of parasitic nematodes.

The challenge is to develop biocontrols as a component of sustainable crop production–nematode management systems that are adaptable for a wide range of crops. Certain nematophagous fungi, including *Verticillium clamydosporium* and *Nematophthora gynophila*, can provide sustainable nematode control in an intensive cropping system (87). In contrast, *Paecilomyces lilacinus* may provide considerable nematode control in soils with limited microflora, but this fungus may have little impact on nematodes in the presence of normal communities of soil microflora (141, 151). In one study involving 20 species of fungi, including *P. lilacinus*, only *Monacrosporium ellipsosporum* failed to provide significant control of *Meloidogyne incognita* on tomato at 60 days after inoculation (141). Many fungi grow slowly in natural soil, and this can be attributed to inherent competition in the highly diverse communities of soil microfauna

and microflora. For a fungus to overcome the competition of resident soil microflora, it must produce a resistant resting stage that is rich in food sources (86). Also, a number of organisms, including mites and possibly mycophagous nematodes, may feed on mycelium of these fungi.

### *Nematodes as Bioindicators of Ecosystem Health*

The abundance of soil organisms, particularly key species, has been proposed as a useful biological marker for ecosystem health (119, 154, 177). For a grass agroecosystem, total abundance of nematodes was positively related to productivity, in contrast to the usual inverse relationship of numbers of plant-parasitic nematodes to plant growth (177). In addition to abundance, other measures available for using invertebrates to assess soil quality include biomass, density, species richness, trophic/guild structure, food-web structure, keystone species, and ecosystem engineers (154).

An assay involving the survival and respiration rates of the bacterivorous nematode *Cruzinema tipartitum* was useful in assessing the presence and concentration of biologically active toxicants (100). An assay provided a measure of toxicant activity at sublethal concentrations and determined when the toxicant had declined to concentrations no longer deleterious to physiological processes. Assays of soil contaminants based on nematode-community structure of resident-soil nematodes were more useful in undisturbed soils than in agricultural soils that had a relatively narrow range of taxa. A soil-toxicity test utilizing *Caenorhabditis elegans* promises rapid assessments of copper and other metals in soils (53). This nematode, however, is insensitive to toxicants such as pentachlorophenol (85). Also, a study of 12 nematodes showed them to be relatively insensitive to cadmium as compared to other invertebrates (85). Slow colonizers (*k*-strategists) were not more sensitive to cadmium and pentachlorophenol than opportunistic *r*-strategists. In general, carnivorous, omnivorous, and phytophagous nematodes are relatively sensitive to pentachlorophenol, whereas bacterivores and fungivores are tolerant. *Aphelenchus avenae*, a mycophagous nematode that often appears in high numbers after organic soil amendments, was tolerant to both compounds. A *Diplogasteritus* species was most sensitive to cadmium. In a study of pastures contaminated with timber preservatives (Cu, Cr, As), populations of nematodes, earthworms, and enchytraeids were depressed by these materials, but no single measurement was adequate to identify sites that needed remediation (178).

Over the long-term, adverse events such as acid rain may eliminate or reduce the beneficial predatory and omnivorous nematodes with or without significantly affecting the total number of nematodes (51, 140). Some plant parasites (*Paratylenchus* spp.) and fungivores (*Aphelenchoides* spp.) increased with the application of sulfuric acid. Acidification sometimes results in an

increase in certain bacterivores [*Acrobeloides buetschlii* and *Wilsonema schuermansstekhoveni* (140)].

A pilot project was initiated on an agroecosystem component for the US Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program. Its purpose is to estimate the status of agroecological resources on a regional basis through the use of selected indicators (115). The distribution of nematode-trophic diversity between annual crops and perennial crops was found to be similar in a study by Neher & Campbell (115). These authors found significant differences between annual and perennial systems in maturity indices for phytophagous nematodes and in the ratio of fungivorous- to bacterivorous-feeding nematodes. This work indicated that perennial-crop sites may be the better suited as reference points using nematodes as biological indicators. As information is forthcoming on soil biology, combinations of bacterivorous nematodes and growth-promoting bacterial species could become diagnostic or keystone species to assess soil quality and health in sustainable nematode and crop management (119).

### *Nematode Interactions with Microorganisms, Insects, and Weeds*

Until recent years, studies of interactions of nematodes in regard to crop management have focused largely on how plant-parasitic nematode species predispose plants to attack by associated fungi and bacteria or on their role as vectors of plant viruses and, in a few instances, bacteria. A wide range of weeds associated with agricultural crops often serve as excellent hosts for plant-parasitic nematodes such as the *Meloidogyne* species (15). In addition, the stunting of crop plants by plant-parasitic nematodes often increases associated weed problems and enhances insect activity in some instances. For example, moderate-to-high infestations of the soybean cyst nematode *Heterodera glycines* favor the development of a number of weeds and insects (3). Nematode and weed responses to various “set-aside” management regimes may differ (23). The use of a cover crop of ryegrass or ryegrass-clover may restrict subsequent weed problems but favor nematode build-up. Weeds, including natural weed banks, also may serve as an efficient reservoir for viruses that are often vectored by nematodes (156). Weed management is especially important for *Meloidogyne* species, which have very wide host ranges (15).

Sustainable nematode management must encompass the associated nematode-pathogen-parasite-pest complexes [for discussion of the many complex interactions between nematodes and other parasites/pests and their host plants, interested readers are referred to other articles (1, 29)]. Forthcoming new research and analytical procedures, including more crop cultivars with multiple-pest resistance and the “replacement series” (150), should contribute to this

integrated management. Certain plant-parasitic nematodes such as *Heterodera glycines* may interfere with the beneficial relationships between symbionts and their host plants. Much of the damage by some races of *H. glycines* on soybean is directly related to the suppression of nodulation and associated N<sub>2</sub> fixation by the bacterium *Bradyrhizobium japonicum* (94).

### *Designing Ecology- and Soil Biology-Based Cropping Management Systems for Nematode Management*

Traditionally, management of plant-parasitic nematodes has focused largely on these organisms, with related interest in the soil ecosystem limited primarily to associated pathogens and pests with which the nematodes might interact in restricting crop productivity. The concepts of integrated pest management broadened this operational framework to encompass all plant pests and an increased awareness of the need to avoid practices that might be detrimental to nontarget organisms (19, 172). Today's concept of a cropping system for managing nematodes is being expanded to include grass fallows, antagonistic plants and trap plants, cover crops that enhance the activity of beneficial soil fauna and flora, and shifts in the time for planting and/or harvesting of crops to limit nematode damage. Current research and deployment of sustainable and integrated crop/production systems are evolving to address the wide range of beneficial and detrimental soil fauna and flora (49, 57, 186). A number of research programs are now developing integrated cropping systems to enhance the activity of beneficial microflora and microfauna and suppress plant pests (57, 62, 186). For example, an integrated farming system with altered soil tillage, sowing techniques, fertilization, organic manure, and restricted pesticide applications resulted in greatly diminished populations of *Ditylenchus dipsaci* and *Heterodera avenae* (Figure 5) in cereals compared to those in conventional production systems (57).

Sustainable agroecosystems require cropping sequences and systems that incorporate desirable aspects of the subsistence agriculture from which they are partially derived. This statement implies that subsistence agriculture was both sustainable and stable, an issue recently addressed by Bridge (28). The ecological approach taken by many researchers in this context is to consider how pest populations are affected in natural, subsistence, and low-input systems. The philosophical focus on ecology has led to advances in the fields of botanical epidemiology (164, 184), integrated pest management (IPM) (19), and quantitative nematology (31, 60, 145). One key feature that contributes to regulation of populations is the apparent diversity inherent in natural ecosystems. A second feature is the appreciation that food webs rather than the more simplistic food chains are more common in nature, especially in the more complex (and thus more diverse) natural ecosystems (186).




Figure 5 Incidence of infestation by *Heterodera avenae* in integrated and conventional systems expressed as the mean number of eggs + larvae per 250 cm<sup>3</sup> soil. Differences are highly significant, according to Wilcoxon test ( $P = 96\%$ ) from 1984 onwards [after El Titi & Ipach (57)].

Inherent in the philosophy of IPM and the recently proposed Ecologically-Based Pest Management (EBPM) is the realization that some level of predation and/or parasitism is not only allowable but desirable, in that it promotes diversity and thus stability in our agroecosystems. Thus, an important aspect of designing sustainable cropping systems is the incorporation of diversity. Diversity may come in many forms—genetic, integration of plant and animal systems, crop rotation, and other cultural practices (28, 55, 125, 158, 183). Such diversity provides options, and thus opportunities, for managing nematode populations that are not available in simple less diverse systems. Diversity must be promoted and encouraged at every level of integration—from individual fields to local and regional levels and, in some instances, across international borders (184).

Future sustainable crop/nematode/pest management systems must therefore address general soil biology/health as well as specific threats from given pest groups such as plant-parasitic nematodes. Sequential cropping systems that include known nonhosts (Table 2) have been used in subsistence and traditional agriculture for centuries. One of the earliest cropping systems specifically designed for nematode management involved 6–8-year rotations and fallows to avoid low yields in the presence of potato cyst nematodes, *Globodera* spp. (28). The basic principle of crop rotation in nematode management has been the reduction of population densities of target nematode species to allow the subsequent production of an acceptable crop (121).

Table 2 Partial list of selected nonhost plants useful in crop rotation

Nematode spp.	Nonhosts or hosts*	Nematode spp.	Nonhosts or hosts*	References
<i>Belonolaimus:</i>		<i>Meloidogyne:</i>		
<i>B. longicaudatus</i>	<i>Crotalaria</i> spp., <i>Crotalaria spectabilis</i> hairy indigo, marigold, tobacco	<i>M. chitwoodi</i>	Pea vine ( <i>Lathyrus</i> spp.) sudangrass hybrids	68 113
		<i>M. arenaria</i>	Bahia grass, joint vetch, velvetbean	
		<i>M. javanica</i>	<i>Andropogon</i> , <i>Crotalaria</i> spp., cotton, peanut, sorghum, velvetbean	
<i>B. gracilis</i>	<i>Crotalaria</i> spp., tobacco, watermelon	<i>M. hapla</i>	Corn, cotton, grasses, lettuce, onion, radish, sudangrass, wheat	
<i>Dolichodorus heterocephalus</i>	<i>Crotalaria spectabilis</i>	<i>M. incognita</i>	Fescue, orchard grass	
<i>Helicotylenchus dihystrera</i>	Alfalfa, corn, fescue*	<i>Meloidogyne</i> spp.	<i>Crotalaria spectabilis</i> <i>Indigofera hirsuta</i> , millet, oats, wheat*	
<i>Heterodera, Globodera:</i>		<i>Paratrichodorus minor</i>	Corn*, <i>Crotalaria spectabilis</i>	
<i>H. glycines</i>	Bahia grass, corn, cotton, cowpea, potato, small grains, grains, tobacco, most vegetables	<i>Pratylenchus:</i>		
		<i>P. leiocephalus</i>	Peanut	
		<i>P. penetrans</i>	Alfalfa*, beet, fescue, marigold, oats, sudangrass, rye	
<i>H. schachtii</i>	Alfalfa, bean, clover, corn, <i>Hesperis matronalis</i> , onion	<i>Pratylenchus</i> spp.	Lettuce, onion, radish	
<i>H. zeae</i> <sup>b</sup>	Wide range of crops	<i>Radapholus similis</i>	<i>Crotalaria spectabilis</i> , most grasses	
<i>G. rostochiensis</i>	Corn, greenbeans, red clover	<i>Rotylenchulus reniformis</i>	Rhodes grass, Pangolagrass, marigolds	33
		<i>Tylenchorhynchus:</i>		
		<i>T. mirzal</i>	Wheat	
<i>Hoplolaimus indicus</i>	Cabbage, chili, eggplant	<i>T. brassicae</i>	Potato, tomato	
		<i>Xiphinema americanum</i>	Alfalfa*, corn*, fescue*, tobacco	

<sup>a</sup>Primarily after Trivedi & Barker (158) (See this article for specific references per nematode/crop combination).

<sup>b</sup>Host range needs further study.

\*Some populations of respective nematode species will reproduce rapidly on crop plants so identified.

Crop rotation provides for diversity in time and space and is often the preferred means for nematode management. Rotation, however, may be of limited value when several damaging species of nematodes are present or for species with broad host ranges. For growers to accept rotation as a viable tool for nematode management, suitable crops and land must be available. The rotational crop must offer the grower an acceptable return, with similar requirements for labor and equipment. The need to rotate specific crops, however, may vary with location. For example, corn can be grown continuously in some regions with little or no effect on yield (185), whereas the parasitic nematodes predominant in the southeastern United States cause significant yield losses on this crop (124). The highly successful practice of rotating tobacco with fescue (nonhost for *Meloidogyne* spp.) has been in place in the southeastern United States for some five decades (121). Periodic incorporation of the dense grass sod improves the soil structure, increases water-holding capacity, and provides control of associated root diseases including root-knot in the primary crop. Other grass fallows that have proven useful in the management of nematodes, especially *Meloidogyne* spp., include bahiagrass (*Paspalum notatum*), bermudagrass (*Cynodon dactylon*), weeping lovegrass (*Eragrostis curvula*), Rhodes grass (*Chloris gayana*), Pangolagrass (*Digitaria decumbens*), and Guinea grass (*Panicum maximum*) (28, 137, 138). Any significant development of broadleaf weeds in these grass fallows can negate their effects in the control of root-knot nematodes because many are hosts for these pathogens (15, 28). The economic viability of grass or pasture is enhanced when animals are included in the system. An important factor is that many grasses and cereal crops may also support reproduction of many plant-parasitic nematodes, including *Meloidogyne* spp.

Many potential rotations or green manure crops that show promise in nematode management may be antagonistic to some nematode species or even serve as trap crops (92, 95, 138, 158). These plants may be categorized as being either active or passive, depending on whether they produce some anti-helminthic compounds or are simply unsuitable hosts for nematodes. Selected *Brassica* species, including rapeseed and mustard, may suppress nematode populations, soilborne pathogens, and weeds in crop rotations (72, 95). These plants produce glucosinolates, and their decomposition products are toxic to nematodes. Nematode-resistant radish is very effective in suppressing *Heterodera schachtii* on sugar beet (95). In contrast, rapeseed is stunted and supports reproduction of *M. arenaria* (KR Barker, unpublished). Some antagonistic (or active) plants, including *Crotalaria* spp., mustard, African marigold, asparagus, castor, and sesame, may be grown as commercial crops, used as cover crops, or established in mixed planting with other crops (28, 138). Caution is needed in selecting from these or other antagonistic plants for cropping

systems in case they contain negative features or hazards in addition to providing nematode control. For example, some of the *Crotalaria* species serve as excellent trap crops for root-knot nematodes, but they also synthesize potent toxins that cause primary tumors or suppress growth of swine, cattle, and poultry. Although the African marigold *Tagetes erecta* and other *Tagetes* spp. may provide effective nematode control under some conditions, the efficacy of the primary nematicidal component ( $\alpha$ -terthienyl) is dependent on light activation (9).

The utilization of certain Sudangrass hybrids as a green manure provides excellent control of *Meloidogyne chitwoodi* on potato (113). Sorghum-Sudangrass hybrids also suppress this pathogen, but these plants may contain a higher concentration of dhurrin, a toxin for cattle when these plants are grazed improperly. In addition, the antagonism of these plants may be limited to certain nematode genera or species, e.g. the lesion nematode *Pratylenchus penetrans* is affected little by the use of these plants as green manure crops (106).

Earlier work on a selective nematicidal component in decomposing rye residues indicated that nematodes may have differential sensitivity to these products (144). In that work, *Meloidogyne incognita* proved to be the most sensitive to the associated decomposition products, *P. penetrans* exhibited intermediate sensitivity, whereas microbivorous nematodes were quite tolerant. Thus, lesion nematodes and the bacterivores probably have developed tolerance to decomposition products, whereas sedentary endoparasites would likely be more sensitive. Butyric acid produced by *Clostridium butyricum* was identified as one of the major toxic components in the decomposing rye (144). However, other compounds may be even more important since only limited amounts of butyric acid were detected in leachates from pots with decaying rye (RG McBride, unpublished). Rye as a cover crop has both negative and positive aspects. Although highly effective against *Meloidogyne incognita* on cotton, it is much less efficacious against the Columbia lance nematode, *Hoplolaimus columbus* (KR Barker & SR Koenning, unpublished). The impact of rye on the reniform nematode, *Rotylenchulus reniformis*, was likely related to suppression of dicotyledonous winter weeds (KR Barker & SR Koenning, unpublished). In addition, the timing of its incorporation in soil before the establishment of some crops, particularly cotton, is important in that the decomposition products may prevent the normal germination of cotton seeds.

Other legumes including selected clovers, velvetbean, joint vetch, and Cahaba white vetch provide multifaceted contributions to soil health and crop productivity when used in rotation as green manure cover crops. For example, the use of velvet bean *Mucuna deeringiana* in a soybean rotation enhances the activity of rhizosphere bacteria antagonistic to the soybean cyst nematode, *H. glycines*, and the southern root-knot nematode, *M. incognita* (92).



In addition to suppressing nematodes, certain plant-growth-promoting rhizobacteria may induce systemic resistance to foliage pathogens such as *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *lacrymans* and *Colletotrichum orbiculare* on cucumber (170). Wei et al (170) suggested that these rhizobacteria may control a spectrum of plant pathogens/pests, including fungi, bacteria, nematodes, and insects. In a split-root system, treatments with *Bacillus sphaericus* B43 or *Agrobacterium radiobacter* G12 also induced a significant degree of resistance in potato to *Globodera pallida* (77). These rhizobacteria suppressed infection of potato roots by the juveniles, but had no effect on egg production.

The use of resistant cultivars, where applicable, is the preferred and most economical means of managing damaging species of nematodes (134, 136, 160, 182). With few exceptions, available nematode-resistant cultivars, as summarized by Young (182), are limited to nematodes (*Meloidogyne*, *Heterodera*, *Globodera*, *Tylenchulus*, *Rotylenchulus* spp.) that induce the development of feeding cells in their hosts. Exceptions include *Ditylenchus dipsaci* on alfalfa and clover, *Xiphinema index* on grape (46), and *Radopholus similis* on banana (107) and citrus (DT Kaplan, personal communication). Although host resistance is an environmentally friendly means of nematode management (46), resistance genes may be considered as a natural resource to be preserved. In fact, resistance has proved to be only a temporary solution, particularly in the case of *r* genes used to manage the amphimictic cyst nematodes (182). Thus, cropping systems must be designed to protect the durability of resistant cultivars (4, 5, 133, 181). These *r* genes should be introduced into agroecosystems in concert with other management measures to prevent or delay the emergence of biotypes that circumvent the resistance mechanisms. Temporal and spatial deployment of resistance genes to *H. glycines* and *H. avenae* has been evaluated (4, 5, 133, 181). For example, continuous use of *H. avenae*-resistant cereal cultivars may negatively affect their resistance while allowing the lesion nematode *Pratylenchus neglectus* to increase to damaging densities (133). Although the durability of host resistance to parthenogenetically reproducing nematodes may be affected less than with amphimictic species, monoculture of *M. incognita*-resistant cultivars may still result in the appearance of resistance-breaking host races or other species of root-knot nematodes (11, 46, 163, 174). The origin and type of host resistance as well as the reproductive biology of the target nematodes should be considered in addressing the durability of resistance genes (20).

Combinations of management tactics for nematodes such as the potato cyst nematodes (*Globodera* spp.) often rely on rotation, nematicides with or without tolerant cultivars, and/or resistant cultivars (40, 87). Although sources of tolerance to a few other nematodes such as the soybean cyst and Columbia lance nematodes have been identified (25, 70), attempts to incorporate tolerance to nematodes in other crops have encountered only limited success. Dalmasso

et al (46) concluded that tolerance to nematodes is an advantageous character only when linked to active resistance. If used without resistance, it leads to increased nematode population densities and thereby could be a disadvantage. Nevertheless, in perennials such as ornamentals, the only practical management option is to replace highly susceptible plants with tolerant plants (17).

Another potential nematode-management strategy involves adjusting the schedules for susceptible crop production to limit nematode reproduction. For example, delayed planting of soybean, which occurs in wheat-soybean double-cropping systems, allows for greater nematode attrition in the absence of a host and results in lower at-planting population densities of *Pratylenchus brachyurus* and *H. glycines* (96, 99). The wheat-soybean double-cropping system was shown to be economically superior to a rotation with grain sorghum in Arkansas (50). This practice may give variable results over time and region (74) and is not well adapted to northerly latitudes where the length of the soybean growing season is limited. This approach also has been tried for root-knot nematode in carrot. Shifts in the planting and harvest dates of carrot to minimize root-knot development caused by *M. incognita* have produced striking results (135). Delaying planting to late autumn or early winter clearly restricts root-gall development on carrot. Although the efficacy of this management strategy increases with lateness of planting, some root galling and crop loss occurred even with the best treatments. Thus, this management strategy should be used in concert with available, compatible tactics (134). In some regions, early harvest of peanut is critical to limiting damage to seeds by *Ditylenchus africanus* (167). Although approaches that limit infection by either promoting greater nematode attrition or limiting infection due to physical constraints such as temperature/planting time are useful in some nematode-host interactions, they have not been effective in limiting damage of *Hoplolaimus columbus* to cotton or soybean (SR Koenning, unpublished; 127).

Many crops vary phenotypically for physiological maturity, a factor that can be exploited to suppress final nematode population densities. Soybean cultivars, for example, are classified by maturity groups that range from 000 to IX; each group is separated by 1 to 2 weeks. Late-maturing cultivars support greater reproduction of *H. glycines* in North Carolina (76). The use of early-maturing cultivars suppresses nematode-population increase and benefits succeeding crops (98). Many other cultivated plants including cotton, corn and small grains differ in maturity, and this technique may have wider applicability.

Various types of soil tillage may have different effects on nematodes. The "plowing out" of the residual roots of *Meloidogyne* hosts after the final harvest of tomato, tobacco, or other perennial-type crops is a long-established practice dating back for 100 years (6, 18). This single practice can reduce surviving *Meloidogyne* populations by 90% or more compared to allowing residual roots to grow (13). For total nematode and soil fauna-flora abundance, the issue of

tillage is more complex. Soil tillage also affects beneficial soil organisms, as well as suppressing undesirable plant (weed) species and improving plant-root growth, the primary reasons for this practice. Improved chemical control of weeds and the development of implements capable of ensuring good seed-to-soil contact have resulted in a wide variety of types of plant culture defined as no-till or minimum-till systems. These systems, often referred to collectively as conservation tillage, that eliminate or reduce tillage have become common in many regions because of government mandate, and also result in economy of time and equipment (129).

Although tillage has long been an important tool in suppressing certain diseases and problems associated with plant-parasitic nematodes, numerous benefits may accrue from conservation tillage systems. Typically, conservation tillage results in increased soil organic matter, with more residue on the soil surface, improved soil structure, and infiltration of water (48). Potentially negative effects of reduced tillage include less mixing of soil nutrients, increased soil strength with associated higher soil bulk density, lower yields for some crops, and greater reliance on herbicides. Secondary effects of changing tillage practices may include changes in the weed spectrum, the use of cover crops, and alterations in other cultural practices. Depending on the type of implements used, nematicide applications may be limited in these systems. Changes in soil biota, including nematodes, effected in agroecosystems by different tillage practices have been documented (79, 126). Earthworms, in particular, tend to increase in numbers when tillage is limited (57, 79), and they are considered a major factor related to improved soil structure. Increases in soil organic matter where tillage is reduced generally are reflected in higher numbers of bacterivorous and fungivorous nematodes (65). Although the available data are diverse and sometimes contradictory, the impact of tillage, or the lack thereof, is likely related to different soil type/genesis, texture, the organisms studied, and climate.

Research in the United States' eastern coastal plain has shown minimal effects of short-term tillage practices on plant-parasitic nematodes (66, 109). Thomas (157) found higher population densities of plant-parasitic nematodes associated with corn in no-till versus conventional till in Iowa. In contrast, population densities of *H. glycines* were suppressed by conservation tillage (97, 161). Several years of continuous no-till were required before suppression of *H. glycines* was measurable, however. Apparent discrepancies about the impact of tillage on nematode communities may be related to the length of time a portion of crop land has been subjected to minimum tillage (126). Several reasons for suppression of *H. glycines* in conservation tillage have been postulated, including the impact of the cover crop (8, 74), or increases in bulk density of the soil that may have restricted aeration (97, 180).

Wardle and associates (169) found that cultivation for weed control was an important factor influencing the species diversity of the nematode community.

Increased numbers of fungivorous nematodes were found in one study in Georgia in reduced tillage plots compared to conventional tillage (126) during the summer, but the reverse was true at other times of year. Similarly, higher numbers of the plant parasite *Helicotylenchus dihystrera*, *Tylenchus*, and *Aphelenchoides* spp. and dorylamids and mononchidae were associated with conventional till systems in North Carolina (105). Numbers of bacterial feeding and total nematode numbers were greatest in a no-till system in Spain (104). However, Freckman & Ettema (65) found only small differences in total nematode abundance related to tillage; the trophic diversity was increased, and the ratio of fungivores to bacterivores was decreased in no-till compared to conventional tillage practices. The ratio of fungivores to bacterivores can be regarded as an indicator of the decomposition pathway in detrital food webs (65). The decrease in this ratio associated with no-till may indicate a shift from a bacteria-based food web to a fungus-based food web.

More comprehensive integrated management farming systems that include more restricted tillage, fertilization, pesticide use, the addition of organic manure, and undersowing with clover greatly alter the soil fauna and microflora (57). For example, the numbers and biomass of earthworms were six times greater in the integrated plot with limited tillage than in the conventionally managed plot. Predatory mites and microbivorous nematodes (bacterivores and fungivores) also are often greatly increased through this type of integrated management (57). Population densities of *Heterodera avenae* and *Ditylenchus dipsaci* were lower in integrated systems with minimal tillage than in conventional systems with standard tillage practices (57).

Unfortunately, many new technologies used in intensive production systems may result in loss of stability in agriculture (183). Zadoks (183) identified several developments contributing to this loss of stability; these include increase in field aggregation, larger field size, increase in plant density, increase in genetic uniformity-crop level, greater farmer specialization (loss of rotation), increased mechanization, increase in international exchange of seed and planting stock, and plant breeding. Thus, it is critical to assess the sustainability of nematode-crop production systems as more complex and larger production systems emerge.

To assess the sustainability of crop-pest production systems, key biophysical and socioeconomic factors must be monitored in measurable terms (110). Proposed characteristics for monitoring the agroecological sustainability of production systems and the respective level and time frame of processes encompass the following:

1. nutrient balance sheet (farm and regional level: 5–10 years);
2. vegetation cover and species composition (farm and regional level: >5 years);

3. water infiltration run-off (farm and regional level: >3 years);
4. replenishment and use of fossil water (regional level: 5–10 years);
5. characteristic in relation to biotic environment economic threshold (farm level: <1 year);
6. pest complex and type of outbreak (farm and regional level: >5 years);
7. host-plant resistance (regional level: >3 years);
8. pest resistance against pesticides (regional level: >5 years);
9. biological control agents (crop, farm, and regional levels: <1 year); and
10. pesticide use (crop, farm, and regional level: >1 year).

Economic viability and soil-fauna-flora diversity could also be added to this list. Although these factors and processes are beyond the scope of this review, their magnitude reflects the huge requirements in developing sustainable crop-pest-nematode production systems.

## NEW TECHNOLOGIES AND NEMATODE MANAGEMENT

As sustainable nematode management becomes increasingly based on soil biology–health, new complementary technologies are developing. These new tools undoubtedly will improve the accuracy of nematode diagnoses and assessments of potential problems, and will result in more effective management, reduced pesticides, pesticide usage, and less contamination of groundwater with agricultural chemicals such as nematicides, nitrogen, and fertilizers.

### *Precision Agriculture*

Modern computerized harvest-management and data systems offer new opportunities for more precise management of nematodes and general crop production. This technology has the potential to improve water use and limit fertilizer and pesticide application on a spatial and temporal basis as dictated by soil fertility and, more important, differential spatial crop yields (45, 59). Based on early results, this management tool should allow specially prescribed nematode control in high-intensive crop production such as *Radopholus similis* on banana (DH Marin-Vargas, personal communication) and root-knot nematodes on potato in the northwestern United States (59). Approaches that focus on a harvest index to locate environmental stress (42) should be able to relate nematode kinds and numbers to poor yield and other stress factors. This

approach is now being used in some banana operations in which fruit is harvested in small subunits and yield data are recorded and analyzed by computer (DH Marin-Vargas, personal communication). Poor-yielding sections can be examined for nematode densities and other potential problems.

### *Nematode Identifications and Population Assessments*

The tools of rDNA technology, especially when allied with traditional taxonomic characters and host differentials, have greatly facilitated identification of nematode species and often host race (12, 34, 58, 64, 81). Isolated specimens of a range of nematode species have been identified by differential isozyme pattern and/or specific DNA probes, and there has been some progress in identifying and quantifying nematodes from processed soil samples (43).

Continuing restrictions in the size of samples and numbers of nematodes that can be examined make it very difficult to fully diagnose the nematode species present in large fields. However, this new technology should facilitate a more complete characterization of the diverse nematode trophic groups and species that are affected by disturbance and management practices in various ecosystems (93). The availability of mobile soil-samplers, especially when used in precision production systems (175), could facilitate more directed, selective sampling for general nematode assays and identifications (10). Geostatistical analyses could be interfaced with these improved sampling apparatus for more precise measurement of data on nematode population (168). Image analysis has been adapted to count specific nematodes, but differentiating species with computers currently available would be too time-consuming (14).

### *Genetically Engineered and Traditional Host Resistance*

Although almost 100 years elapsed between the appearance of Mendel's rules and the initial discoveries in molecular biology, dramatic progress in the latter area has occurred during the last 30 years (128). The increasing complexity and costs of genetic engineering of plants for pest resistance or altering biocontrol agents make it unlikely that significant economic repercussions of molecular biology will be felt on agricultural production in the near future (128). There has been considerable progress made in engineering host resistance to nematodes, genetic mapping, and diagnostics (32, 34, 122, 174). However, genetically engineered resistance to nematodes is still at the developmental stage in contrast to the recently deployed herbicide- and insect-resistant cultivars of cotton, soybean, and other crops. One strategy involves transformation of plants with a transgene(s) encoding a product detrimental to the target nematode or that suppresses the expression of key plant genes involved in the nematode-host interaction (122, 174). Candidate genes for this strategy include collagenase, genes expressed in the development of specialized feeding cells induced by

species of *Globodera* or *Heterodera* (syncytia) and *Meloidogyne* (giant cells). Constructs of the root-specific *TobRB7* gene in tobacco have been used to develop promising root-knot nematode-resistant genotypes (122). Linking this gene with a BARNASE gene resulted in root knot-resistant plants, but difficulties were encountered in recovering resistant lines from progeny of the transformants. Transformed plants with an antisense *TobRB7* construct also exhibited root-knot resistance; root-gall development was about 70% less in than susceptible plants (122).

A second approach for engineering nematode-resistant plants involves identifying, cloning, and introducing natural plant-resistance genes into susceptible crop plants. Exciting results with this strategy were recently reported with *Heterodera schachtii* on sugar beet (32). In one major development, Cai et al (32) cloned the cyst-resistant gene in wild *Beta* species. A transformed, normally susceptible sugar beet line exhibited the typical incompatible resistant reaction. Similar progress is being made with the *Mi* gene, which confers resistance to the common *Meloidogyne* species and populations attacking tomato (VM Williamson, personal communication; see pp. 277–293). With the wide host range of these nematodes, the transfer of the *Mi* gene to numerous crop species, for which root-knot nematodes affect major crop yields, has great economic promise. Because populations of *M. incognita* may overcome this resistance, much care is needed in developing cropping systems to prolong the durability of this resource in a wider range of genetically engineered resistant crops.

New molecular techniques and markers also have positively affected traditional plant-breeding programs related to the development of host-resistance to nematodes. Recently, two markers for parasitism in *H. glycines* were identified (52) and molecular markers for crop resistance for various cyst nematodes are being investigated. These resistance markers included soybean (*H. glycines*) (41), potato (*G. rostochiensis*) (131), and wheat (*H. avenae*) (173). Markers for *M. incognita* races 1 and 3 resistance in tobacco also have been described (179). Undoubtedly, combining markers for parasitism (virulence) within different nematode populations and host-resistance genes should spur advances through traditional plant breeding.

### *Advisory Programs*

Despite the development of nematode advisory programs in some states in the United States in the 1960s and earlier elsewhere (13), low-cost, highly effective nematicides remained in use as a form of insurance until recently. The unreliability of nematode assays, due to difficulties in sampling the contagious infestations, identification of related species, and lack of information on economic thresholds helped to prolong nematicide use. Nevertheless, advisory

programs have successfully contributed to lower pesticide usage and greater farm profits. For peanut alone, growers in Virginia were able to reduce their nematicide use by 35% after a predictive nematode assay program was established (130). Savings in production costs for 1989 were estimated at \$800,000, primarily through fewer nematicide applications. Currently, about one half of the states in the United States offer their farmers some type of nematode advisory program, usually through the Extension Service, State Departments of Agriculture, or private consultants. Many growers monitor the relative magnitude of nematode problems in given fields by observing root symptoms and signs of nematodes and through field histories.

The use of hazard indices in lieu of damage or economic thresholds has promoted better communication to growers on the relative nematode-damage potential for annual crops in given fields (13). These hazard indices are based on the relative damage potential of the nematode species/races present, their population densities, the cropping history, and soil type.

Where detailed data on production and nematode populations are maintained, more precise approaches in decision-making are becoming available. Burt & Ferris (31) developed a sequential decision rule to aid in choosing a rotation crop versus host crop where this practice is the management tactic rather than using a nematicide. The static model used by Ferris (60) is unsuitable for quantifying the optimal dynamic threshold that would be characterized by population densities lower than where returns from the nematode host and nonhost are equal. A dynamic model for this type of crop-nematode management system was recently developed (31). Application of this model should allow better economic management of nematodes, but data will still be needed on annual nematode population change under host and nonhost crops and the relationships between nematode numbers and crop yields. More comprehensive pest-host simulators and expert systems (142) have bolstered research in recent years (108).

Management of nematodes, including advisory programs, poses greater challenges for perennial crops than for annual crops. Control options are limited, and very low population densities often build up to cause severe damage over time. Integrated management, including assays to determine numbers and kinds of nematodes present, and appropriate control tactics such as preplant fumigation where necessary, use of nematode-free stock, tolerant cultivars where available, and organic mulches are useful for woody ornamentals (17).

## CONCLUSIONS

New approaches to nematode control hold great promise for sustainable, integrated crop-pest-management systems. Rapidly evolving knowledge and understanding of soil biology and crop molecular biology can be exploited in



highly productive, intensive cropping systems. The challenge is to develop primary cover-crop, animal-waste, tillage systems that result in the build-up of favorable rhizobacteria, fungi, nematodes, protozoa, earthworms, and other fauna while also suppressing plant-parasitic nematodes and other crop pathogens. Combining this new, integrated soil biology-based nematode-pest-crop management with traditional and/or genetically engineered host resistance and cultural practices such as rotation should reduce the need for pesticides. However, Kiraly (90) concluded that worldwide the area dedicated to crop production is unlikely to expand during the next two decades; on the contrary, there is a continuous and substantial decline in grain-producing area per person. Thus, food production per hectare must be increased. The data in Figure 1 may indicate that considerable opportunities for this exist in many countries.

Avery (7) claimed that widespread use of pesticides and plastics must be employed in intensive agriculture to “save the planet.” Although this is an obvious overstatement, the use of pesticides in agriculture has indeed been critical to large-scale production of inexpensive, high-quality fruits and vegetables for human consumption (90). However, we need to weigh the negative effects of use of pesticides and excessive tillage on soil organisms (110). Concepts for measuring the impact of given practices on sustainability versus instability are emerging (110, 183), but they remain to be widely adopted.

Exciting new technologies for crop-pest management are on the horizon at the same time as new challenges are emerging. In today’s global marketplace, any incident involving international shipment of produce contaminated with a nematicide or other pesticide generally elicits a reaction that often has no bearing on or recognition of the importance of these products in food production (90). This problem is even greater if pests “accompany” the produce. Introduction of new crops or even transplants of current crops into an area could well lead to the establishment of new nematode species (117). The risks of introducing key nematodes such as *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* greatly restricts international shipment of some products (56). Based on analyses by the CLIMEX computer program (22), the European virus-vectoring nematode, *Xiphinema diversicaudatum*, could become established in North America, Australia, New Zealand, and parts of Asia. Hence, quarantine restrictions on movement of plants and soil will likely become more stringent in the face of expanding international trade and global climate warming. Molecular diagnostics should increase the reliability of such nematode-regulatory programs (155).

The predicted global climate warming is being debated as sustainable nematode and crop management strategies and tactics are under development. For example, an increase of only 1°C could enable the ectoparasite *Longidorus caespiticola* to become established in all of England and most of Scotland (24). Currently, the most damaging of nematodes, *Meloidogyne* spp., generally are

favored by warm to tropical conditions (160). Will warming in many countries, including the United States, be sufficient to effect the spread of the highly aggressive root-knot species *Meloidogyne javanica* and *M. arenaria* into regions presently unsuitable for these pathogens? Such a development would require new initiatives in the development of durable heat-tolerant nematode resistance in most crop plants and shifts in crop cultivars.

In conclusion, the development of sustainable nematode-management systems is not an option. It is imperative that scientists devise the requisite sustainable tactics as one component of the world's complex food-fiber production system to meet the pressure of the rapid population increase. Management of plant-parasitic nematodes is essential to sustainability, since impaired efficiency of plants' water and nutrient utilization caused by these pathogens limits production and degrades the environment. The proposed strategy of increased use of pesticides and plastics to meet this challenge (7) would likely provide only short-term benefits. For example, the repeated heavy use of chemicals such as methyl bromide essentially sterilizes the soil and eliminates beneficial soil microflora and fauna as well. Many other current crop- and pest-management practices also contribute to the instability of our food production (83). Fortunately, the new technologies forthcoming from molecular and soil biology and truly integrated cropping-nematode-pest management systems are providing new strategies and tactics that can be linked to traditional nematode management for more general integrated and sustainable food and fiber production. In fact, the wide gaps between and within developing and developed countries (Figure 1) indicate that global food production still can be increased.

Visit the *Annual Reviews* home page at  
<http://www.AnnualReviews.org>.

#### Literature Cited

1. Abawi GS, Chen J. 1998. Concomitant pathogen and pest interactions. See Ref. 13a, pp. 135–58
2. Alpei J, Bonkowski M, Scheu S. 1996. Protozoa, nematoda and lumbricidae in the rhizosphere of *Hordelymus europaeus* (Poaceae): faunal interactions, response of microorganisms and effects on plant growth. *Oecologia* 106:111–26
3. Alston DG, Bradley JR Jr, Schmitt DP, Coble HD. 1991. Response of *Helicoverpa zea* (Lepidoptera Noctuidae) populations to canopy development in soybean as influenced by *Heterodera glycines* (Nematoda: Heteroderidae) and annual weed population densities. *J. Econ. Entomol.* 84:267–76
4. Anand SC, Koenning SR, Sharma SB. 1995. Effect of temporal deployment of different sources of resistance to soybean cyst nematode. *J. Prod. Agric.* 8:33–34; 119–23
5. Anand SC, Koenning SR, Sharma SB. 1995. Performance of blends of soybean cyst nematode resistant and susceptible soybean cultivars. *Crop Sci.* 35:524–28
6. Atkinson GF. 1889. A preliminary report upon the life-history and metamorphoses of a root-gall nematode, *Heterodera radicicola* (Greef) Müller, and the injuries caused by it upon the roots of various plants. *Bull. Ala. Polytech. Inst., N. S.*, No. 9

7. Avery DT. 1995. *Saving the Planet with Pesticides and Plastic*. Indianapolis: Hudson Inst. 432 pp.
8. Baird SM, Bernard EC. 1984. Nematode population and community dynamics in soybean-wheat cropping and tillage regimes. *J. Nematol.* 16:379–86
9. Bakker J, Gommers FJ, Smits L, Fuchs A, DeVries FW. 1983. Photoactivation of isoflavanoid phytoalexins: involvement of free radicals. *Phytochem. Phytobiol.* 38:323–29
10. Barker KR. 1985. Sampling nematode communities. In *An Advanced Treatise on Meloidogyne, Vol. II. Methodology*, ed. KR Barker, CC Carter, JN Sasser, pp. 3–17. Coop. Publ. Dep. Plant Pathol., NC State Univ./US AID, Raleigh, NC
11. Barker KR. 1989. Yield relationship and population dynamics of *Meloidogyne* spp. on flue-cured tobacco. *J. Nematol.* 21(4S):597–608
12. Barker KR, Davis EL. 1996. Assessing plant nematode infestations and infections. In *Advances in Botanical Research (incorporating Advances in Plant Pathology)*, ed. SH DeBoer, 23:103–36. Pathogen Indexing Technologies, London: Academic
13. Barker KR, Imbriani JL. 1984. Nematode advisory programs—status and prospects. *Plant Dis.* 68:735–41
- 13a. Barker KR, Pederson GA, Windham GL, eds. 1998. *Plant and Nematode Interactions*. Agron. Monogr. 36. Am. Soc. Agron., Crop Sci. Soc. Am., and Soil Sci. Soc. Am.
14. Been TH, Meijer MJ, Beniers AE, Knol JW. 1996. Using image analysis for counting larvae of potato cyst nematodes (*Globodera* spp.). *Fundam. Appl. Nematol.* 19:297–304
15. Bélair G, Benoit DL. 1996. Host suitability of 32 common weeds to *Meloidogyne hapla* in organic soils of southwestern Quebec. *J. Nematol.* 28(4S): 643–47
16. Benbrook CW. 1991. Introduction. See Ref. 114a, pp. 1–10
17. Benson DM, Barker KR. 1985. Nematodes—a threat to ornamental plants in the nursery and landscape. *Plant Dis.* 69: 97–100
18. Bessey EA. 1911. Root-knot and its control. *US Dep. Agric., Bur. Plant Ind., Bull.* 217. 89 pp.
19. Bird GW. 1987. Role of nematology in integrated pest management programs. See Ref. 164a, pp. 114–21
20. Blok VC, Ehwaeti M, Fargette M, Kumar A, Phillips MS, et al. 1997. Evolution of resistance and virulence in relation to the management of nematodes with different biology, origins and reproductive strategies. *Nematologica* 43:1–13
21. Bloem J, Lebbink G, Zwart KB, Bouwman LA, Burgers SLGE, et al. 1994. Dynamics of microorganisms, microbivores and nitrogen mineralization in winter wheat fields under conventional and integrated management. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 51:129–43
22. Boag B, Evans KA, Yeates GW, Brown DJF, Neilson R. 1997. Global potential distribution of European longidorid virus-vector nematodes. *Nematologica* 43:99–106
23. Boag B, Lawson HM, Neilson R, Wright GMCN. 1994. Observations on the diversity of soil nematode fauna and weed seedbanks under different set-aside management regimes. *Asp. Appl. Biol.* 40:443–52
24. Boag B, Neilson R. 1996. Effects of potential climatic changes on plant-parasitic nematodes. *Asp. Appl. Biol.* 45:331–34
25. Boerma HR, Hussey RS. 1984. Tolerance to *Heterodera glycines* in soybean. *J. Nematol.* 16:289–96
26. Bongers T. 1990. The maturity index: an ecological measure of environmental disturbance based on nematode species composition. *Oecologia* 83:14–19
27. Bouwman LA, Bloem J, van den Boogert PHJF, Bremer F, Hoenderboom GHJ, DeRuiter PC. 1994. Short-term and long-term effects of bacterivorous nematodes and nematophagous fungi on carbon and nitrogen mineralization in microcosms. *Biol. Fertil. Soils* 17:249–56
28. Bridge J. 1996. Nematode management in sustainable and subsistence agriculture. *Annu. Rev. Phytopathol.* 34:201–25
29. Brown DJF, Robertson WM, Trudgill DL. 1995. Transmission of viruses by plant nematodes. *Annu. Rev. Phytopathol.* 33:223–49
- 29a. Brown RH, BR Kerry, eds. 1987. *Principles and Practice of Nematode Control in Crops*. Sydney: Academic
30. Browning JA, Frey KJ. 1981. The multiline concept in theory and practice. In *Strategies for the Control of Cereal Disease*, ed. JF Jenkyn, RT Plumb, pp. 39–46. Oxford: Blackwell Sci.
31. Burt OR, Ferris H. 1996. Sequential decision rules for managing nematodes with crop rotations. *J. Nematol.* 28:457–74

32. Cai D, Kleine M, Kifle S, Harloff H-J, Sandal NN, et al. 1997. Positional cloning of a gene for nematode resistance in sugar beet. *Science* 275:32–34
33. Caswell-Chen EP, DeFrank J, Apt WJ, Tang CS. 1991. Influence of nonhost plants on population decline of *Rotylenchulus reniformis*. *J. Nematol.* 23:91–98
34. Caswell-Chen EP, Williamson VM, Westerdahl BB. 1993. Viewpoint-applied biotechnology in nematology. *J. Nematol.* 25:719–30
35. Chen ZX, Dickson DW. 1997. Estimating incidence of attachment of *Pasteuria penetrans* endospores to *Meloidogyne* spp. with tally thresholds. *J. Nematol.* 29:289–95
36. Ciancio A. 1995. Density-dependent parasitism of *Xiphinema diversicaudatum* by *Pasteuria penetrans* in a naturally infested field. *Phytopathology* 85:144–49
37. Cobb NA. 1918. Estimating the nema population of soil. *US Dep. Agric. Tech. Circ.* 1. 48 pp.
38. Cohen SZ. 1996. Pesticides in ground water in the United States: monitoring, modeling, and risks from the US perspective. *J. Environ. Sci. Health* 33:1:345–52
39. Concibido VC, Denny RL, Lange DA, Orf JH, Young ND. 1996. RFLP mapping and marker-assisted selection of soybean cyst nematode resistance in PI 209332. *Crop Sci.* 36:1643–50
40. Cook R, Evans K. 1987. Resistance and tolerance. See Ref. 29a, pp. 179–231
41. Cook RJ. 1991. Challenges and rewards of sustainable agriculture, research and education. See Ref. 114a, pp. 32–76
42. Copeland PJ, Malzer GL, Davis JG, Lamb JA, Robert PC, Bruulsema TW. 1996. Using harvest index to locate environmental stress. See Ref. 136a, pp. 531–40
43. Curtis RH, Al-Hinai MS, Diggines AER, Evans K. 1997. Serological identification and quantification of *Heterodera avenae* from processed soil samples. *Nematologica* 43:199–23
44. D'Abbatto T. 1995. The nematicidal effect of organic amendments: a review of the literature, 1982–1994. *Nematol. Medit.* 23:299–305
45. Daberkaw S, Christensen L. 1996. The potential contributions of precision agriculture to IPM. See Ref. 136a, p. 567
46. Dalmasso A, Castegnone-Sereno P, Abad P. 1992. Seminar: tolerance and resistance of plants to nematodes—knowledge, needs and prospects. *Nematologica* 38:466–72
47. Davies KG, Donks C. 1993. Carbohydrate/protein interactions between the cuticle of infective juveniles of *Meloidogyne incognita* and spores of the obligate hyperparasite *Pasteuria penetrans*. *Nematologica* 39:53–64
48. Denton HP, Cassel DK. 1989. Conservation tillage and soil physical properties. In *Conservation Tillage for Crop Production in North Carolina*, ed. MG Cook, MW Lewis, pp. 16–22. NC Agric. Ext. Serv. AG-407
49. DeRuiter PC, Moore JC, Zwart KB, Bouwman LA, Hassink J, et al. 1993. Simulation of nitrogen mineralization in the below ground food webs of two winter wheat fields. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 30:95–106
50. Dillon CR, Keisling TC, Riggs RD, Oliver LR, Fultz L. 1996. Profitability of nonirrigated soybean cropping rotations. *Proc. Annu. South. Soybean Conf., 5th*, pp. 88–97
51. Dmowska E. 1993. Effects of long-term artificial acid rain on species range and diversity of soil nematodes. *Eur. J. Soil Biol.* 29:97–107
52. Dong K, Opperman CH. 1997. Genetic analysis of parasitism in the soybean cyst nematode *Heterodera glycines*. *Genetics* 146:1311–18
53. Donkin SG, Dusenbury DB. 1994. Using the *Caenorhabditis elegans* soil toxicity test to identify factors affecting toxicity of your metal ions in intact soil. *Water Air Soil Pollut.* 78:359–73
54. Duncan LW. 1991. Current options for nematode management. *Annu. Rev. Phytopathol.* 29:469–90
55. Duncan LW, Noling JW. 1998. Agricultural sustainability and nematode IPM. See Ref. 13a, pp. 251–87
56. Dwinell LD. 1997. The pinewood nematode: regulation and mitigation. *Annu. Rev. Phytopathol.* 35:153–66
57. El Titi A, Ipach U. 1989. Soil fauna in sustainable agriculture: results of an integrated farming system at Lautenbach, F.R.G. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 27:561–72
58. Evans K. 1995. Closing the gap between molecular biologists and traditional nematologists. *Nematologica* 41:385–94
59. Evans RG, Han S, Kraiger MW, Schneider SM. 1996. Precision center pivot irrigation for efficient use of water and nitrogen. See Ref. 136a, pp. 75–84
60. Ferris H. 1978. Nematode economic thresholds: derivation, requirements,

- and the theoretical considerations. *J. Nematol.* 10:341–50
61. Ferris H, Eyre M, Venette RC, Lau SS. 1996. Population energetics of bacterial-feeding nematodes: stage-specific development and fecundity rates. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 28:271–80
  62. Ferris H, Venette RC, Lau SS. 1996. Dynamics of nematode communities in tomatoes grown in conventional and organic farming systems, and their impact on soil fertility. *Appl. Soil Ecol.* 3:161–75
  63. Ferris H, Venette RC, Lau SS. 1997. Population energetics of bacterial-feeding nematodes: carbon and nitrogen budgets. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 29:1183–94
  64. Ferris VR, Ferris JM. 1992. Integration of classical and molecular approaches in nematode systematics. In *Nematology from Molecule to Ecosystem*, ed. F Gommers, PWITH Maas, pp. 92–100. Wageningen, Netherlands: Eur. Soc. Nematol.
  65. Freckman DW, Ettema CH. 1993. Assessing nematode communities in agroecosystems of varying human intervention. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 45:239–61
  66. Gallaher RN, Dickson DW, Corella JF, Hewlett TE. 1988. Tillage and multiple cropping systems and population dynamics of phytoparasitic nematodes. *Suppl. J. Nematol.* 20:90–94
  67. Giannakou IO, Pembroke B, Gowen SR, Davies KG. 1997. Effects of long-term storage and above normal temperatures on spore adhesion of *Pasteuria penetrans* and infection of the root-knot nematode *Meloidogyne javanica*. *Nematologica* 43:185–92
  68. Griffin GD, Rumbaugh MD. 1996. Host suitability of twelve leguminosae species to populations of *Meloidogyne hapla* and *M. chitwoodi*. *J. Nematol.* 28:400–5
  69. Griffiths BS, Caul S. 1993. Migration of bacterial-feeding nematodes, but not protozoa, to decomposing grass residues. *Biol. Fertil. Soils* 15:201–7
  70. Gutierrez OA. 1995. *Inheritance of tolerance to Columbia lance nematode (Hoplolaimus columbus Sher) in cotton (Gossypium hirsutum L.)*. PhD thesis. NC State Univ., Raleigh. 100 pp.
  71. Hackenburg C, Muchlchen A, Forge T, Vrain TC. 1997. Antagonistic potential of rhizobacteria for control of *Pratylenchus penetrans* on fruit crops. *J. Nematol.* 29:581 (Abstr.)
  72. Halbrendt JM. 1996. Allelopathy in the management of plant-parasitic nematodes. *J. Nematol.* 28:8–14
  73. Hassink J, Neutel AM, DeRuiter PC. 1994. C and N mineralization in sandy and loamy grassland soils: the role of microbes and microfauna. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 26:1565–71
  74. Hershman DE, Bachi PR. 1995. Effect of wheat residue and tillage on *Heterodera glycines* and yield of doublecrop soybean in Kentucky. *Plant Dis.* 79:631–33
  75. Hewitt TI, Smith KR. 1995. *Intensive agriculture and environmental quality: examining the newest agricultural myth*. Rep. Henry A. Wallace Inst. Alternat. Agric. Greenbelt, MD. 12 pp.
  76. Hill NS, Schmitt DP. 1989. Influence of temperature and soybean phenology on dormancy induction of *Heterodera glycines*. *J. Nematol.* 21:361–69
  77. Hoffmann-Hergarten S, Hasky K, Reitz M, Sikora RA. 1997. Induced systemic resistance by Rhizobacteria toward the cyst nematode, *Globodera pallida*, on potato. See Ref. 121a, pp. 292–95
  78. Hoffmann-Hergarten S, Keuken O, Gulatin M, Sikora RA. 1997. Yield responses and biological control of the root-knot nematode, *Meloidogyne incognita*, treated with *Bacillus cereus*. See Ref. 121a, pp. 364–67
  79. House GJ, Parmelee RW. 1985. Comparison of soil arthropods and earthworms from conventional and no-tillage agroecosystems. *Soil Tillage Res.* 5:351–60
  80. Hussey RS, McGuire JM. 1987. Interaction with other organisms. See Ref. 29a, pp. 313–20
  81. Hyman BC. 1996. Molecular systematic and population biology of phytonematodes: some unifying principles. *Fundam. Appl. Nematol.* 19:309–13
  82. Ingham ER, Horton KA. 1987. Bacterial, fungal and protozoan responses to chloroform fumigation in stored soil. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 19:545–50
  83. Ingham RE, Trofymow JA, Ingham ER, Coleman DC. 1985. Interactions of bacteria, fungi, and their nematode grazers: effects on nutrient cycling and plant growth. *Ecol. Monogr.* 55:119–40
  84. Jaffee BA. 1997. Nematodes, fungi, and enchytraeids. *J. Nematol.* 29:586 (Abstr.)
  - 84a. Kadir AASA, Barlow HS, eds. 1992. *Pest Management and the Environment in 2000*. Wallingford, UK: CAB Int.
  85. Kammenga JE, van Gestel CAM, Bakker J. 1994. Patterns of environmental contamination. *Toxicology* 27:88–94

86. Kerry BR. 1990. An assessment of progress toward microbial control of plant-parasitic nematodes. *J. Nematol. (Suppl.)* 22:621–31
87. Kerry BR, Evans K. 1996. New strategies for the management of plant-parasitic nematodes. In *Principles and Practices of Managing Soilborne Plant Pathogens*, ed. R Hall, pp. 134–52. St. Paul: APS Press
88. Khan Z, Bilgrami AL, Jairajpuri MS. 1995. A comparative study on the predation by *Allodorylaimus americanus* and *Discolaimus silvicolus* (Nematoda: Dorylaimida) on different species of plant-parasitic nematodes. *Fundam. Appl. Nematol.* 18:98–108
89. Kimpinski J, Sturz AV. 1996. Population growth of a rhabditid nematode on plant growth promoting bacteria from potato tubers and rhizosphere soil. *J. Nematol.* 28(4S):682–86
90. Király Z. 1996. Sustainable agriculture and the use of pesticides. *J. Environ. Sci. Health B31*:283–91
91. Klink JW, Barker KR. 1968. Effect of *Aphelenchus avenae* on the survival and pathogenic activity of root-rotting fungi. *Phytopathology* 58:228–32
92. Klopper JW, Rodríguez-Kábana R, McInroy JA, Young RW. 1992. Rhizosphere bacteria antagonistic to soybean cyst (*Heterodera glycines*) and root-knot (*Meloidogyne incognita*) nematodes: identification by fatty acid analysis and frequency of biological control activity. *Plant Soil* 139:75–84
93. Knaap E van der, Rodríguez RJ, Freckman DW. 1993. Differentiation of bacterial-feeding nematodes in soil ecological studies by means of arbitrarily-primed PCR. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 25:1141–51
94. Ko MP, Huang P-Y, Huang J-S, Barker KR. 1991. Response of nodulation to various combinations of *Bradyrhizobium japonicum* strains, soybean cultivars and races of *Heterodera glycines*. *Phytopathology* 81:591–95
95. Koch DW, Gray FA. 1997. Nematode-resistant oil radish for control of *Heterodera schachtii* I. Sugar beet-barley rotations. *J. Sugar Beet Res.* 34:31–43
96. Koenning SR, Anand SC. 1991. Effects of wheat and soybean planting date on *Heterodera glycines* population dynamics and soybean yield with conventional tillage. *Plant Dis.* 75:301–4
97. Koenning SR, Schmitt DP, Barker KR. 1995. Impact of crop rotation and tillage system on *Heterodera glycines* population density and soybean yield. *Plant Dis.* 79:282–86
98. Koenning SR, Schmitt DP, Barker KR. 1993. Cropping systems effects on *Heterodera glycines* population densities and associated soybean yield. *Plant Dis.* 77:780–86
99. Koenning SR, Schmitt DP, Barker KR. 1985. Influence of planting date on population dynamics and damage potential of *Pratylenchus brachyurus* on soybean. *J. Nematol.* 17:428–34
100. Lau SS, Fullers ME, Ferris H, Venette RC, Scow KM. 1997. Development and testing of an assay for soil ecosystem health using the bacterial-feeding nematode *Cruzinema tripartitum*. *Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf.* 36:133–39
101. Lee DL, Atkinson HJ. 1977. *Physiology of Nematodes*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press. 215 pp.
102. Leyns L, Borgonie G, Arnaut G, De-Waele D. 1995. Nematicidal activity of *Bacillus thuringiensis* isolates. *Fundam. Appl. Nematol.* 18:211–18
103. Li J, Vincx M, Herman PMJ. 1997. Carbon flows through meiobenthic nematodes in the Westerscheide Estuary. *Fundam. Appl. Nematol.* 20:487–94
104. López-Fando C, Bello A. 1995. Variability in soil nematode populations due to tillage and crop rotation in semi-arid Mediterranean agroecosystems. *Soil Tillage Res.* 36:59–72
105. Mannion CD. 1991. *Influence of tillage practices and crop rotation on soil arthropods and nematodes*. MS thesis. NC State Univ., Raleigh, NC
106. MacGuidwin AE, Layne TL. 1995. Response of nematode communities to sudangrass and sorghum-sudangrass hybrids grown as green manure crops. *J. Nematol. Suppl.* 27(4S):609–16
107. Marin-Vargas DH. 1997. *Characterization and diversity of Radopholus similis populations on selective germplasm of bananas*. PhD thesis. NC State Univ., Raleigh, NC. 105 pp.
108. McSorley R. 1994. Nematode management in sustainable agriculture. In *Environmentally Sound Agriculture*, ed. KL Campbell, WD Graham, AB Del Botcher, pp. 517–22. St. Joseph: Am. Soc. Agric. Eng.
109. McSorley R, Gallaher RN. 1993. Effects of crop rotation and tillage on nematode densities in tropical corn. *J. Nematol. Suppl.* 25:814–19
110. Meerman F, Ven GJW van de, Keulen H van, Breman H. 1996. Integrated crop

- management: an approach to sustainable agricultural development. *Int. J. Pest Manage.* 42(1):13–24
111. Melton TA. 1995. Disease management. In *1995 Flue-Cured Information*, pp. 85–111. Raleigh: NC State Univ., NC Agric. Ext. Serv. AG-187
  112. Meyer SLF, Meyer RJ. 1996. Survival of the nematode-antagonistic fungus *Verticillium lecanii* in alginiate prills. *Nematologica* 42:114–23
  113. Mojtahedi H, Santo GS, Ingham RE. 1993. Suppression of *Meloidogyne chitwoodi* with sudangrass cultivars as green manure. *J. Nematol.* 25:303–11
  114. Mullin BA, Abawi GS, Pastor-Corrales MA. 1991. Modification of resistance expression of *Phaseolus vulgaris* to *Meloidogyne incognita* by elevated soil temperatures. *J. Nematol.* 23:182–87
  - 114a. Natl. Res. Council. Board Agric. 1991. *Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education in the Field*. Washington, DC: Natl. Acad. Press
  115. Neher DA, Campbell CL. 1994. Nematode communities and microbial biomass in soils with annual and perennial crops. *Appl. Soil Ecol.* 1:17–28
  116. Neher DA, Peck SL, Rawlings JO, Campbell CL. 1995. Measures of nematode community structure and sources of variability among and within agricultural fields. *Plant Soil* 170:167–81
  117. Neilson R, Boag B. 1996. The predicted impact of possible climatic change on virus-vector nematodes in Great Britain. *Eur. J. Plant Pathol.* 102:193–99
  118. Neilson R, Boag B, Palmer LF. 1996. The effect of environment on marine nematode assemblages as indicated by the maturity index. *Nematologica* 42:232–42
  119. Niles RK, Freckman DW. 1998. From the ground up: nematode ecology in bioassessment and ecosystem health. See Ref. 13a, pp. 65–85
  120. Noe JP, Sasser JN, Imbriani JL. 1991. Maximizing the potential of cropping systems for nematode management. *J. Nematol.* 23:353–61
  121. Nusbaum CJ, Ferris H. 1973. The role of cropping systems in nematode population management. *Annu. Rev. Phytopathol.* 11:423–40
  - 121a. Ogoshi A, Kobayashi K, Homma Y, Kodama F, Kondo N, Akino S, eds. 1997. Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria—present status and future prospects. *Proc. Int. Workshop Plant-Growth-Promot. Rhizobacteria, 4th*, Jpn.-OECD Joint Workshop, Sapporo
  122. Opperman CH, Conkling MA. 1998. Bioengineering resistance to plant-parasitic nematodes. See Ref. 13a, pp. 239–50
  123. Opperman MH, Wood M, Harris PJ, Cherrett CP. 1993. Nematode and nitrate dynamics in soils treated with cattle slurry. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 25:19–24
  124. Osteen C, Johnson AW, Dowler CC. 1982. Applying the economic threshold concept to control lesion nematodes on corn. *USDA ERS Tech. Bull. No. 1670* Page SLJ, Bridge J. 1993. Plant nematodes and sustainability in tropical agriculture. *Exp. Agric.* 29:139–54
  126. Parmelee RW, Alston DG. 1986. Nematode trophic structure in conventional and no-till agroecosystems. *J. Nematol.* 18:403–7
  127. Perez EE, Mueller JD, Lewis SA. 1996. Effect of planting date on population densities of *Hoplotaimus columbus* and yield of soybean. *J. Nematol.* 28:569–74
  128. Persley GL. 1992. Beyond Mendel's garden. See Ref. 84a, pp. 360–70
  129. Phillips RE, Phillips SH. 1984. *No-Tillage Agriculture Principles and Practice*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold
  130. Phipps PM. 1993. IPM in peanuts: developing and delivering working IPM systems. *Plant Dis.* 77:307–9
  131. Pineda O, Bonierbale MW, Plaisted RL, Brodie BB, Tanksley SD. 1993. Identification of RFLP markers linked to the *II<sub>1</sub>* gene conferring resistance to the potato cyst nematode *Globodera rostochienensis*. *Genome* 36:152–56
  132. Pinkerton JN, Santo GS, Mojtahedi H. 1991. Population dynamics of *Meloidogyne chitwoodi* on Russet Burbank potatoes in rotation to degree-day accumulation. *J. Nematol.* 23:283–90
  133. Rivoal R, Lasserre F, Cooke R. 1995. Consequences of long-term cropping with resistant cultivars on the population dynamics of the endoparasitic nematodes *Heterodera avenae* and *Pratylenchus neglectus* in a cereal ecosystem. *Nematologica* 41:516–29
  134. Roberts PA. 1992. Current status of the availability, development, and use of host plant resistance to nematodes. *J. Nematol.* 24:213–27
  135. Roberts PA. 1993. The future of nematology: integration of new and improved management strategies. *J. Nematol.* 25:383–94
  136. Roberts PA. 1995. Conceptual and practical aspects of variability in root-knot nematodes related to host plant

- resistance. *Annu. Rev. Phytopathol.* 33: 199–221
- 136a. Robert PC, Rust RH, Larson WE, eds. 1996. *Proc. Int. Conf. Precision Agric.*, 3rd. Madison, WI: ASA/CSSA/SSSA
137. Rodríguez-Kábana R, Robertson DG, Weaver CF, Wells LW. 1991. Rotations of bahiagrass and castorbean with peanut for the management of *Meloidogyne arenaria*. *J. Nematol. Suppl.* 23 (4S): 658–61
138. Rodríguez-Kábana R, Canullo GH. 1992. Cropping systems for the management of phytonematodes. *Phytoparasitica* 20:211–24
139. Rönn R, Thomsen IK, Jenson B. 1995. Naken amoebae, flagellates. *Eur. J. Soil Biol.* 31:135–41
140. Ruess L, Funke W. 1992. Effects of experimental acidification on nematode populations in soil cultures. *Pedobiologia* 36:231–39
141. Santos MA, Ferraz S, Muchovej JJ. 1992. Evaluation of 20 species of fungi from Brazil for biocontrol of *Meloidogyne incognita* race 3. *Nematropica* 22:183–92
142. Saracino F, Scardicchio D, Faretra F, Molelas T, Pizza M. 1995. S.E.M.M.: a multimedia expert system for integrated and crop protection. *Difesa Pianta* 18(2):143–53
143. Sasser JN, Freckman DW. 1987. A world perspective of nematology: the role of the Society. See Ref. 164a, pp. 7–14
144. Sayre RM, Patrick ZA, Thorpe HJ. 1965. Identification of a selective nematicidal component in extracts of plant residues decomposing in soil. *Nematologica* 11:263–68
145. Seinhorst JW. 1970. Dynamics of populations of plant-parasitic nematodes. *Annu. Rev. Phytopathol.* 8:131–56
146. Setälä H, Tyynismaa M, Martikainen E, Huhta V. 1991. Mineralization of C, N, and P in relation to decomposer community structure in coniferous forest soil. *Pedobiologia* 35:285–96
147. Siddiqui ZA, Mahmood I. 1995. Biological control of *Heterodera cajani* and *Fusarium udum* by *Bacillus subtilis*, *Bradyrhizobium japonicum* and *Glomus fasciculatum* on pigeonpea. *Fundam. Appl. Nematol.* 18:559–66
148. Sikora RA. 1992. Management of the soil antagonistic potential in agroecosystems for nematode control. In *Nematology from Molecule to Molecule*, ed. FJ Gommers, P.WTH Maas, pp. 249–56. Wildervank, Netherlands: Dekker & Huisman
149. Sohlenius B, Boström S, Sandor A. 1987. Long-term dynamics of nematode communities in arable soil under four cropping systems. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 24:131–44
150. Stetina SR, Russin JS, McGawley EC. 1997. Replacement series: a tool for characterizing competition between phytoparasitic nematodes. *J. Nematol.* 29:35–42
151. Stirling GR. 1991. *Biological Control of Plant-Parasitic Nematodes*. Wallingford, UK: CAB Int. 282 pp.
152. Stirling GR, Mani A. 1995. The activity of nematode-trapping fungi following their encapsulation in alginate. *Nematologica* 41:240–50
153. Stirling AM, Stirling GR, Macrae IC. 1992. Microbial degradation of fenamiphos after repeated application to a tomato-growing soil. *Nematologica* 38:245–54
154. Stork NE, Eggleton P. 1992. Invertebrates as determinants and indicators of soil quality. *Am. J. Altern. Agric.* 7:38–47
155. Szalanski AL, Sui DD, Harris TS, Powers TO. 1997. Identification of cyst nematodes of agronomic and regulatory concern with PCR-RFLP of ITS1. *J. Nematol.* 29:255–67
156. Taylor CE, Brown DJF, Neilson R, Jones AT. 1994. The persistence and spread of *Xiphinema diversicaudatum* in cultivated and uncultivated biotypes. *Ann. Appl. Biol.* 124:469–77
157. Thomas SH. 1978. Population densities of nematodes under seven tillage regimes. *J. Nematol.* 10:24–27
158. Trivedi PC, Barker KR. 1986. Management of nematodes by cultural practices. *Nematropica* 16:213–36
159. Trudgill DL. 1991. Resistance to and tolerance of plant-parasitic nematodes in plants. *Annu. Rev. Phytopathol.* 29:167–92
160. Trudgill DL. 1995. Seminar: host and plant temperature effects on nematode development rates and nematode ecology. *Nematologica* 41:398–404
161. Tyler DD, Overton JR, Chambers AY. 1983. Tillage effects on soil properties, diseases, cyst nematodes, and soybean yields. *J. Soil Water Conserv.* 38:374–76
162. Tyler J. 1933. The root-knot nematode. *Circular 330*. Univ. Calif. Berkeley: Coll. Agric., Agric. Exp. Stn.
163. Tzortzakakis EA, Gowen SR. 1996. Occurrence of a resistance breaking pathotype of *Meloidogyne javanica* on



- tomatoes in Greece. *Fundam. Appl. Nematol.* 19:283–88
164. Vanderplank JE. 1963. *Plant Diseases: Epidemics and Control*. New York: Academic. 349 pp.
  - 164a. Veech JA, Dickson DW, eds. 1987. *Vistas on Nematology*. Hyattsville, MD: Soc. Nematol.
  165. Venette RC, Ferris H. 1997. Thermal constraints to population growth of bacterial-feeding nematodes. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 29:63–74
  166. Venette RC, Mostafa FAM, Ferris H. 1997. Trophic interactions between bacterial-feeding nematodes in plant rhizospheres and the nematophagous fungus *Hirsutiella rhossiliensis* to suppress *Heterodera schachtii*. *Plant Soil* 191:213–23
  167. Venter C, DeWaele D, Meyer AJ. 1992. Minimizing damage by *Ditylenchus destructor* to peanut seed with early harvest. *J. Nematol.* 24:528–32
  168. Wallace MK, Hawkins DM. 1994. Applications of geostatistics in plant nematology. *J. Nematol.* 26:626–34
  169. Wardle DA, Yeates GW, Watson RN, Nicholson KS. 1995. The detritus food-web and the diversity of soil fauna as indicators of disturbance regimes in agroecosystems. *Plant Soil* 170:35–43
  170. Wei G, Klopper JW, Tuzun S. 1996. Induced systemic resistance to cucumber diseases and increased growth by plant growth-promoting Rhizobacteria under field conditions. *Phytopathology* 86:221–24
  171. Westcott SW III, Kluepfel DA. 1993. Inhibition of *Criconebella xenoplax* egg hatch by *Pseudomonas aureofaciens*. *Phytopathology* 83:1245–49
  172. Whitten MJ. 1992. Pest management in 2000: What we might learn from the twentieth century. See Ref. 84a, pp. 9–44
  173. Williams KJ, Fisher JM, Langridge P. 1996. Development of a PCR-based allele-specific assay from an RFLP probe linked to resistance to cereal cyst nematode in wheat. *Genome* 39:798–801
  174. Williamson VM, Ho J-Y, Ma HM. 1992. Molecular transfer of nematode resistance genes. *J. Nematol.* 24:234–41
  175. Wright NA. 1996. New mobile soil samples compared to hand probes and augers for fertility evaluations. See Ref. 136a, pp. 631–38
  176. Yeates GW. 1994. Modification and qualification of the nematode maturity index. *Pedobiologia* 38:97–101
  177. Yeates GW. 1996. Nematode ecology. *Russ. J. Nematol.* 4:71–75
  178. Yeates GW, Orchard VA, Speir TW, Hunt JL, Hermans MCC. 1994. Impact of pasture contamination by copper, chromium, arsenic timber preservative on soil biology. *Biol. Fertil. Soils* 18:200–8
  179. Yi Y-H. 1997. *Randomly amplified polymorphic DNA (RAPD) analysis of cultivated tobacco (Nicotiana tabacum L.)*. PhD thesis. NC State Univ., Raleigh. 121 pp.
  180. Young LD. 1987. Effects of soil disturbance on reproduction of *Heterodera glycines*. *J. Nematol.* 19:141–42
  181. Young LD. 1992. Problems and strategies associated with long-term use of nematode-resistant cultivars. *J. Nematol.* 24:228–33
  182. Young LD. 1998. Breeding for nematode-resistance and tolerance. See Ref. 13a, pp. 187–207
  183. Zadoks JC. 1993. The partial past—comments on the history of thinking about resistance of plants against insects, nematodes, fungi, and other harmful agents. In *Durability of Disease Resistance*, ed. TH Jacobs, JE Parlevliet, pp. 11–22. Dordrecht: Kluwer
  184. Zadoks JC, Schein RD. 1979. *Epidemiology and Plant Disease Management*. New York/Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press. 422 pp.
  185. Zawislak K, Tyburski J. 1992. The tolerance of root, industrial and fodder crops to continuous cultivation. *Acta Acad. Agric. Tech Olszt.* 55:149–60
  186. Zwart KB, Burgers SLGE, Bloem J, Bouwman LA, Brussard L, et al. 1994. Population dynamics in the below-ground food webs in two different agricultural systems. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 51:187–98



## CONTENTS

One Phytopathologist's Growth Through IPM to Plant Health: The Key to Approaching Genetic Yield Potential, <i>J. Artie Browning</i>	1
KATHERINE ESAU, 1898–1997, <i>Jennifer A. Thorsch, Ray F. Evert</i>	27
Diversity Among Xanthomonads Pathogenic on Pepper and Tomato, <i>J. B. Jones, R. E. Stall, H. Bouzar</i>	41
Current Concepts of Active Defense in Plants, <i>Steven W. Hutcheson</i>	59
Cypress Canker: A Pandemic in Progress, <i>Antonio Graniti</i>	91
Application of Mating Type Gene Technology to Problems in Fungal Biology, <i>B. Gillian Turgeon</i>	115
Biology and Molecular Biology of Viruses in the Genus Tenuivirus, <i>Bryce W. Falk, James H. Tsai</i>	139
Developing Sustainable Systems for Nematode Management, <i>Kenneth R. Barker, Stephen R. Koening</i>	165
Homoserine Lactone-Mediated Gene Regulation in Plant-Associated Bacteria, <i>Leland S. Pierson III, Derek W. Wood, Elizabeth A. Pierson</i>	207
Management of Fire Blight: A Case Study in Microbial Ecology, <i>K. B. Johnson, V. O. Stockwell</i>	227
Recombination in <i>Magnaporthe grisea</i> , <i>Robert S. Zeigler</i>	249
Root-Knot Nematode Resistance Genes in Tomato and Their Potential for Future Use, <i>Valerie M. Williamson</i>	277
Satellite Viruses of Tobamoviruses, <i>J. Allan Dodds</i>	295
Function of Root Border Cells in Plant Health: Pioneers in the Rhizosphere, <i>M. C. Hawes, L. A. Brigham, F. Wen, H. H. Woo, Y. Zhu</i>	311
Genetics and Physiology of Aflatoxin Biosynthesis, <i>G. A. Payne, M. P. Brown</i>	329
Type III Protein Secretion Systems in Plant and Animal Pathogenic Bacteria, <i>Sheng Yang He</i>	363
Programmed Cell Death in Plant Disease: The Purpose and Promise of Cellular Suicide, <i>D. G. Gilchrist</i>	393
Control of Papaya Ringspot Virus in Papaya: A Case Study, <i>Dennis Gonsalves</i>	415
Root Cortex--The Final Frontier for the Biocontrol of Root-Rot with Fungal Antagonists: A Case Study on A Sterile Red Fungus, <i>K. Sivasithamparam</i>	439
Systemic Resistance Induced by Rhizosphere Bacteria, <i>L. C. van Loon, P. A. H. M. Bakker, C. M. J. Pieterse</i>	453
The Impact of Reduced Tillage on Soilborne Plant Pathogens, <i>W. W. Bockus, J. P. Shroyer</i>	485