

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Papers in Plant Pathology

Plant Pathology Department

7-1990

Towards an Improved Taxonomy of *Xanthomonas*

L. Vauterin

Rijksuniversiteit Groningen

J. Swings

Rijksuniversiteit Groningen

K. Kersters

Rijksuniversiteit Groningen

M. Gillis

Rijksuniversiteit Groningen

T. W. Mew

International Rice Research Institute

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/plantpathpapers>



Part of the [Plant Pathology Commons](#)

Vauterin, L.; Swings, J.; Kersters, K.; Gillis, M.; Mew, T. W.; Schroth, M. N.; Palleroni, N. J.; Hildebrand, D. C.; Stead, D. E.; Civerolo, E. L.; Hayward, A. C.; Maraïte, H.; Stall, R. E.; Vidaver, A. K.; and Bradbury, J. F., "Towards an Improved Taxonomy of *Xanthomonas*" (1990). *Papers in Plant Pathology*. 255.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/plantpathpapers/255>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Plant Pathology Department at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Papers in Plant Pathology by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Authors

L. Vauterin, J. Swings, K. Kersters, M. Gillis, T. W. Mew, M. N. Schroth, N. J. Palleroni, D. C. Hildebrand, D. E. Stead, E. L. Civerolo, A. C. Hayward, H. Maraïte, R. E. Stall, A. K. Vidaver, and J. F. Bradbury

Towards an Improved Taxonomy of *Xanthomonas*

L. Vauterin¹, J. Swings¹, K. Kersters¹, M. Gillis¹, T. W. Mew², M. N. Schroth³, N. J. Palleroni⁴, D. C. Hildebrand³, D. E. Stead⁵, E. L. Civerolo⁶, A. C. Hayward⁷, H. Maraïte⁸, R. E. Stall⁹, A. K. Vidaver¹⁰ and J. F. Bradbury¹¹

¹Laboratorium voor Microbiologie en Microbiële Genetica, Rijksuniversiteit, Ledeganckstraat 35, B-9000 Ghent, Belgium

²Department of Plant Pathology, International Rice Research Institute, Manila, The Philippines

³Department of Plant Pathology, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720

⁴Department of Microbiology, New York University Medical School, New York, New York 10016

⁵ADAS Central Science Laboratory, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Hatching Green, Harpenden AL5 2BD. Great Britain

⁶Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Beltsville, Maryland 20705

⁷Department of Microbiology, University of Queensland, St. Lucia 4067, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

⁸Laboratoire de Phytopathologie, Université Catholique de Louvain, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

⁹Department of Plant Pathology, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611

¹⁰Department of Plant Pathology, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68583-0722

¹¹Commonwealth Mycological Institute, Kew, Surrey TW9 3AF, Great Britain

Corresponding author — J. Swings

Abstract — Improvement of the taxonomy of the genus *Xanthomonas* and especially of *Xanthomonas campestris*, which is subdivided into more than 125 pathovars, is discussed. Recent contributions to the taxonomy of *Xanthomonas* are reviewed, and on the basis of these data and unpublished data from several laboratories, the usefulness of different phenotypic, chemotaxonomic, and genotypic techniques is discussed. The heterogeneity of several *X. campestris* pathovars has been demonstrated by sodium dodecyl sulfate electrophoresis of whole-cell proteins and fatty acid fingerprinting. The host selectivity of the pathovars is not correlated with their relationships as revealed by DNA-DNA hybridization experiments. In order to reveal the phylogenetic relationships among *X. campestris* pathovars and their relationships to other *Xanthomonas* species, it will be necessary to perform extensive DNA-DNA homology studies as an essential part of a polyphasic approach. At present, six DNA homology groups within *X. campestris* have been delineated. A systematic approach to improve the taxonomy of the genus *Xanthomonas* is proposed.

Towards an Improved Taxonomy of *Xanthomonas*

L. VAUTERIN,¹ J. SWINGS,^{1*} K. KERSTERS,¹ M. GILLIS,¹ T. W. MEW,² M. N. SCHROTH,³ N. J. PALLERONI,⁴
D. C. HILDEBRAND,³ D. E. STEAD,⁵ E. L. CIVEROLO,⁶ A. C. HAYWARD,⁷ H. MARAÏTE,⁸ R. E. STALL,⁹
A. K. VIDAVER,¹⁰ AND J. F. BRADBURY¹¹

Laboratorium voor Microbiologie en Microbiële Genetica, Rijksuniversiteit, Ledeganckstraat 35, B-9000 Ghent, Belgium¹;
Department of Plant Pathology, International Rice Research Institute, Manila, The Philippines²; Department of Plant
Pathology, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720³; Department of Microbiology, New York University
Medical School, New York, New York 10016⁴; ADAS Central Science Laboratory, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and
Food, Hatching Green, Harpenden AL5 2BD, Great Britain⁵; Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of
Agriculture, Beltsville, Maryland 20705⁶; Department of Microbiology, University of Queensland, St. Lucia 4067,
Brisbane, Queensland, Australia⁷; Laboratoire de Phytopathologie, Université Catholique de Louvain, B-1348 Louvain-
la-Neuve, Belgium⁸; Department of Plant Pathology, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611⁹; Department of
Plant Pathology, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68583-0722¹⁰; and Commonwealth Mycological Institute,
Kew, Surrey TW9 3AF, Great Britain¹¹

Improvement of the taxonomy of the genus *Xanthomonas* and especially of *Xanthomonas campestris*, which is subdivided into more than 125 pathovars, is discussed. Recent contributions to the taxonomy of *Xanthomonas* are reviewed, and on the basis of these data and unpublished data from several laboratories, the usefulness of different phenotypic, chemotaxonomic, and genotypic techniques is discussed. The heterogeneity of several *X. campestris* pathovars has been demonstrated by sodium dodecyl sulfate electrophoresis of whole-cell proteins and fatty acid fingerprinting. The host selectivity of the pathovars is not correlated with their relationships as revealed by DNA-DNA hybridization experiments. In order to reveal the phylogenetic relationships among *X. campestris* pathovars and their relationships to other *Xanthomonas* species, it will be necessary to perform extensive DNA-DNA homology studies as an essential part of a polyphasic approach. At present, six DNA homology groups within *X. campestris* have been delineated. A systematic approach to improve the taxonomy of the genus *Xanthomonas* is proposed.

The genus *Xanthomonas* consists mainly of plant-pathogenic bacteria that occur worldwide and cause diseases of diverse plants. Because of its economic importance, this genus has been subjected to many taxonomic and determinative studies. DNA-rRNA hybridizations (4, 17) have revealed that the genus constitutes a separate rRNA branch in the gamma taxon of the *Proteobacteria* (sensu Stackebrandt et al. [21]). In *Bergey's Manual of Systematic Bacteriology*, the genus is divided into the following five species (1): *Xanthomonas albilineans*, *Xanthomonas ampelina*, *Xanthomonas axonopodis*, *Xanthomonas campestris* (type species), and *Xanthomonas fragariae*. Recently, the following proposals have been formulated in order to improve the classification of the genus *Xanthomonas*: (i) the name "*Xanthomonas populi*" (18) has been proposed, but has not been validated yet; (ii) Swings et al. transferred *Pseudomonas maltophilia* to the genus *Xanthomonas* as *Xanthomonas maltophilia* (24); (iii) in an extensive phenotypic study of 268 *Xanthomonas* strains, *X. campestris* pv. *graminis* and *X. campestris* pv. *oryzae* were clearly separated from other *X. campestris* pathovars, and Van den Mooter et al. proposed that these pathovars should be reclassified as separate species ("*Xanthomonas graminis*" and "*Xanthomonas oryzae*") (29); and (iv) Willems et al. proposed that *X. ampelina* does not belong to the genus *Xanthomonas* and reclassified this organism as *Xylophilus ampelinus* (32).

Consequently, Van den Mooter et al. (29) proposed that the genus *Xanthomonas* contains the following eight species: *X. albilineans*, *X. axonopodis*, *X. campestris*, *X. fragariae*, "*X. graminis*," *X. maltophilia*, "*X. oryzae*," and "*X. populi*." *X. campestris* is by far the most complex of these

species because it has been subdivided into 123 pathovars as described by Dye et al. (5) (this number has increased by an additional 20 pathovars since the study of Dye et al. [J. M. Young, personal communication]). The term pathovar was established in a special-purpose nomenclature (5) to satisfy the needs of plant pathologists for names of pathogens that are, or are believed to be, specific for certain hosts or diseases. This special-purpose classification does not meet the requirements for naming taxa according to the *International Code of Nomenclature of Bacteria* (13). It is a nomenclatural compromise which is open to criticism (6, 20, 23, 29). In a general taxonomic environment, there is no reason to assign crucial importance to a single phenotypic feature (in this case, phytopathogenicity). "Modern bacterial systematists should not be content to work with two types of classification: an artificial one for practical purposes only and a natural one without practical implication. Rather, the ultimate goal of bacterial taxonomists should be to define taxa on the basis of their genealogical relationships" (13). An important consequence of pathovar classification in the genus *Xanthomonas* is that nonpathogenic xanthomonads (e.g., epiphytic isolates) cannot be classified in the system.

It is generally accepted that the taxonomy of the genus *Xanthomonas* and especially of *X. campestris* needs revision. The results of some recent studies of *X. campestris* taxonomy are summarized in Table 1.

In our opinion, the development of improved *Xanthomonas* taxonomy will depend on satisfying the two following criteria: examination of large, representative sets of *Xanthomonas* strains and use of a number of discriminating techniques. In the most extensive taxonomic study performed so far, 268 strains belonging to 107 *X. campestris* pathovars (29) were examined. This means that on average fewer than three

* Corresponding author.

TABLE 1. Recent contributions to the taxonomy of the genus *Xanthomonas*^a

Pathovar(s)	No. of strains investigated	Reference	Main method(s)	Main conclusions
<i>oryzae, oryzicola</i>	49	30	Phenotypic features and soluble protein PAGE	Both rice pathogens are differentiated phenotypically and by protein electrophoresis
<i>campestris</i>	35	25	Serological techniques, SDS-PAGE of membrane proteins	Strain identification by Ouchterlony double diffusion is possible; <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>campestris</i> is distinguished from other <i>X. campestris</i> pathovars by SDS-PAGE of membrane proteins
<i>manihotis, cassavae</i>	43	27	Phenotypic features, soluble protein PAGE, and DNA-DNA hybridizations	The cassava pathogens are differentiated from each other by protein electrophoresis and phenotypic analysis; DNA-DNA hybridizations reveal low levels of homology (18 to 37%) among <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>manihotis</i> , <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>cassavae</i> , and <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>campestris</i>
<i>graminis, phleipratensis, poae, arrhenatheri</i>	35	28	Phenotypic features and soluble protein PAGE	In protein electrophoresis each of the four pathovars forms a separate cluster; in the phenotypic analysis <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>arrhenatheri</i> and <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>poae</i> cluster together; <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>graminis</i> and <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>phleipratensis</i> occur in two separate phena
107 pathovars	268	29	Physiological and biochemical tests	One <i>X. campestris</i> cluster exists without internal differentiation, except for <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>graminis</i> and <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>oryzae</i> , which occur in separate phena
26 pathovars	117	14	RFLP analysis of plasmid DNA	Not all <i>X. campestris</i> strains contain plasmids; plasmid-containing strains are distinguishable on the pathovar level
26 pathovars	93	15	RFLP analysis of genomic DNA	Differentiation among pathovars is possible; RFLP analysis is suitable for identifying unknown <i>Xanthomonas</i> strains
<i>citri</i>	30	10	Total genomic fingerprinting by DNA restriction analysis	Two clonal <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>citri</i> groups correspond to pathological groups A and (B+D+C); pathological group E is heterogeneous
<i>citri</i>	24	7	RFLP analysis of genomic DNA	Clonal variation occurs among <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>citri</i> strains, analogous to the results of Hartung and Civerolo ^b
<i>citri, phaseoli, alfalfae, glycines, cyamopsidis, dieffenbachiae, pisi</i>		8	RFLP analysis of genomic DNA, phytopathological tests	Reinstatement of <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>citri</i> pathological group A to <i>X. citri</i> and reclassification of pathological groups (B+D+C) and E as <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>aurantifolii</i> and <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>citrumelo</i> , respectively; reinstatement of American <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>phaseoli</i> strains to <i>X. phaseoli</i>
15 pathovars from grasses and cereals	120	12	SDS-PAGE of whole-cell proteins and DNA-DNA hybridizations	Various pathovars display a characteristic protein pattern; <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>translucens</i> , <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>hordei</i> , <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>cerealis</i> , <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>secalis</i> , <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>undulosa</i> , and <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>poae</i> cannot be differentiated by SDS-PAGE and are genomically highly related
14 pathovars from grasses and cereals	63	22	Gas-chromatographic analysis of cellular fatty acids	Various pathovars display a distinct fatty acid pattern; <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>translucens</i> , <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>hordei</i> , <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>cerealis</i> , <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>secalis</i> , and <i>X. campestris</i> pv. <i>undulosa</i> cannot be differentiated

^a Contributions since the publication of *Bergey's Manual* in 1984 (1).^b See reference 10.

strains per pathovar were included. On the basis of studies in which pathovars have been examined extensively by high-resolution techniques (e.g., sodium dodecyl sulfate [SDS] protein electrophoresis, fatty acid analysis, DNA restriction analysis), it appears that some pathovars are heterogeneous

(see below). Valid taxonomic conclusions cannot be made unless large numbers of strains, representing the geographical distribution area of each pathovar, are examined. A number of methods discriminate groups of strains at the specific and infraspecific levels and have been used to study

X. campestris pathovars (e.g., serological techniques, phage typing, protein electrophoretic patterns, isoenzyme electrophoresis, phenotypic analysis, fatty acid composition, DNA restriction analysis). For classification purposes however, it is now considered necessary to calibrate these techniques against DNA-DNA hybridization, the conventional method used for the delineation of species (11, 19, 26, 31). It should be realized that in fact the complete nucleotide base sequence of genomic DNA is the absolute reference standard (31).

SDS-polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE) of cellular proteins has demonstrated the homogeneity or heterogeneity of *X. campestris* pathovars (Table 1 and see below). The following pathovars have been shown to be internally homogeneous as determined by SDS-PAGE (Vauterin, unpublished data, except where indicated otherwise): *X. campestris* pv. *arrhenatheri* (7 strains) (12), *X. campestris* pv. *begoniae* (35 strains), *X. campestris* pv. *campestris* (112 strains), *X. campestris* pv. *cassavae* (18 strains), *X. campestris* pv. *cucurbitae* (8 strains), *X. campestris* pv. *glycines* (15 strains), *X. campestris* pv. *graminis* (14 strains) (12), *X. campestris* pv. *holcicola* (9 strains) (12), *X. campestris* pv. *hyacinthi* (11 strains), *X. campestris* pv. *manihotis* (19 strains), *X. campestris* pv. *melonis* (5 strains), *X. campestris* pv. *oryzae* (18 strains) (12), *X. campestris* pv. *oryzicola* (12 strains) (12), *X. campestris* pv. *pelargonii* (131 strains), *X. campestris* pv. *phlei* (7 strains) (12), *X. campestris* pv. *pruni* (14 strains), and *X. campestris* pv. *vitians* (10 strains). Although not all pathovars have been studied by SDS-PAGE, it is clear that several pathovars are heterogeneous and possess two or more protein electrophoretic types. The following pathovars have been shown to be heterogeneous by SDS-PAGE (Vauterin, unpublished data, except where indicated otherwise): *X. campestris* pv. *alfalfae* (10 strains), *X. campestris* pv. *citri* (43 strains), *X. campestris* pv. *corylina* (7 strains), *X. campestris* pv. *juglandis* (11 strains), *X. campestris* pv. *malvacearum* (11 strains), *X. campestris* pv. *phaseoli* (17 strains), *X. campestris* pv. *poinsetticola* (9 strains), *X. campestris* pv. *ricini* (10 strains), *X. campestris* pv. *vasculorum* (24 strains) (12), *X. campestris* pv. *vesicatoria* (22 strains), and *X. campestris* pv. *vignicola* (12 strains). *X. campestris* pv. *cerealis* (8 strains), *X. campestris* pv. *hordei* (11 strains), *X. campestris* pv. *poae* (2 strains), *X. campestris* pv. *secalis* (4 strains), *X. campestris* pv. *translucens* (10 strains), and *X. campestris* pv. *undulosa* (6 strains) (12) cannot be differentiated from each other by SDS-PAGE of proteins.

Fatty acid analyses of lipopolysaccharides and membrane lipids of members of 60 species and pathovars within the genus *Xanthomonas* have demonstrated the great heterogeneity within the genus. Most species, except *X. campestris*, are relatively homogeneous, but even within some individual *X. campestris* pathovars there is great heterogeneity (22; Stead, unpublished data). Some pathovars (for example, *X. campestris* pv. *vasculorum*) comprise several discrete subgroups. Other heterogeneous pathovars are *X. campestris* pv. *citri*, *X. campestris* pv. *dieffenbachiae*, and *X. campestris* pv. *vesicatoria*.

Many taxa group together according to fatty acid profile type. Table 2 shows some *X. campestris* groups based on principal-component analysis. These groups are virtually identical to those based on DNA-DNA homology (Table 3) and SDS-PAGE (data not shown). Some pathovars are so closely related that there are no significant differences between profiles. These include (i) *X. campestris* pv. *holcicola* and *X. campestris* pv. *vasculorum* subgroup C and (ii) *X.*

TABLE 2. Some fatty acid profile groups within *X. campestris*^a

Group	<i>X. campestris</i> pathovars	Host family
1	<i>phaseoli</i> , <i>alfalfae</i> , <i>glycines</i> , <i>vignicola</i> , <i>sesami</i> , <i>passiflorae</i>	Mainly Fabaceae
2	<i>campestris</i> , <i>raphani</i> , <i>armoraciae</i> , <i>barbareae</i> , <i>incanae</i>	Brassicaceae
3	<i>graminis</i> , <i>arrhenatheri</i> , <i>phlei</i> , <i>poae</i> , <i>cerealis</i> , <i>undulosa</i> , <i>secalis</i> , <i>hordei</i> , <i>translucens</i> , <i>phleipratensis</i>	Poaceae
4	<i>holcicola</i> , <i>vasculorum</i> subgroup C, <i>oryzae</i> , <i>oryzicola</i> , <i>cyamopsidis</i>	Mainly Poaceae

^a Stead, unpublished data.

campestris pv. *translucens*, *X. campestris* pv. *cerealis*, *X. campestris* pv. *hordei*, *X. campestris* pv. *undulosa*, and *X. campestris* pv. *secalis*.

The application of restriction fragment length polymorphism (RFLP) analysis also seems to offer new perspectives for *Xanthomonas* taxonomy (Table 1). Gabriel et al. (8) proposed reinstatement of *X. campestris* pv. *citri* strains to the species *Xanthomonas citri* and reinstatement of American *X. campestris* pv. *phaseoli* strains to the species *Xanthomonas phaseoli*. In both cases, the only differentiating criterion advanced by the authors was a "distinctive pattern of hybridizing DNA bands by RFLP analysis." Although we are aware of the possibilities that RFLP analysis offers for bacterial characterization, we do not agree with the reclassifications proposed by these authors, because the reinstatements of former pathovars or parts of them to species level are based essentially on RFLP differences. The similarities of RFLP patterns refer only to congruence of a restricted fragment of the entire genome. This could lead to the development of an RFLP system, which probably would be as unjustified as a system based on pathogenicity. If RFLP data are to be used in taxonomy, they should be complemented with total DNA-DNA homology studies.

DNA-DNA hybridization studies have demonstrated great variation in the relatedness of pathovars (12, 16, 27; Hildebrand, Palleroni, and Schroth, unpublished data; unpublished data obtained in the Laboratory of Microbiology, State University, Ghent, Belgium). A DNA homology value of 60 to 70% is the generally accepted minimum value for strains within a species (11, 19, 31). Many *X. campestris* pathovars have DNA-DNA homology values between 0 and 40% and thus are unlikely to belong to a single species, whereas other pathovars have levels of DNA-DNA homology (Table 3) higher than 60% and most likely belong to the same species. At present, six DNA homology groups have been delineated within *X. campestris*. The pathovar reference strains given by Dye et al. (5) for the pathovars listed in Table 3 are all representative and can be used as reference strains of the DNA homology groups, except for *X. campestris* pv. *vesicatoria* subgroup A. A representative strain of this subgroup is strain NCPPB 2573. At first, it was striking that some of the six groups shown in Table 3 comprise pathovars which attack plants of the same family. Reality is more complex however; there are pathovars that attack members of the same plant family but occur in different DNA homology groups, as well as pathovars that attack members of different plant families and occur in the same DNA homology group. A number of pathovars, including *X. campestris* pv. *eucalypti*, *X. campestris* pv. *papavericola*, *X. campestris* pv. *pisi*, *X. campestris* pv. *vesicatoria* subgroup B (including the pathovar reference strain), *X. campestris* pv. *hyacinthi*, and *X. campestris* pv. *cassavae*,

TABLE 3. DNA-DNA homology groups within *X. campestris*

Group	<i>X. campestris</i> pathovars	Host family(ies)	DNA-DNA homology values (%)
1	<i>phaseoli</i> , <i>phaseoli</i> "var. <i>fuscans</i> ," <i>alfalfae</i> , <i>glycines</i> , <i>cajani</i> , <i>vignicola</i> , <i>manihotis</i> , <i>vesicatoria</i> subgroup A, <i>malvacearum</i> , <i>begoniae</i> , <i>cassiae</i> , <i>melhusi</i> , <i>biophyti</i> , <i>khayae</i> , <i>physalidicola</i> , <i>fascicularis</i> , <i>nakataecorchori</i> , <i>lespedezae</i> , <i>maculifoliogardeniae</i> ^c	Fabaceae and others	50-90 ^{a,b}
2	<i>campestris</i> , <i>raphani</i> , <i>aberrans</i> , <i>armoraciae</i> , <i>barbareae</i> , <i>incanae</i> , <i>plantaginis</i>	Mainly Brassicaceae	68-95 ^{a,b}
3	<i>graminis</i> , <i>arrhenatheri</i> , <i>phlei</i> , <i>poae</i> , <i>cerealis</i> , <i>undulosa</i> , <i>secalis</i> , <i>hordei</i> , <i>translucens</i> , <i>phleipratensis</i>	Poaceae	58-94 ^d
4	<i>oryzae</i> , <i>oryzicola</i>	Poaceae	80-100 ^d
5	<i>taraxaci</i> , <i>carotae</i> , <i>pelargonii</i> , " <i>X. gardneri</i> "	Different families	88-96 ^b
6	<i>juglandis</i> , <i>celebensis</i>	Different families	84 ^b

^a L. Vauterin and B. Hoste, unpublished data.

^b Hildebrand, Palleroni, and Schroth, unpublished data. DNA homology values were recalculated by using the methods of Grimont (9) and De Ley et al. (3).

^c *X. campestris* pv. *vesicatoria* subgroup A does not include the pathovar reference strain according to Dye et al. (5).

^d Data from reference 12.

do not fall into any of the groups listed and may represent additional DNA homology groups. It is also clear that in many cases the DNA homology groups are not consistent with the pathovar subdivision. Although several attempts have been made to characterize and isolate genes for pathogenicity (2), it is still not known whether phytopathological specialization is related to only a single gene or to many genes. The present data suggest that genes for pathogenicity constitute a rather small part of the genome or at least that phytopathogenic specialization is affected by few genes, as a number of pathovars with different host ranges share high levels of DNA homology. This also implies that host specificity is not a representative marker for phylogenetic classification.

It is evident from a survey of the recent literature, together with unpublished data from some of our laboratories, that the taxonomic structure of the genus *Xanthomonas* is very complex. The sometimes unexpected phylogenetic relationships between pathovars can be detected only by extensive DNA-DNA hybridizations.

Progress in *Xanthomonas* taxonomy will largely depend on a systematic, polyphasic, and comprehensive approach, involving (i) the constitution of a large, representative collection of strains, comprising fresh isolates and type, neotype, and collection strains from all *Xanthomonas* species and pathovars; (ii) screening of the entire collection for identical and closely related strains by appropriate methods (e.g., phenotypic tests, SDS-PAGE, fatty acid analysis, etc.); (iii) selection of one or two representative members from each group for genotypic analysis; (iv) construction of a DNA-DNA homology matrix, essentially containing representative strains of all pathovars of *X. campestris* and all species of *Xanthomonas*; (v) the search for phenotypic features allowing differentiation between the delineated DNA homology groups; and (vi) pathogenicity testing of the delineated DNA homology groups by inoculation and cross-inoculation tests.

As the investigation of all described *X. campestris* pathovars will be a very extensive task, a collaborative polyphasic approach will be needed to obtain a reliable classification of the genus *Xanthomonas*. Workers should refrain from advancing premature nomenclatural changes in the genus *Xanthomonas* on the basis of fragmentary data. Both the stability and the uniformity of the classification and the respectability of taxonomists will profit from this.

We thank J. M. Young for critically reading the manuscript and

for his valuable suggestions. L.V. is indebted to the Instituut tot Aanmoediging van het Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek in Nijverheid en Landbouw.

LITERATURE CITED

- Bradbury, J. F. 1984. *Xanthomonas* Dowson 1939, p. 199-210. In N. R. Krieg and J. G. Holt (ed.), *Bergey's manual of systematic bacteriology*, vol. 1. The Williams & Wilkins Co., Baltimore.
- Daniels, M. J. 1986. Molecular genetics of pathogenicity of *Xanthomonas campestris*, p. 291-295. In J. Bailey (ed.), *Biology and molecular biology of plant-pathogen interactions*. NATO Advanced Study Institute Series, vol. H1. Springer-Verlag KG, Berlin.
- De Ley, J., H. Cattoir, and A. Reynaerts. 1970. The quantitative measurement of DNA hybridization from renaturation rates. *Eur. J. Biochem.* 12:133-142.
- De Vos, P., and J. De Ley. 1983. The intra- and intergeneric similarities of *Pseudomonas* and *Xanthomonas* ribosomal ribonucleic acid cistrons. *Int. J. Syst. Bacteriol.* 33:487-509.
- Dye, D. W., J. F. Bradbury, M. Goto, A. C. Hayward, R. A. Lelliott, and M. N. Schroth. 1980. International standards for naming pathovars of phytopathogenic bacteria and a list of pathovar names and pathotype strains. *Rev. Plant Pathol.* 59:153-168.
- Ercolani, G. L. 1987. Practical problems with the pathovar scheme in plant quarantine, p. 786-793. In E. L. Civerolo, A. Collmer, R. E. Davis, and A. G. Gillaspie (ed.), *Plant pathogenic bacteria*. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, Boston.
- Gabriel, D. W., J. Hunter, M. Kingsley, J. Miller, and G. Lazo. 1988. Clonal population structure of *Xanthomonas campestris* and genetic diversity among citrus canker strains. *Mol. Plant Microbe Interact.* 1:59-65.
- Gabriel, D. W., M. T. Kingsley, J. E. Hunter, and T. Gottwald. 1989. Reinstatement of *Xanthomonas citri* (ex Hasse) and *X. phaseoli* (ex Smith) to species and reclassification of all *X. campestris* pv. *citri* strains. *Int. J. Syst. Bacteriol.* 39:14-22.
- Grimont, P. A. D. 1988. Use of DNA reassociation in bacterial classification. *Can. J. Microbiol.* 34:541-546.
- Hartung, J. S., and E. L. Civerolo. 1987. Genomic fingerprints of *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *citri* strains from Asia, South America and Florida. *Phytopathology* 77:282-285.
- Johnson, J. L. 1984. Nucleic acids in bacterial classification, p. 8-11. In N. R. Krieg and J. G. Holt (ed.), *Bergey's manual of systematic bacteriology*, vol. 1. The Williams and Wilkins Co., Baltimore.
- Kerstens, K., B. Pot, B. Hoste, M. Gillis, and J. De Ley. 1989. Protein electrophoresis and DNA:DNA hybridizations of xanthomonads from grasses and cereals. *Bull. OEPP (Organ. Eur. Méditerr. Prot. Plant.)/EPPO (Eur. Mediterr. Plant Prot. Organ.) Bull.* 19:51-55.
- Lapage, S. P., P. H. A. Sneath, E. F. Lessel, V. B. D. Skerman,

- H. P. R. Seelinger, and W. A. Clark (ed.). 1975. International code of nomenclature of bacteria. 1975 Revision. American Society for Microbiology, Washington, D.C.
14. Lazo, G. R., and D. W. Gabriel. 1987. Conservation of plasmid DNA sequences and pathovar identification of strains of *Xanthomonas campestris*. *Phytopathology* **77**:448-453.
 15. Lazo, G. R., R. Roffey, and D. W. Gabriel. 1987. Pathovars of *Xanthomonas campestris* are distinguishable by restriction length fragment polymorphisms. *Int. J. Syst. Bacteriol.* **37**: 214-221.
 16. Murata, G. R., and M. P. Starr. 1973. A concept of the genus *Xanthomonas* and its species in the light of segmental homology of deoxyribonucleic acids. *Phytopathol. Z.* **77**:285-323.
 17. Palleroni, N. J., R. Kunisawa, R. Contopoulou, and M. Doudoroff. 1973. Nucleic acid homologies in the genus *Pseudomonas*. *Int. J. Syst. Bacteriol.* **23**:333-339.
 18. Ridé, M., and S. Ridé. 1978. *Xanthomonas populi* (Ridé) comb. nov. (syn. *Aplanobacter populi* Ridé), spécificité, variabilité et absence de relations avec *Erwinia cancerogena*. *Eur. J. For. Pathol.* **8**:310-330.
 19. Schleifer, K. H., and E. Stackebrandt. 1983. Molecular systematics of prokaryotes. *Annu. Rev. Microbiol.* **37**:143-187.
 20. Schroth, M. N., and O. C. Hildebrand. 1983. Towards a sensible taxonomy of bacterial plant pathogens. *Plant Dis.* **67**:128.
 21. Stackebrandt, E., R. G. E. Murray, and H. G. Trüper. 1988. *Proteobacteria* classis nov. A name for the phylogenetic taxon that includes the "purple bacteria and their relatives." *Int. J. Syst. Bacteriol.* **38**:321-325.
 22. Stead, D. E. 1989. Grouping of *Xanthomonas campestris* pathovars of cereals and grasses by fatty acid profiling. *Bull. OEPP (Organ. Eur. Méditerran. Prot. Plant.)/EPPPO (Eur. Mediterr. Plant Prot. Organ.) Bull.* **19**:57-68.
 23. Swings, J. 1989. Classification of the bacterial blight pathogen, p. 13-17. Proceedings of the International Workshop on Bacterial Blight of Rice. International Rice Research Institute, Manila, The Philippines.
 24. Swings, J., P. De Vos, M. Van den Mooter, and J. De Ley. 1983. Transfer of *Pseudomonas maltophilia* Hugh 1981 to the genus *Xanthomonas* as *Xanthomonas maltophilia* (Hugh 1981) comb. nov. *Int. J. Syst. Bacteriol.* **33**:409-413.
 25. Thavechai, N., and N. W. Schaad. 1986. Serological and electrophoretic analysis of membrane protein extracts of *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *campestris* from Thailand. *Phytopathology* **76**:139-147.
 26. Tourova, T. P., and A. S. Antonov. 1987. Identification of microorganisms by rapid DNA:DNA hybridization, p. 333-355. In R. R. Colwell and R. Grigorova (ed.), *Methods in microbiology*, vol. 19. Academic Press, Inc. (London), Ltd., London.
 27. Van den Mooter, M., H. Maraité, L. Meiresonne, J. Swings, M. Gillis, K. Kersters, and J. De Ley. 1987. Comparison between *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *manihotis* (ISPP List 1980), and *X. campestris* pv. *cassavae* (ISPP List 1980) by means of phenotypic, protein electrophoretic, DNA hybridization and phytopathological techniques. *J. Gen. Microbiol.* **133**:57-71.
 28. Van den Mooter, M., M. Steenackers, C. Maertens, F. Gosselé, P. De Vos, J. Swings, K. Kersters, and J. De Ley. 1987. Differentiation between *X. campestris* pv. *graminis* (ISPP List 1980), pv. *phleipratensis* (ISPP List 1980) emend., pv. *poae* Egli and Schmidt 1982 and pv. *arrhenatheri* Egli and Schmidt 1982, by numerical analysis of phenotypic features and protein gel electrophoregrams. *J. Phytopathology* **118**:135-156.
 29. Van den Mooter, M., J. Swings, F. Gosselé, K. Kersters, and J. De Ley. 1987. The taxonomy of *Xanthomonas* Dowson 1939, p. 795-796. In E. L. Civerolo, A. Collmer, R. E. Davis, and A. G. Gillaspie (ed.), *Plant pathogenic bacteria*. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, Boston.
 30. Vera Cruz, C. M., F. Gosselé, K. Kersters, P. Segers, M. Van den Mooter, J. Swings, and J. De Ley. 1984. Differentiation between *X. campestris* pv. *oryzae*, *X. campestris* pv. *oryzicola* and the bacterial "brown blotch" pathogen on rice by numerical analysis of phenotypic features and protein gel electrophoregrams. *J. Gen. Microbiol.* **130**:2983-2999.
 31. Wayne, L. G., D. J. Brenner, R. R. Colwell, P. A. D. Grimont, O. Kandler, M. I. Krichevsky, L. H. Moore, R. G. E. Murray, E. Stackebrandt, M. P. Starr, and H. G. Trüper. 1987. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Reconciliation of Approaches to Bacterial Systematics. *Int. J. Syst. Bacteriol.* **37**:463-464.
 32. Willems, A., M. Gillis, K. Kersters, L. Van den Broucke, and J. De Ley. 1987. Transfer of *Xanthomonas ampelina* Panagopoulos 1969 to a new genus, *Xylophilus* gen. nov., as *Xylophilus ampelinus* (Panagopoulos 1969) comb. nov. *Int. J. Syst. Bacteriol.* **37**:422-430.