Effect of Powdery Scab Root Galls on Yield of Potato in the Columbia Basin
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Powdery scab of potato, caused by the soilborne, plant endoparasitic slime mold, *Spongospora subterranea*, is a major concern for potato production in the Columbia Basin. Occurrence of powdery scab in the Columbia Basin before 1981 was limited and sporadic, whereas now the disease occurs at high severities in many fields throughout the region. The pathogen is present in many potato production regions worldwide. Infected seed tubers and contaminated soils are means of disseminating the pathogen, and *S. subterranea* also transmits the *Potato mop top virus* that causes potato mop top.

Powdery scab symptoms are confined to belowground plant organs, and generally do not become visible for three or more weeks after infection. Infection results in abnormal enlargement or hypertrophy of cells. Infected roots and stolons develop wart-like galls, which are white at first and turn brown to black as they mature. Galls vary in size up to that of a pea. Disease symptoms on young tubers consist of small, gray, elevated pustules on the tuber surface. Pustules later dry and break open, leaving circular to oval, small, scabby pits. The pits contain a yellow-brown powder that consists of a mass of clustered spores. Pustules on tubers can be entry points for infection by pathogens that cause pink rot and late blight. Pustules on tubers additionally break the preventive chemical barrier to pink rot and late blight pathogens formed at the tuber periderm from systemic fungicides such as metalaxyl.

Most commercial potato cultivars develop root galls at various severities when inoculum levels and environment favor infection. Tubers of white and red skinned potato cultivars are susceptible, and those of russet skinned cultivars are partially resistant and are usually not damaged significantly (Nitzan et al. 2010). Resistances to the root and tuber phases of the disease appear to be inherited independently.

Plants with a severe level of root galls have been reported to wilt and die, but this is seldom observed (Christ 2001). Powdery scab root galling was stated to cause yield losses of up to 5 to 12 metric tons/ ha in Washington State (Brown et al. 2007); however, a non-infected control treatment for comparison with infected plants, and the elimination of other soilborne pathogens such as *Verticillium dahliae* (Verticillium wilt) and *Colletotrichum coccodes* (black dot) were not done in that study to make a reliable loss estimation. In a controlled experiment in Colombia, reductions of 23% for plant length, 32% for foliar dry weight, and 30% for tuber weight were attributed to powdery scab root galling for the cultivar Diacol Capiro, which is a member of the *andigena* subspecies of *S. tuberosum* (Gilchrist et al. 2011). Infested and non-infested soil in containers was used in that study in Colombia, but methods were not described for how the soil was infested and whether other pathogens were successfully excluded (Gilchrist et al. 2011). Tuber yield of potato was also reduced in a shadehouse environment...
when soil was infested with *S. subterranea* inoculum prepared by peeling the periderm from powdery scab-infected tubers grown in the field (Shah et al. 2012).

A few cultivars are available with resistance to root galling (Nitzan et al. 2008, 2010). Other than resistance and avoiding infested fields, satisfactory management tactics are not currently available for reducing root galls on commercial cultivars and limiting tuber pustules on white and red skinned potato cultivars. Delaying planting to reduce the time period that potatoes are grown in disease favorable cool soil temperatures may reduce severity of powdery scab due to disease escape (Christ and Weidner 1988, Johnson and Miliczky 1993), but early markets and maximum yields may be sacrificed with this practice.

The effect of root galls on yield of potato, *S. tuberosum* spp. *tuberosum*, under commercial production in the Columbia Basin of Washington State has not been quantified satisfactorily. The effect of root galls on yield should be quantified to established action and economic thresholds, and determine if control tactics are applicable for this phase of the disease. Methods available to determine yield reduction caused by the obligate pathogen *S. subterranea* are limited because chemical controls are not available to provide a comparison between diseased and non-diseased plants. Comparing yields of plants grown in infested and non-infested soil in containers is risky because soil inoculated with root galls or tuber periderm produced in the field may be infected or infested with other soilborne pathogens such as *V. dahliae* and *C. coccodes*, thereby inadvertently contaminating the test soil and confounding the yield loss estimate. The purpose of this research was to determine quantitatively this effect on yield of potato, *S. tuberosum* spp. *tuberosum*. Yield from cultivars resistant and susceptible to root galling in naturally-infested and non-infested field soil were compared to measure the effect of powdery scab root galls on yield.

**Materials and Methods**

**General.** Field trials were conducted in soil naturally infested and non-infested with *S. subterranea* f. sp. *subterranea* in 2007, 2008, 2010, 2011, and 2012. The infested soils were in commercial fields near Warden, WA, and the non-infested soil was at the Washington State University Experiment Station near Othello, WA. Soil type at Warden, WA was a Timmerman coarse sandy loam in 2007, and a Quincy fine sand in 2008, 2010, 2011, and 2012; whereas at Othello, WA the soil type was a Shano silt loam for all five years. Different fields or plot areas were used each year.

Cultivars used were Shepody, Umatilla Russet, Summit Russet, and Mesa Russet. Shepody is very susceptible, Umatilla Russet is susceptible, and Summit Russet and Mesa Russet are resistant to powdery scab root gall development. A resistant and at least one susceptible cultivar were planted at each location each year. Cultivars each year were planted from certified seed tubers cut to 70-g seed pieces. Data recorded for each cultivar at each location and year were root gall index, incidence of plants with root galls, and the yield components of total yield, number of tubers, and mean tuber weight, as described below.

Root systems of three plants per plot were dug carefully by hand with a forked spade to expose, but not to dislodge, root galls. Roots of plants adjacent to the plots were sampled beginning in early August to determine the optimum time to assess the number of root galls. Plant roots were dug when galls were mature but not beginning to dry and excise. Soil was gently removed from the sampled root systems, and the numbers of galls per root system were counted and placed in one of six gall index categories as detailed below. Actual number of galls per root system was counted for one plant per plot of each cultivar as a standard for assessment accuracy for the two additional plants sampled per plot. In 2012, galls on sampled root systems were assessed, and then the same plants were counted separately for galls to determine a quantitative association for each cultivar between the gall index and actual number of plant galls. Gall index categories were as follows: 0 = 0 gall, 1 = 1 to 25 galls/ plant, 2 = 26 to 50 galls/ plant, 3 = 51 to 100 galls/ plant, 4 = 101 to 150 galls/ plant, and 5 > 151 galls/ plant (Nitzan et al. 2008).

Yield ratios were used to evaluate the effect of powdery scab on a yield component for each cultivar between infested and non-infested fields. Yield ratios were derived from the following formula:
a yield component of a diseased plot (infested soil) / mean yield component of plots from the non-
diseased field (non-infested soil). A yield ratio $\geq 1.00$ for a cultivar indicated that powdery scab galls
had a limited negative effect on yield of that cultivar.

The experimental design in 2010 through 2012 was changed from that used in 2007 and 2008 to
increase the number of replications and not substantially increase the amount of tubers harvested by
hand. Also, in 2010 through 2012, plants sampled for yield components were 0.3 to 0.9 m away from
those plants assessed for number of galls; whereas, in 2007 and 2008, the assessed plants were random
along the center row of the 4.6 m length of plot in which plants were also harvested for yield.

Trials in 2007 and 2008. Cultivars Shepody, Umatilla Russet, and Summit Russet were planted
in plots near Warden and Othello in each of 2007 and 2008. Each plot of each cultivar was three rows
wide and 4.6 m long. Distance between rows was 0.86 m. Each row was planted with 18 seed-pieces,
each piece spaced 25 cm apart within a row. Cultivars were arranged in a randomized complete block
design (RCB) with six replicates at each location; however, some plots were destroyed by cultivation
error, thus reducing the number of replications for some cultivars (Table 1).

Number of galls/ plant was assessed on three plants selected from the center row of each plot. All
tubers were harvested, counted, and weighed from the center row of each plot. In 2007, plots were
planted on 27 April at Warden and 12 April at Othello. Vines were killed 131 days after planting (DAP),
and tubers were harvested on 19 September at both locations. At both locations in 2008, plots were
planted on 2 April, vines were killed at 162 DAP, and tubers were harvested and assessed for galls on 24
September.

Trials in 2010 through 2012. Cultivars Umatilla Russet and Mesa Russet were planted in 2010;
whereas and cultivars Shepody, Umatilla Russet, and Mesa Russet were planted in each of 2011 and
2012 in plots near Warden and Othello. Cultivar plots were single rows, each 1.83 m long, and were
planted with six seed-pieces spaced 30 cm apart within the rows. Rows were spaced 0.86 m apart.
Cultivars were arranged in a RCB design with ten replicates. Cultivars within a block were arranged
and randomized laterally, and replicates were arranged end-to-end with 0.9 m spacing between adjacent
replicas. The trial was bordered with a row of Alturas in each of the three years.

Number of galls/ plant was assessed on three contiguous plants/ plot. Tubers were harvested,
counted, and weighed from the other three contiguous plants of the six-plant plots. The plots at Warden
and Othello were planted, rated for galls, and harvested on the same day for a given year. Plots were
planted on 9 April 2010, 8 April 2011, and 19 April 2012. Three contiguous plants/ plot were harvested
destructively, and root systems were rated for galls on 24 August 2010 (137 DAP), 16 August 2011(129
DAP), and 15 August 2012 (118 DAP). The remaining three plants per plot were harvested for
determination of yield components on 17 September 2010 (161 DAP), 16 September 2011(160 DAP),
and 14 September 2012 (149 DAP).

Data analysis. Yield measurements and gall assessments from individual plants were considered
subsamples, the mean of which was calculated for each experimental unit (plot). Data for gall index,
and the three yield components for each location and year were dependent variables analyzed separately by
one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) using a RCB design. The independent variables were block
(random) and cultivar (fixed). Least-square means tests for comparisons among cultivars for each
location and year were considered significant at $P = 0.05$ when the ANOVA F-test was significant ($P <
0.05$). Data for yield ratios (dependent variables) for each cultivar (fixed, independent variable) and for
each year were analyzed by one-way ANOVA. Significance among cultivars was determined from least-
square means tests at $P = 0.05$. Regression analysis was used to investigate the effect of root galls on
potato yield components with total yield (yield/ plant), number of tubers/ plant, and tuber weight
analyzed separately as dependent variables, and gall index as the independent variable. Residual analysis
was used to test normality and variance assumptions of the regression models. Statistical analyses were
Results

Trials in 2007 and 2008. Powdery scab root galls were not observed on plants grown in the non-infested soil at Othello, WA in both years of the trial. Root galls were not recorded on potato plants grown at Warden, WA in 2007, but they were observed at that location in 2008. All plants of Umatilla Russet and Shepody had root galls, whereas only 11% of Summit Russet plants had root galls (Table 1). Plants of Summit Russet had significantly fewer ($P < 0.05$) galls than Umatilla Russet or Shepody; whereas plants of Shepody had significantly more ($P < 0.05$) galls than either Summit Russet or Umatilla Russet in 2008. Mean gall index for Shepody, Umatilla Russet, and Summit Russet were 2.67, 1.22, and 0.11, respectively (Table 1).

Mean yield/plant was significantly greater ($P < 0.05$) for Shepody and Umatilla Russet than for Summit Russet at both locations in both years (Table 1). Mean yield/plant in 2008 ranged from 2078 to 2263 g for Shepody and Umatilla Russet and from 1078 to 1300 g for Summit Russet. Mean number of tubers/plant was significantly less ($P < 0.05$) for Summit Russet (4.1) than the other two cultivars at Warden in 2008 (6.3 for Shepody and 10.2 for Umatilla Russet). Mean tuber weight was significantly greater ($P < 0.05$) for Shepody than for Umatilla Russet and Summit Russet, and did not significantly differ ($P > 0.05$) between Umatilla Russet and Summit Russet at both locations in 2008 (Table 1).

Yield ratios for mean yield per plant, mean number of tubers and mean tuber weight were $> 0.99$ for Shepody and $> 1.00$ for Umatilla Russet in 2008 (Table 1). Yield ratios for Summit Russet were $< 1.00$ for mean yield per plant (0.83) and number of tubers (0.65) and $> 1.00$ for tuber weight (1.30) in 2008.

Trials in 2010 through 2012. Powdery scab root galls were not observed on plants grown in the non-infested soil at Othello, WA in all three years of the trial. Root galls were observed on potato plants in the infested soil at Warden in 2010, 2011, and 2012 (Table 2). All plants of Umatilla Russet and Shepody had root galls, whereas, only 41 to 53% of the Mesa Russet plants had root galls over the three years (Table 2). Severity of galls and incidence of root systems with galls were both significantly less ($P < 0.05$) for Mesa Russet than for Umatilla Russet in 2010, and were significantly less ($P < 0.05$) for Mesa Russet than for Umatilla Russet and Shepody in 2011 and 2012. Mean gall index for Shepody were 3.53 in 2011, and 4.13 in 2012. Mean gall index the three years for Umatilla Russet ranged from 1.83 in 2010 to 2.87 in 2012, and for Mesa Russet it ranged from 0.46 in 2010 to 0.65 in 2012.

Mean yield per plant, mean number of tubers per plant, and mean tuber weight were significantly greater ($P < 0.05$) for Umatilla Russet than for Mesa Russet in infested and non-infested soil in 2010 (Table 2). Mean yield per plant did not significantly differ ($P > 0.05$) among the three cultivars in infested and non-infested soil in 2011 and in infested soil at Warden in 2012, but was significantly greater ($P < 0.05$) for Umatilla Russet (2874 g) than for Shepody (1899 g) and Mesa Russet (1718 g) in non-infested soil at Othello in 2012. Mean number of tubers were significantly greater ($P < 0.05$) for Umatilla Russet (10.0 and 9.2 in infested and non-infested, respectively) and Mesa Russet (9.8 and 9.3 in infested and non-infested, respectively) than for Shepody (6.1 and 7.0 in infested and non-infested, respectively) in infested and non-infested soil in 2011, and was significantly greater ($P < 0.05$) for Umatilla Russet (16.4 and 22.6 in infested and non-infested, respectively) than Mesa Russet and Shepody (ranged of means from 9.8 to 10.3) in infested and non-infested soil in 2012. Mean tuber weight did not differ significantly ($P > 0.05$) between Mesa Russet and Umatilla Russet in infested and non-infested soil in 2011, and between Mesa Russet and Shepody in infested and non-infested soil in 2012 (Table 2).

During 2010 to 2012, the yield ratio for total yield for Umatilla Russet was $< 1$ only in one of the three years (0.82 in 2012), but was $> 1$ in two of two years (1.00 and 1.28 in 2010 and 2011, respectively) (Table 2). Total yield ratio was $> 1$ for Shepody in two of two years (1.26 and 1.14 in 2011 and 2012, respectively), and was $> 1$ for Mesa Russet in two of the three years (1.25 and 1.45 in 2011 and 2012, respectively). Total yield ratio for Mesa Russet was 0.91 in 2010. The yield ratio for number of tubers was $< 1$ in two of three years for Umatilla Russet (0.82 and 0.73 in 2010 and 2012, respectively), in two of two years for Shepody (0.87 and 0.89 in 2011 and 2012, respectively), but only in one of three years for Mesa Russet (0.92 in 2010). The ratio for mean tuber weight was notably $> 1$ in
three of three years for Umatilla Russet (1.23, 1.24, and 1.13 in 2010, 2011, and 2012, respectively); in two of two years for Shepody (1.44 and 1.30 in 2011 and 2012, respectively); and in two of three years for Mesa Russet (1.19 and 1.43 in 2011 and 2012, respectively). The ratio for mean tuber weight was 0.97 for Mesa Russet in 2010.

Mean yield per plant, mean number of tubers, and mean tuber weight for Umatilla Russet and Shepody either did not significantly change ($P > 0.05$) or significantly increased ($P < 0.05$) as gall index increased in 2010 (Fig. 1), 2011 (Fig. 2), and 2012 (Fig. 3). Mean yield per plant for Shepody decreased as gall index increased in 2011, but only at the 11% ($P = 0.11$) significance level, not the 5% ($P = 0.05$) levels of testing (Fig. 2). Mean tuber weight significantly increased as gall index increased for Umatilla Russet ($P = 0.016$) in 2010 and 2012 ($P = 0.015$). Mean number of tubers for Mesa Russet significantly decreased ($P = 0.02$) as gall index increased in 2012 (Fig. 3), but not for any other yield component for Mesa Russet the other two years (Figs. 1 and 2).

**Discussion**

Potato tuber yields for the three yield components of yield/ plant, number of tubers/ plant, and weight of tubers/ plant were not negatively affected by powdery scab on roots of Umatilla Russet and Shepody, as indexed by the yield ratio measure for three of the four years, and by regression analyses calculated for three of three years. Regression lines with a non-significant slope or slopes that significantly increased with gall index also indicated that the number of root galls/ plant did not reduce yield significantly. The yield ratios between infested and non-infested fields for mean yield per plant and mean numbers of tubers for Umatilla Russet in 2012 were the exception, and, as this cultivar displayed, had low yield ratios. However, the regression slopes for those two variables for Umatilla Russet in 2012 did not decrease, indicating that yield was not affected by the number of powdery scab galls. The low yield ratios for Umatilla Russet that year were likely due to the cultivar producing a relatively high yield in the non-infested field, as significant differences were not recorded for total yield between the infested and non-infested soils. Shepody was more susceptible to root galling than Umatilla Russet but total yield was not affected significantly in either cultivar.

The significant increase in mean tuber weight with increasing root gall index for Umatilla Russet in 2010 and 2012 in this study was likely due to a decrease in number of tubers/ plant, which increased mean tuber weight. This was supported by a yield ratio < 1.0 for the number of tubers/ plant in 2010 and 2012, but not in 2011 (Table 2). Consequently, tuber number/ plant may be reduced with increasing number of powdery scab root galls/ plant and, therefore, increase the mean tuber weight.

The yield ratios and regressions analyses in this study were both satisfactory methods of assessing the effect of powdery scab root galls on yield. The slopes of the yield component plots against number of galls or gall index likely gave a more precise indication of the effect of galling on yield than yield ratios. This is because the effect of disease severity on yield was considered using adjacent plants within the same plots and not compared between plots in different fields. However, yield ratios as determined in this study have validity in giving an estimate of the effect of disease on yield.

An action threshold greater than the number of galls encountered in this study on roots of Umatilla Russet and Shepody is needed before an economic loss can be expected at more severe levels of powdery scab, and to assess the economic viability of control tactics for powdery scab (Rowe and Powelson 2008). The mean gall index for Shepody was 4.13 in 2012, which represents 141 galls/ plant. A greater number of galls/ plant may reduce potato yields. Consequently, the outcome of this study suggests that specific control tactics directed solely at preventing powdery scab galls on roots are not economically justified for powdery scab root galls in the Columbia Basin. However, *S. subterranea* and *Colletotrichum coccodes*, the cause of potato black dot, may interact to produce more severe disease and plant damage (D.A. Johnson, unpublished data). Resistant germplasm to both *S. subterranea* root galling (Nitzan et al. 2008, 2010) and stem and root invasion by *C. coccodes* (Nitzan et al. 2009) are available, and the development of cultivars resistant to both pathogens is desirable to reduce the harmful effects of interactions between the two pathogens on potato. Resistance to root galling could be important to prevent a buildup of soilborne inoculum for future growing seasons, even though there is
no evidence of a direct effect of the disease on yield at levels of soilborne inoculum that have been
detected in the Columbia Basin to date. On account of a potential synergistic interaction with \textit{C. coccodes},
resistance to black dot development in roots should be sought.

The decrease in yield with increasing gall index observed on Mesa Russet in 2012 does not
indicate that yield was affected by root galls on this resistant cultivar. The gall index for Mesa Russet
ranged from 0 to 1 and represented a maximum of 15 galls/plant. One gall/plant resulted in a gall index
of 1. The narrow range for the dependent variable gall index was not sufficient to detect an effect on
yield by regression analysis for Mesa Russet. A gall index was used in this study because counting
individual galls on root systems was time consuming. Estimating the number of root galls and using the
gall index was sufficiently accurate for the objectives of the study. The value of gall index, as expected,
was directly correlated to the number of root galls observed/plant.

A reduction in potato yield due to powdery scab root galling was expected but not encountered in
this study. The different reactions to root gall measured on potato in Colombia (Gilchrist et al. 2011) and
Australia (Shah et al. 2012) vs. this study may be associated with the cultivars, severity of root galls,
environment, available soil moisture, and method of estimating the effect of the pathogen on yield.
Severity of root galls on Shepody in this study was severe with > 30% of the root area displaying galls.
Potato roots with galls were demonstrated to have a reduced capacity to take up water in a study by
Falloon et al. (2004), in which test plants were grown in soil infested with spores obtained by scraping
powdery scab lesions from tubers produced in the field. An impediment of water uptake due to root galls
might be overcome in the field with ample soil moisture provided by irrigation or rainfall. Pivot
irrigation systems in the Columbia Basin of Washington State supply 50 to 76 cm/ha for a growing
season, which is a plentiful supply of water.

A comparison of yield from cultivars resistant and susceptible to root galling in naturally infested
and non-infested field soil was used to measure the effect of powdery scab root galls on potato yield in
this study. Yields of potato cultivars Shepody and Umatilla Russet, two commonly grown cultivars in
the Columbia Basin, were not impaired by the levels of root galling caused by \textit{S. subterranea} in this
region. Evaluations were done in fields under conditions used for commercial potato production in the
Columbia Basin of Washington State, not in a greenhouse or shadehouse. Consequently, control tactics
directed solely at reducing powdery scab galls on roots are not economically justified at the levels of
soilborne inoculum of \textit{S. subterranea} encountered in the Columbia Basin fields used for this study.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Disease/Location</th>
<th>Cultivar</th>
<th>Gall Index</th>
<th>(%) Gall Incidence</th>
<th>Yield/plant (g)</th>
<th>Number of tubers/plant</th>
<th>Mean tuber weight (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Non-infested/Warden</td>
<td>Shepody (4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1801 a</td>
<td>5.3 b</td>
<td>340 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Umatilla Russet (4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1784 a</td>
<td>10.8 a</td>
<td>166 c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summit Russet (5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>630 b</td>
<td>3.3 c</td>
<td>193 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-infested/Othello</td>
<td>Shepody (5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2098 a</td>
<td>6.4 b</td>
<td>331 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Umatilla Russet (6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1995 a</td>
<td>10.9 a</td>
<td>183 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summit Russet (5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1061 b</td>
<td>6.6 b</td>
<td>161 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Infested/Warden</td>
<td>Shepody (6)</td>
<td>2.67 a</td>
<td>100 a</td>
<td>2098 a</td>
<td>6.3 b</td>
<td>333 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Umatilla Russet (5)</td>
<td>1.22 b</td>
<td>100 a</td>
<td>2263 a</td>
<td>10.2 a</td>
<td>221 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summit Russet (4)</td>
<td>0.11 c</td>
<td>11 b</td>
<td>1078 b</td>
<td>4.1 c</td>
<td>261 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-infested/Othello</td>
<td>Shepody (6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2078 a</td>
<td>6.2 b</td>
<td>334 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Umatilla Russet (6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2080 a</td>
<td>9.5 a</td>
<td>219 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summit Russet (6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1300 b</td>
<td>6.4 b</td>
<td>203 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yield Ratio</td>
<td>Shepody (6)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.01 ab</td>
<td>1.02 a</td>
<td>0.99 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Umatilla Russet (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.09 a</td>
<td>1.08 a</td>
<td>1.01 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summit Russet (4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.83 b</td>
<td>0.65 b</td>
<td>1.30 a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Values for each set of cultivars within a site and year with the same letter are not significantly different at $P = 0.05$ using analysis of variance.

* (n) number of replicated plots (experimental units) where each plot was a mean of 18 subsampled plants.

* Yield ratio was calculated for each yield component from each cultivar plot from infested soil divided by the mean of all plots of that cultivar from non-infested soil where means were compared among cultivars using analysis of variance.
Table 2. Severity and incidence of root galls, yield components, and yield ratios for Mesa Russet, Umatilla Russet, and Shepody planted in soils naturally infested with the powdery scab (*Spongospora subterranea*) and in non-infested soils in separate locations in the Columbia Basin, WA from 2010 to 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial Year</th>
<th>Disease/Location Cultivar</th>
<th>Gall Index</th>
<th>(%) Gall Incidence</th>
<th>Yield/plant (g)</th>
<th>Number tubers/plant</th>
<th>Mean tuber weight (g)</th>
<th>Yield Ratio</th>
<th>Umatilla Russet</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>1.00 a</th>
<th>0.82 a</th>
<th>1.23 a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Infested/Warden Umatilla Russet</td>
<td>1.83 a</td>
<td>100 a</td>
<td>2810 a</td>
<td>11.9 a</td>
<td>235. a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mesa Russet</td>
<td>0.46 b</td>
<td>41 b</td>
<td>2194 b</td>
<td>7.1 b</td>
<td>311. b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-infested/Othello Umatilla Russet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2803 a</td>
<td>14.7 a</td>
<td>191 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mesa Russet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2400 b</td>
<td>7.7 b</td>
<td>312 b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yield Ratio</td>
<td>Shepody</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.00 a</td>
<td>0.82 a</td>
<td>1.23 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Umatilla Russet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.91 a</td>
<td>0.92 a</td>
<td>0.97 b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Infested/Warden Shepody</td>
<td>3.53 a</td>
<td>100 a</td>
<td>2245 a</td>
<td>6.1 b</td>
<td>362 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Umatilla Russet</td>
<td>2.23 b</td>
<td>100 a</td>
<td>2331 a</td>
<td>10.0 a</td>
<td>233 b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mesa Russet</td>
<td>0.53 c</td>
<td>53 b</td>
<td>2633 a</td>
<td>9.8 a</td>
<td>265 b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-infested/Othello Shepody</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1779 a</td>
<td>7.0 b</td>
<td>254 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Umatilla Russet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1742 a</td>
<td>9.2 a</td>
<td>190 b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mesa Russet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2101 a</td>
<td>9.3 a</td>
<td>226 ab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yield Ratio</td>
<td>Shepody</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.26 a</td>
<td>0.87 a</td>
<td>1.44 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Umatilla Russet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.28 a</td>
<td>1.07 a</td>
<td>1.24 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesa Russet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.25 a</td>
<td>1.05 a</td>
<td>1.19 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Infested/Warden Shepody</td>
<td>4.13 a</td>
<td>100 a</td>
<td>2161 a</td>
<td>9.8 b</td>
<td>220 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Umatilla Russet</td>
<td>2.87 b</td>
<td>100 a</td>
<td>2366 a</td>
<td>16.4 a</td>
<td>144 b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mesa Russet</td>
<td>0.65 c</td>
<td>48 b</td>
<td>2498 a</td>
<td>10.2 b</td>
<td>245 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-infested/Othello Shepody</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1899 b</td>
<td>11.0 b</td>
<td>172 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Umatilla Russet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2874 a</td>
<td>22.6 a</td>
<td>127 b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mesa Russet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1718 b</td>
<td>10.3 b</td>
<td>166 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yield Ratio</td>
<td>Shepody</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.14 b</td>
<td>0.89 ab</td>
<td>1.30 ab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Umatilla Russet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.82 c</td>
<td>0.73 b</td>
<td>1.13 b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesa Russet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.45 a</td>
<td>0.99 a</td>
<td>1.43 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Values for each set of cultivars within a site and year with the same letter are not significantly different at $P = 0.05$ using analysis of variance.

* Calculated from a mean of three subsampled plants each for gall index and yield per cultivar with ten replications.

* Shepody was not grown in 2010.

* Yield ratio was calculated for each yield component from each cultivar plot from infested soil divided by the mean of all plots of that cultivar from non-infested soil where means were compared among cultivars using analysis of variance.
Fig. 1. Yield components for the potato cultivars Umatilla Russet, and Mesa Russet in relation to root gall index for galls caused by *Spongospora subterranea* at Warden, WA in 2010.
Fig. 2. Yield components for the potato cultivars Shepody, Umatilla Russet, and Mesa Russet in relation to root gall index for galls caused by *Spongospora subterranea* at Warden, WA in 2011.
Fig. 3. Yield components for the potato cultivars Shepody, Umatilla Russet, and Mesa Russet in relation to root gall index for galls caused by *Spongospora subterranea* at Warden, WA in 2012.