## Subject Category: Epidemiology

1	Spatial patterns of soilborne inoculum of Verticillium dahliae
2 ,	in four commercial potato fields of Central Wisconsin
3	P. C. Nicot, D. I. Rouse, and B. S. Yandell
4	First and second authors, former research assistant and assistant professor,
5	respectively, Department of Plant Pathology, 1630 Linden Drive, University
6	of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI 53706. Third author, assistant
7	professor, Department of Horticulture and Department of Statistics,
8	University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI 53706.
9	Supported by Hatch project 142-2500 and by funds from the Wisconsin Potato
10	Board.
11	Accepted for publication
12	
13	ABSTRACT
14	Nicot, P. C., Rouse, D. I., and Yandell, B. S. 1985. Spatial patterns of
15	soilborne inoculum of Verticillium dahliae in four commercial potato fields of
16	Central Wisconsin. Phytopathology 75:000-000.
17	Square "study areas" of three different sizes were established in each of
18	four commercial potato fields of Central Wisconsin. Depending on its size,
19	each study area was divided into 25, 49, 100, or 400 contiguous square
20	quadrats. A sample of soil was taken from each quadrat, air dried, and
21	assayed for Verticillium dahliae Kleb. by a soil dilution plating technique.
22	The variability of inoculum levels across each study area was assessed by
23	analysis of variance and by frequency distribution analysis. Within each
24	large study area (540 m $\times$ 540 m divided into 400 quadrats in 1982 and 100 in
25	

1983). large, significant differences in inoculum density were found among Significant differences in inoculum density among samples within a 2 study area were found in fewer small study areas (50 cm x 50 cm in 1982 and 3 12.5 cm x 12.5 cm in 1983, all divided into 25 quadrats) than medium-sized study areas (4.5 m  $\times$  4.5 m divided into 25 quadrats in 1982, and 6.3 m  $\times$  6.3 m 5 divided into 49 quadrats in 1983). The observed level of variability of 6 inoculum densities decreased as the size of the quadrats decreased. Each 7 study area had a unique arrangement of quadrats with high and low inoculum 8 densities of V. dahliae. The spatial pattern of inoculum in each study area 9 was characterized as "aggregated", "random", or "regular", based on a visual 10 assessment and analysis of spatial autocorrelation. A large scale aggregation 11 was observed in the large study areas of three of the four fields examined. 12 The pattern was random in most medium-sized and small study areas. The 13 results of this study suggest that caution should be taken when collecting 14 soil samples to assess the populations of V. dahliae in potato fields, as 15 large zones with either high or low inoculum densities might be missed by 16 17 particular sampling schemes. 18

Information on the location of individual propagules of plant pathogens in soil may be critical for studies of the epidemiology and ecology of soilborne pathogens. It has been postulated that clumping of inoculum in field soil may be associated with low correlations between inoculum density and disease incidence (21), or that it may affect the shape of the curves relating disease incidence to soil inoculum density (12, 25). The occurrence of inoculum in clumps has also been shown to increase the influence of the sampling

- l procedures on the accuracy of the estimates of average soil inoculum levels in
- 2 field studies (7, 9, 13). Commonly used mathematical models of root infection
- 3 by soilborne fungi, recently reviewed by Gilligan (8), assume that the
- 4 propagules of the pathogen in the vicinity of the host roots occur uniformly
- 5 in the soil at the apices of tetrahedra (3, 4, 15), or randomly (2, 11). To
- 6 account for possible clumping of inoculum in naturally infested soils,
- 7 Gilligan expanded an earlier model by approximating the distribution of
- 8 inoculum with a negative binomial distribution (8). The results of Gilligan's
- 9 study suggested that the selection of a particular model of host infection
- 10 should be based on prior knowledge of the patterns of inoculum in the soil
- ll surrounding the host (8).
- 12 Frequency distribution analysis has often been used as a tool to test
- 13 whether propagules of a pathogen occurred at random or in clumps in a volume
- 14 of soil (19). As a consequence, the word "distribution" has often been used
- both to designate a probability distribution (frequency distribution), in a
- 16 mathematical sense, and to designate the spatial arrangement of propagules of
- 17 a pathogen in a volume of soil. To avoid confusion in this paper, the use of
- 18 the term <u>distribution</u> will be restricted to its mathematical meaning and the
- 19 spatial arrangement of propagules of a pathogen in soil will be referred to as
- 20 spatial pattern.
- 2l Differences in inoculum levels of <u>Verticillium</u> <u>dahliae</u> at different depths
- 22 in the soil have been reported by several researchers (14, 27). Based on a
- 23 bioassay with tomato seedlings, Wilhelm (27) observed a degree of infectivity
- 24 3-4 times higher in samples taken from the 0-30cm layer of soil than below
- 25 30cm. The fungus could either be detected at very low levels, or not detected

l at all, at depths greater than 30cm at 15 of the 20 sites sampled. In another  $^2$  study 98% of the population of  $\underline{v}$ .  $\underline{dahliae}$ , assessed with a dilution plating technique, were found in the top 30cm of soil (14). Differences in inoculum levels occuring across a field have also been studied. Evans and Gleeson (7) estimated soil populations of  $\underline{V}$ . dahliae in an intensively sampled (12m x 12m) study area. Although spatial patterns of the pathogen were not mentioned, the authors tested a "row effect" and a "column effect" in an analysis of variance 7 and reported a significant column effect. This is an indication that the 8 pattern of the fungus was probably not random over the study area. The frequency distribution of soil inoculum levels of  $\underline{\mathtt{V}}$ . dahliae in an intensively 10 sampled potato field in Ohio was shown to give a poor fit to the Poisson 11 distribution (23). This suggests that the pattern of occurence of the fungus 12 may be nonrandom at some scale smaller than the sampling unit, but says little 13 about the large scale pattern in the field. Although the spatial arrangement 14 of zones of high and of low inoculum density was not discussed in either of 15 these studies, their results support the hypothesis that spatial patterns of 16 17 V. dahliae were nonrandom. The present study was initiated to examine the variability of soil 18 inoculum levels of V. dahliae across several commercial potato fields of 19 central Wisconsin and to characterize the patterns of inoculum in each field. 20 As patterns may appear random or aggregated depending on the scale at which 21 they are examined (20, 26), the study was done in each field at three scales 22 of biological importance: the whole field ("large scale"), the volume of soil 23 explored by the roots of an individual potato plant ("medium scale"), and a 24 25 single soil core ("small scale").

## 1 MATERIALS AND METHODS Site selection and sampling. Four commercial potato fields with a history 2 of Verticillium wilt were chosen for this study in the Central Sands area of 3 Wisconsin. Research was conducted in field "A" during 1982, and in fields 4 "B", "C", and "D" in 1983. These fields consisted of Plainfield loamy sand 5 and were flat, circular (ca. 800m in diameter), and irrigated with center 6 pivot systems. The eastern half of field C was fumigated with 50 gals/acre 7 8 metham-sodium in October 1983. In each field, square "study areas" of 3 different sizes (corresponding to 9 the scales at which the pattern of inoculum was to be studied) were delimited, 10 and each divided into contiguous squares referred to as "quadrats". One 11 "large" study area, approximately centered on the irrigation pivot, was 12 delimited in each field. The large study area was divided into 400 "large" 13 (27m x 27m) quadrats on a 20x20 grid pattern in field A, and into 100 large 14 (54m x 54m) quadrats on a 10x10 grid pattern in fields B, C, and D. Ten 15 "medium-size" and ten "small" study areas were established in field A in 1982 16 and three medium-size and three small study areas were established in each of 17 fields B, C, and D in 1983. The medium-size study areas were divided into 25 18 "medium-size" (90cm x 90cm) quadrats on a 5x5 grid in 1982 and into 49 (90cm x 19 90cm) quadrats on a 7x7 grid in 1983. The small study areas consisted of 20

Soil samples were taken from field A in early June 1982 and from fields B,

C, and D, in early June 1983. In 1982 each sample of soil consisted of a

single 30cm-deep soil core, 2.5cm in diameter, which was removed from the

(50cm x 50cm) squares in 1982 and (12.5cm x 12.5cm) squares in 1983, each

divided into 25 "small" quadrats on a 5x5 grid.

21

1 center of each quadrat in every study area. In 1983, each sample removed from 2 a large or a medium-size quadrat was a composite of 9 soil cores taken as 3 indicated in Fig. 1; a single soil core was taken from the center of each small quadrat. To evaluate the variability of inoculum levels across each 5 quadrat of the large study areas, an additional soil sample was removed from 6 each large quadrat in two fields in 1983. Each additional sample was a 7 composite of 9 cores taken at random throughout the (54m x 54m) quadrat. 8 All the samples taken in 1982 and 1983 were placed in separate 9 polyethylene bags labeled with a study area number and quadrat coordinates, 10 and transported to the laboratory. 11 Soil assay for Verticillium dahliae. The samples were air dried for 4-5 12 weeks at 30-50% relative humidity and 20-24°C to eliminate drought-sensitive 13 conidia and mycelial fragments (5, 22), and stored at room temperature until 14 assayed. Just before each sample was assayed, the soil aggregates were gently 15 broken by hand to a particle size smaller than 500µm and the soil was 16 homogenized by hand shaking. 17 For each sample assayed in 1982, one log subsample was suspended in 100ml 18 of water, from which five 1ml aliquots were taken with a pipet and plated 19 separately onto an NPX-pectate medium selective for V.dahliae (5). In 1983, 20 three 10g subsamples were taken from each sample and two 1ml aliquots were 21 plated for each subsample. Therefore, the estimate of the soil inoculum of V. 22 dahliae in a sample was obtained by averaging colony counts from 5 plates in 23 1982 and from 6 plates in 1983. The change in design between 1982 and 1983 24 was made to increase the precision of the estimate of inoculum density in each

25

sample (18).

- All the plates were incubated at 20-22°C for at least two weeks and 1
- microsclerotial colonies of  $\underline{V}$ . dahliae were counted with the aid of a
- dissecting microscope (magnification 15%). The number of colony forming units
- (CFU) of the pathogen per plate was converted into a number of propagules per
- gram of dry soil (ppg) by multiplying the number of CFU per plate by 10. 5
- As the assay of the 900 samples taken in 1982 and 1175 taken in 1983 6
- lasted over a period of several months, the possibility of a loss of viability
- of the fungus in storage was considered: To avoid systematically 8
- underestimating the inoculum density of  $\underline{V}$ . dahliae in all the samples of whole
- study areas, the samples to be assayed were drawn at random. The viability of 10
- the fungus was tested by re-assaying the first 25 samples at the end of the 11
- period needed to assay all the samples. 12
- Statistical analysis of the spatial patterns. An analysis of spatial 13
- autocorrelation (19) was performed for each study area, on the square-root 14
- transformed estimates of soil inoculum density of V. dahliae in the soil 15
- samples from each quadrat. The data were square-root transformed to stabilize 16
- 17 the variance (18).
- We tested for spatial autocorrelation in each study area, using Moran's I 18
- statistic (6, 16, 24) where X was the square root of the total number of 19

21
$$I = -\frac{n}{S_0} - \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ij} (X_i - \overline{X})(X_j - \overline{X})}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} (X_i - \overline{X})^2},$$
22

23 CFU counted from the assay of the soil sample taken from quadrat i; X was the 24 average of all X;'s for the study area; n was the total number of quadrats 25

- l in the study area; w was a weight coefficient between quadrat i and
- $^{2}$  quadrat j; and  $^{S}$  was the sum of all  $^{W}$  's for i=1 to n and for j=1 to n.
- 3 The weight coefficients were determined prior to the computation of the
- 4 statistic, based on which quadrats were to be compared. In this study, the
- $^{5}$  inoculum level of  $\underline{\text{V}}$ . dahliae in every quadrat i was correlated to those in its
- 6 four immediate neighbors, that is, those quadrats having an edge in common
- 7 with i. The coefficient w was therefore given a value of one if i and j
- 8 were immediate neighbors, and zero otherwise. The probability distribution of
- 9 the I statistic can be approximated by a normal distribution, under certain
- 10 conditions (6). This property was used to test for the occurence of spatial
- ll autocorrelation in each study area, as described by Cliff and Ord (6). Based
- 12 on the weight coefficients used in this study, a significantly positive I
- 13 implied that either high or low inoculum levels of  $\underline{v}$ . dahliae tended to occur
- 14 in groups of neighboring quadrats indicating an aggregated pattern. A
- 15 significantly negative I implied that inoculum levels in neighboring quadrats
- 16 tended to be alternatively high and low in an arrangement similar to that of
- 17 black and white squares on a chessboard ("regular pattern").
- 18 The underlying model used for this analysis was the spatial autoregressive
- 19 model:
- 20  $(X_{i} \mu) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ij} (X \mu) + e_{i}$
- Where  $\mu$  was the expected value of  $X_{i}$ , and  $e_{i}$  is unexplained error.
- 23 Because the eastern half of field C had been fumigated,  $\underline{V}$ .  $\underline{dahliae}$  was not
- 24 detected in the eastern half of the field except at a low inoculum density in
- 25 a few quadrats. High inoculum densities were observed in the western half of

l the field. Due to this systematic difference between the two halves of field

2 C, the model was not appropriate to use for the whole field. Thus, an analysis

3 of spatial autocorrelation was performed separately for the non-fumigated

4 (western) part of field C.

5 RESULTS

6 Survival of V. dahliae in stored dry soil. The inoculum level of V.

7 dahliae declined by an average of 10% in the 25 soil samples assayed at the

8 begining and at the end of the 6-month period needed to assay all the samples

9 taken in 1983. This decline, evaluated by a paired t-test on the estimates of

10 soil inoculum level (in ppg) in each sample and on their square root transform

ll (effected to stabilize the variance [28]), was not statistically significant

12 (p>0.10).

Differences in soil inoculum levels of V. dahliae across four commercial

14 potato fields. The range of inoculum levels and the average for each study

15 area are shown in Tables 1-3. The widest ranges for each field were observed

.6 in the large study areas. The highest inoculum level found in this study was

17 80ppg, in field C.

18 For most techniques used to quantitate  $\underline{V}$ . dahliae in field soil, repeated

19 assays of a sample of soil yield individual estimates of inoculum density of

20 the fungus that are not identical (18). Therefore, differences between

21 estimates of levels obtained from the assay of different samples could reflect

22 actual differences in the samples, but they could also be an artifact

23 resulting from the variability of the soil assay. Two methods were used to

24 test, for each study area, the hypothesis that the inoculum levels in the soil

25 samples from every quadrat were identical, against the alternative hypothesis

1 that soil inoculum levels differed at the various sampling locations in the 2 study area. 3 The first method, a frequency distribution analysis, relied on the 4 assumption that counts per plate of colony forming units of V. dahliae for 5 repeated assays of a given sample of soil, with the dilution plating 6 technique, were approximately Poisson distributed (18). If the inoculum density of the fungus was identical in all the samples taken in an area then 8 the frequency distribution of Verticillium counts per plate from the assay of 9 these samples should be identical. The hypothesis was tested for each study 10 area by fitting a Poisson model to the observed frequency distribution of 11 Verticillium counts in each quadrat, based on the total number of V. dahliae 12 CFU counted in the 5 or 6 plates examined for each sample. The observed 13 frequencies were compared to their expected values, (calculated from a Poisson 14 distribution with mean estimated as the average CFU count for the whole study 15 area) and a chi-square goodness-of-fit test was performed. 16 The second method used to test the hypothesis that the inoculum levels of 17 V. dahliae were identical in all the soil samples taken from a study area, was 18 an analysis of variance based on the CFU count from the plates examined for 19 each sample. The CFU counts per plate were square-root transformed prior to 20 the analysis of variance, to stabilize the variance (28). A one-way analysis 21 of variance was performed on the 1982 data. The 1983 data was analyzed by 22 nested analysis of variance because of the nested design in the assay of the 23 sample of soil taken in each quadrat of the study areas (three "subsamples" 24 were taken from each sample, and each "subsample" was in turn subsampled when

two lml aliquots were taken from the suspension).

- 1 The results of the frequency distribution analysis and the analysis of
- 2 variance for each of the large, medium, and small study areas are shown in
- 3 Tables 1, 2, and 3, respectively. The hypothesis was rejected with both types
- 4 of statistical analysis in all large study areas (Table 1), and by analysis of
- 5 variance in most medium size study areas, indicating the presence of
- 6 significantly different inoculum levels across the study areas. In contrast,
- 7 the hypothesis failed to be rejected in 10-13 (depending on which test was
- 8 used) of the 19 small study areas examined, indicating that the soil inoculum
- 9 levels in those study areas were not significantly different, given the level
- 10 of precision associated with the soil assay used in this study.
- Il The frequency of rejection, with either of the two statistical methods, of
- 12 the hypothesis of apparent uniformity of inoculum levels in a study area, was
- 13 compared for the three sizes of study areas (Table 4). The proportion of
- 14 study areas in which the hypothesis was rejected by both methods decreased
- 15 sharply as the size of the study area decreased.
- To measure the variability of soil inoculum levels across a study area, a
- 17 coefficient of variability (ratio of the standard deviation to the mean [27])
- 18 was computed for each study area, based on the total CFU counts for each
- 19 sample (Tables 1-3). The average coefficients of variability were 1.48, 1.46,
- 20 and 1.12 for the large, medium and small study areas, respectively, indicating
- 21 a decrease in the level of variability of inoculum density as the distance
- 22 between samples decreased.
- Comparison of two sampling schemes in the large scale study areas. Two
- 24 estimates of soil inoculum density of  $\underline{V}$ . dahliae were compared for each
- 25 quadrat of the large scale study area of fields B and C: that from the assay

- 1 of the sample taken near the center of the quadrat (9 bulked soil cores), and
- 2 that from the assay of the additional sample (9 soil cores taken at random
- 3 throughout the quadrat and bulked). The two types of estimates were compared
- 4 separately for each individual quadrat, by nested analysis of variance (same
- 5 nested design as described earlier). The hypothesis of equality of the two
- 6 estimates of inoculum density provided for each quadrat by both types of
- 7 sample, was rejected for 6 and 11 of the 100 large quadrats of fields B and C,
- 8 respectively.
- 9 For each guadrat, the estimate of inoculum density obtained with one type
- 10 of sample was plotted against the estimate obtained with the other type of
- 11 sample (Fig. 2) The data points were widely scattered for both fields,
- 12 suggesting little similarity between estimates. This coincided with
- 13 significant (P<0.01; square-root transformed data) but low coefficients of
- 14 correlation between sample types:  $r_B = 0.532$  and  $r_C = 0.698$  for fields B
- 15 and C respectively. The regression lines (Fig. 2) were compared to the line Y
- 16 = X. For field B the slope was significantly smaller than 1.00 (P<0.01) and
- 17 the intercept was significantly greater than zero (P<0.01), indicating that on
- 18 the average, each type of sampling resulted in distinct estimates of soil
- 19 inoculum level in a large quadrat. The line Y = X and the regression line for
- 20 field C were not significantly different (P>0.05), indicating that on the
- 21 average, both types of samples tended to give similar estimates of soil
- 22 inoculum density in the large quadrats of that field.
- 23 Spatial patterns of soil inoculum levels. Each study area had a unique
- 24 arrangement of quadrats with high and low inoculum densities. The pattern in
- 25 each study area was examined and rated visually. The pattern was

- l characterized as "aggregated" if either high or low values of inoculum level
- 2 tended to be found near each other. The pattern was characterized as
- 3 "regular" if high inoculum levels tended to be regularly interspersed with low
- 4 inoculum levels. The pattern was characterized as "random" if no particular
- 5 trend could be detected.
- 6 The visual rating and the characterization of pattern based on the I
- 7 statistic gave similar results in most study areas (Tables 5-7). The pattern
- 8 of inoculum was aggregated in the large scale study areas of three of the four
- 9 fields studied (Table 5). The pattern in field C appeared aggregated when the
- 10 whole field was examined, because the western half of the field had high
- ll inoculum levels and the eastern half, which had been fumigated, had very low
- 12 levels of  $\underline{V}$ . dahliae. However, when only the western half of the field was
- 13 examined (Cw and Co, w in Table 5), the pattern of inoculum appeared random.
- 14 The pattern was random in most medium and small study areas (Tables 6 and 7),
- 15 and the small study areas in which the pattern of inoculum appeared aggregated
- 16 or regular (Table 7) were study areas for which inoculum levels among quadrats
- 17 were not significantly distinct from each other (Table 3). A comparison of
- 18 the frequency of each type of pattern in the large, medium, and small study
- 19 areas (Tables 5-7) shows less aggregation and more regularity of the pattern
- 20 as the quadrat size decreased.
- 21 DISCUSSION
- The inoculum levels of  $\underline{V}$ . dahliae in 25 air-dried soil samples declined on
- 23 the average by 10% during a 6-month storage period at 20-22°C. However the
- 24 differences between soil inoculum level before and after the storage period
- 25 were not statistically significant. These results are in agreement with the

observations of others (1, 7, 10), who reported that populations of V. dahliae 2 were stable in dry soil over periods of several months. 3 Two statistical methods, analysis of variance and frequency distribution analysis, were used to test whether differences in inoculum levels observed in 5 the assay of soil samples taken from a study area could be attributed to 6 actual differences in the field or if they were likely to have resulted from 7 the variability of the soil assay. Both methods led to similar conclusions for each of the large study areas. However, the hypothesis was rejected nearly twice as often with the analysis of variance as with the frequency 10 distribution analysis for the small and medium study areas (Tables 2, 3). A 11 possible reason for these differences might be a difference in the number of 12 quadrats in each type of study area. The medium and small scale study areas 13 had only 49 or 25 quadrats, allowing for few classes of soil inoculum levels 14 of the fungus in the frequency tables. As a consequence, the chi-square 15 goodness of fit test in each of these study areas may have had less power 16 (probability of rejecting the hypothesis when it is false [27]) than the 17 analysis of variance, because of the small number of degrees of freedom 18 (between 1 and 3) associated with the frequency tables. 19 A wide range and a high variability of inoculum levels were found in the 20 soil samples taken 27m or 54m apart in the large study areas of four 21 commercial potato fields. The discrepancy between inoculum levels in the 22 samples taken near the center and those taken at random throughout the large 23 quadrats of field B (and to a lesser extent in those of field C) suggests that 24 significant spatial variations of inoculum levels may also have occurred

within some of these quadrats. It also suggests that a soil sample taken from

- the center of a 54m x 54m area in these fields may provide a poor estimate of the average inoculum level over the area. 3 The observed variability of inoculum levels in a study area decreased with 4 the distance between sampling locations, determined by the sizes of quadrats 5 and study areas. Soil inoculum levels in samples taken from (50cm x 50cm) or (12.5cm x 12.5cm) study areas differed significantly within only half of the areas examined in this study. These results suggest that there was little 8 short-distance variability of inoculum levels across the fields studied. 9 The pattern of inoculum of V. dahliae appeared aggregated in the large 10 study areas of three of the four fields examined, with distinct zones of high 11 inoculum density and zones of low inoculum density covering large areas in the 12 fields. The pattern appeared random in most medium and small study areas. In 13 one of the fields studied the eastern half had been fumigated and had 14 non-detectable levels of V. dahliae. The population size of the pathogen in 15 the non-fumigated half of the field was high and the pattern of inoculum in 16 the large quadrats appeared random. Such a pattern might be the result of the 17 planting of Verticillium infested seed pieces (17) some year in the past, with 18 a random dispersion of infested seed pieces. One could also speculate that 19 the pattern in that field has evolved gradually over the years from an 20 aggregated state with large zones of high inoculum levels as were observed in 21 the three other fields studied. As potato crops were continuously planted in 22 that field over many years, the soil populations of V. dahliae may have 23 increased year after year and the inoculum may have been spread by implements
- The combined information on variability of soil inoculum levels and

throughout the field.

PHYTOPATHOLOGY Nicot et al. Page 16

spatial patterns in study areas of different sizes indicates that there were large differences in inoculum levels over large distances across the four fields studied, but that inoculum levels tended to be more similar as the distance between samples decreased. These observations suggest that caution should be taken when collecting soil samples to assess the populations of V. dahliae in potato fields, as large zones with either high or low inoculum levels might be "missed" by particular sampling schemes. 

## literature cited

- 2 1. Ashworth, L. J. Jr., Huisman, O. C., Grogan, R. G., and Harper, D. M.
- 3 1976. Copper-induced fungistasis of microsclerotia of Verticillium
- 4 albo-atrum and its influence on infection of cotton in the field.
- 5 Phytopathology 66:970-977.
- 6 2. Baker, R. 1978. Inoculum potential. Pages 137-157 in: Plant Disease,
- 7 An Advanced Treatise. Vol. II. J. G. Horsfall and E. B. eds. Academic
- 8 Press, New York. 436 pp.
- 9 3. Baker, R., and Drury, R. 1981. Inoculum potential and soilborne
- pathogens: The essence of every model is within the frame.
- 11 Phytopathology 71:363-372.
- 12 4. Baker, R. Maurer, C. L., and Maurer, R. A. 1967. Ecology of plant
- pathogens in soil. VII. Mathematical models and inoculum density.
- 14 Phytopathology 57:662-666.
- 5. Butterfield, E. J., and DeVay, J. E. 1977. Reassessment of soil assays
- for Verticillium dahliae. Phytopathology 67:1073-1078.
- 6. Cliff, A. D., and Ord, J. K. 1981. Spatial processes. Models and
- applications. Pion Ltd., London. 266 p.
- 7. Evans, G., and Gleeson, A. C. 1980. An evaluation of the sampling
- variation when estimating the population of Verticillium dahliae in
- 2l field soil. Ann. Appl. Biol. 95:177-184.
- 22 8. Gilligan, C. A. 1985. Probability models for host infection by
- 23 soilborne fungi. Phytopathology 75:61-67.
- 9. Goodell, P. B., and Ferris, H. 1981. Sample optimization for five
- 25 plant parasitic nematodes in an alfalfa field. J. Nematol. 13:304-313.

- 1 10. Green, R. J. Jr., 1980. Soil factors affecting survival of
- 2 microsclerotia of <u>Verticillium dahliae</u>. Phytopathology 70:353-355.
- 3 11. Gregory, P. H. 1948. The multiple-infection transformation. Ann.
- 4 Appl. Biol. 35:412-417.
- 5 12. Grogan, R. G., Sall, M. A., and Punja, Z. K. 1980. Concepts for
- 6 modeling root infection by soilborne fungi. Phytopathology 70:361-363.
- 7 13. Hau, F. C., Campbell, C. L., and Beute, M. K. 1982. Inoculum
- 8 distribution and sampling methods for Cylindrocladium crotalariae in a
- 9 peanut field. Plant Disease 66:568-571.
- 10 14. Jordan, V. W. 1971. Estimation of the distribution of Verticillium
- populations in infected strawberry plants and soil. Pl. Path. 20:21-24.
- 12 15. McCoy, M. L., and Powelson, R. L. 1974. A model for determining
- spatial distribution of soilborne propagules. Phytopathology 64:145-147.
- 14 16. Moran, P.A.P. 1950. Notes on continuous stochastic phenomena.
- 15 Biometrika 37:17-23.
- 16 17. Nachmias, A, and Krikun, J. 1984. Transmission of Verticillium dahliae
- in potato tubers. Phytopathology 74:535-537.
- 18. Nicot, P. C., and Rouse, D. I. 1986. Precision and bias of three
- 19 quantitative soil assays for <u>Verticillium dahliae</u>. Phytopathology
- 20 76:(accepted).
- 21 19. Nicot, P. C., Rouse, D. I., and Yandell, B. S. 1984. Comparison of
- 22 statistical methods for the study of spatial patterns of soilborne plant
- pathogens in the field. Phytopathology 74:1399-1402.
- 20. Pielou, E. C. 1977. Pages 113-165 in Mathematical Ecology, J. Wiley
- and Sons, New York. 385 pp.

- l 21. Roth, D. A., and Griffin, G. J. 1981. Cylindrocladium root rot of
- black walnut seedlings and inoculum pattern in nursery soil. Can. J.
- 3 Plant Pathology 3:1-5.
- 4 22. Schnathorst, W. C. 1981. Life cycle and epidemiology of Verticillium.
- Pages 81-111 in M. E. Mace, A. A. Bell, and C. H. Beckman eds. Fungal
- 6 wilt diseases of plants. Academic Press, New York. 640 pp.
- 7 23. Smith, V.L., and Rowe, R.C. 1984. Characteristics and distribution of
- 8 propagules of Verticillium dahliae in Ohio potato field soils and
- 9 assessment of two assay methods. Phytopathology 74:553-556.
- 10 24. Sokal, R. R., and Oden, L. 1978. Spatial autocorrelation in biology.
- 1. Methodology. 2. Some biological implications and four applications
- of evolutionary and ecological interest. Biol. J. Linn. Soc.
- 13 10:199-249.
- 14 25. Taylor, J. D., Griffin, G. J., and Garren, K. H. 1981. Inoculum
- pattern, inoculum density-disease incidence relationships, and
- population fluctuations of Cylindrocladium crotalariae microsclerotia in
- peanut field soil. Phytopathology 71:1297-1302.
- 18 26. Vandermeer, J. 1981. Elementary Mathematical Ecology. J. Wiley and
- 19 Sons, New York. 294 pp.
- 20 27. Wilhelm, S. 1950. Vertical distribution of Verticillium albo-atrum in
- 21 soils. Phytopathology 40:368-376.
- 22 28. Zar, J.H. 1984. Biostatistical analysis. Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- 23 Englewood Cliffs, NJ. 718 pp.

TABLE 1. Variability of soil inoculum levels of <u>Verticillium dahliae</u> across the large study areas.

				Test of Hypothesis <sup>4</sup>							
				frequency	/ distribu	tion		and the second second second			
	range of	average	coefficient	anal	ysis <sup>5</sup>		analysis	of varian	ice6		
study	inoculum	inoculum	of								
areal	leve1s <sup>2</sup>	leve12	variability <sup>3</sup>	χ2	$p(\chi^2 > \chi^2)$	?)	f	p(F > 1	f)		
А	0-40	5.73	1.08	275.75	<.001	*	9.43	<.001	*		
В	0-25	4.40	1.30	114.78	<.001	*	3.93	<.001	*		
Br	0-18	2.97		70.02	<.001	*	4.44	<.001	*		
С	0-80	10.47	1.35	436.17	<.001	*	11.53	<.001	*		
C₩	0-80	19.93		22.42	<.001	*	4.67	<.001	*		
Cr	0-33	8.18		169.98	<.001	*	5.98	<.001	*		
Cr,₩	0-33	13.63		12.25	.02	*	2.73	<.001	*		
D	0-58	3.72	2.18	292.49	<.001	*	9.69	<.001	*		

Study areas from different fields are indicated by different letters. The soil samples were taken from the center of each quadrat, except for the study areas marked "r" for which each sample consisted of 9 cores taken at random throughout the quadrat and bulked. The eastern half of field C had been fumigated and had low populations of V. dahliae. The subscript "w" indicates that the data are shown separately for the western part of the field.

23

24

1	TABLE 1. (continued)
2	Expressed as number of propagules per gram of dry soil.
3	$^{3}$ Ratio of the standard deviation to the mean, calculated on the basis of the total
4	CFU counts for each sample.
5	4 Hypothesis of identical soil inoculum level in all the samples taken from a study
6	area. A star (*) indicates rejection of the hypothesis at 5% significance level.
7	<sup>5</sup> Chi square test for the fit of a Poisson model (see text for details).
8	6 Based on the CFU counts from the plates examined for each sample. The counts were
9	square-root transformed prior to the analysis.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

TABLE 2. Variability of soil inoculum levels of <u>Verticillium dahliae</u> across the medium-size study areas.

to the same to the									
					Test o	of Hypo	othesis <sup>4</sup>		
				frequenc	y distribu	ution		A DE TETRA BOUNDE LA BONNE POR LO HOLD MANAGE	
	range of	average	coefficient	ana	lysis <sup>5</sup>		analysis	of varian	ce
study	inoculum	inoculum	of						
area 1	leve1s <sup>2</sup>	leve1 <sup>2</sup>	variability <sup>3</sup>	x <sup>2</sup>	$p(\chi^2 > \chi^2)$	<sup>2</sup> )	f	p(F > f	)
A1	0-10	1.92	1.33	1.15	.30		1.65	.05>p>.01	*
A2	0-14	2.24	1.32	3.42	.07		1.58	.10>p>.05	
A3	0-14	2.72	1.31	2.49	. 12		1.96	.05>p>.01	*
A4	0-12	2.72	1.08	0.53	. 48		1.39	.25>p>.10	
A5	0-10	2.72	1.06	4.69	.03	*	1.84	.05>p>.01	*
A6	0-10	2.72	1.24	4.94	.03	*	2.99	<.01	*
A7	0-14	3.28	1.04	0.81	.40		1.48	. 10>p>.05	
A8	0-12	3.44	1.07	2.30	. 15		2.02	<0.01	*
A9	0-16	4.08	1.04	1.63	.22		2.63	<0.01	*
A10	0-16	4.88	0.90	3.66	.06		2.38	<0.01	*
В1	0-3	0.34	2.23	0.10	.96		0.85	>0.50	
B2	0-7	1.02	1.73	8.13	.004	*	1.68	.05>p>.01	*
В3	0-45	17.65	0.49	25.74	<.001	*	2.57	<0.01	*
Cl	0-3	0.17	3.60	3.10	.22		1.66	.05>p>.01	*
C2	0-45	10.85	0.87	51.17	<.001	*	4.68	<0.01	*
C3	0-64	17.31	0.84	42.36	<.001	*	6.53	<0.01	*

1				
Τ	TABLE	2.	(continue	d)

2				The state of the s				
3						Test of Hypo	othesis <sup>4</sup>	
4					frequency	distribution		
5		range of	average	coefficient	analy	ysis <sup>5</sup>	analysis	of variance <sup>6</sup>
6	studv	inoculum	inoculum	of				
7	-				2	2 2		and the second control of the second control
8	area	levels <sup>2</sup>	leve1 <sup>2</sup>	variability <sup>3</sup>	X <sub>Z</sub> t	$p(\chi^2 > \chi^2)$	f	p(F > f)
9	Dl	0-7	0.51	2.42	2.39	. 13	1.70	.05>p>.01 *
10	D2	0-5	0.58	2.26	2.40	. 13	2.14	<0.01 *
11	D3	0-14	1.46	1.84	11.05	<.001 *	3.09	<0.01 *
12								

Study areas from different fields are indicated by different letters. 13

23

24

<sup>14</sup> Expressed as number of propagules per gram of dry soil.

 $<sup>^3</sup>$ Ratio of the standard deviation to the mean, calculated on the basis of the total

CFU counts for each sample. 16

<sup>4</sup> Hypothesis of identical soil inoculum level in all the samples taken from a study 17

area. A star (\*) indicates rejection of the hypothesis at 5% significance level. 18

 $<sup>^{5}</sup>$  Chi square test for the fit of a Poisson model (see text for details). 19

 $<sup>^{6}</sup>$  Based on the CFU counts from the plates examined for each sample. The counts were 20

square-root transformed prior to the analysis (see text for details). 21

TABLE 3. Variability of soil inoculum levels of <u>Verticillium dahliae</u> in the small study areas.

				~~~~					
See of the gardine real relative discovering					Test	of Hypo	thesis <sup>4</sup>	nere melepanier une percent migro aldry a based	~
				frequency	y distrib	ution			
study		average	coefficient of	ana	lysis <sup>5</sup>		analysis	of varia	nce <sup>6</sup>
areal	leve1s <sup>2</sup>	leve1 <sup>2</sup>	variability <sup>3</sup>	x <sup>2</sup>	$p(\chi^2 > \chi$	<sup>2</sup> )	f	p(F >	f)
AA1	0-6	0.72	2.10	1.37	.25		1.49	.10>p>.0	5
AA2	0-4	0.96	1.36	0.06	.83		0.97	>.25	
AA3	0-10	1.84	1.37	0.69	.43		1.50	.10>p>.0	5
AA4	0-8	1.92	1.14	0.34	.58		1.12	>.25	
AA5	0-6	2.00	1.12	0.90	.37		1.29	.25>p>.1	0
AA6	0–8	2.08	0.98	0.57	.47		1.14	>.25	
AA7	0-12	2.64	1.43	8.30	<.01	*	2.82	<.01	*
AA8	0-14	4.96	0.96	8.68	.02	*	2.17	<.01	*
AA9	0-82	6.32	2.53	9.87	<.01	*	13.65	<.01	*
AA10	0-50	9.76	1.11	8.89	<.01	*	4.73	<.01	*
BB1	0-12	3.40	1.09	3.83	.05		1.42	.25>p>.1	0
BB2	0-28	6.13	1.31	7.71	<.01	*	7.41	<.01	*
BB3	12-33	20.27	0.26	1.02	.61		0.84	>.25	
CC1	0-15	2.80	1.34	2.84	.09		4.60	<.01	*
CC2	0-17	5.00	0.89	1.56	.22		1.92	.05>p>.0	1] *
CC3	2-25	15.33	0.37	1.21	.55		1.30	.25>p>.1	0
	AA1 AA2 AA3 AA4 AA5 AA6 AA7 AA8 AA9 AA10  BB1 BB2 BB3  CC1 CC2	study inoculum areal levels2  AA1 0-6 AA2 0-4 AA3 0-10 AA4 0-8 AA5 0-6 AA6 0-8 AA7 0-12 AA8 0-14 AA9 0-82 AA10 0-50  BB1 0-12 BB2 0-28 BB3 12-33  CC1 0-15 CC2 0-17	study       inoculum       inoculum         areal       levels2       level2         AA1       0-6       0.72         AA2       0-4       0.96         AA3       0-10       1.84         AA4       0-8       1.92         AA5       0-6       2.00         AA6       0-8       2.08         AA7       0-12       2.64         AA8       0-14       4.96         AA9       0-82       6.32         AA10       0-50       9.76         BB1       0-12       3.40         BB2       0-28       6.13         BB3       12-33       20.27         CC1       0-15       2.80         CC2       0-17       5.00	study         inoculum         inoculum         of           area1         levels2         level2         variability3           AA1         0-6         0.72         2.10           AA2         0-4         0.96         1.36           AA3         0-10         1.84         1.37           AA4         0-8         1.92         1.14           AA5         0-6         2.00         1.12           AA6         0-8         2.08         0.98           AA7         0-12         2.64         1.43           AA8         0-14         4.96         0.96           AA9         0-82         6.32         2.53           AA10         0-50         9.76         1.11           BB1         0-12         3.40         1.09           BB2         0-28         6.13         1.31           BB3         12-33         20.27         0.26           CC1         0-15         2.80         1.34           CC2         0-17         5.00         0.89	range of average coefficient analystudy inoculum inoculum of  areal levels2 level2 variability3 X2  AA1 0-6 0.72 2.10 1.37  AA2 0-4 0.96 1.36 0.06  AA3 0-10 1.84 1.37 0.69  AA4 0-8 1.92 1.14 0.34  AA5 0-6 2.00 1.12 0.90  AA6 0-8 2.08 0.98 0.57  AA7 0-12 2.64 1.43 8.30  AA8 0-14 4.96 0.96 8.68  AA9 0-82 6.32 2.53 9.87  AA10 0-50 9.76 1.11 8.89  BB1 0-12 3.40 1.09 3.83  BB2 0-28 6.13 1.31 7.71  BB3 12-33 20.27 0.26 1.02  CC1 0-15 2.80 1.34 2.84  CC2 0-17 5.00 0.89 1.56	range of average coefficient analysis <sup>5</sup> study inoculum inoculum of  area <sup>1</sup> levels <sup>2</sup> level <sup>2</sup> variability <sup>3</sup>	range of average coefficient analysis 5  study inoculum inoculum of  area 1 levels 2 level 2 variability 3	range of average coefficient analysis analysis analysis study inoculum inoculum of areal levels level variability X2 p(x2 > x2) f  AA1 0-6 0.72 2.10 1.37 .25 1.49 AA2 0-4 0.96 1.36 0.06 .83 0.97 AA3 0-10 1.84 1.37 0.69 .43 1.50 AA4 0-8 1.92 1.14 0.34 .58 1.12 AA5 0-6 2.00 1.12 0.90 .37 1.29 AA6 0-8 2.08 0.98 0.57 .47 1.14 AA7 0-12 2.64 1.43 8.30 <.01 * 2.82 AA8 0-14 4.96 0.96 8.68 .02 * 2.17 AA9 0-82 6.32 2.53 9.87 <.01 * 13.65 AA10 0-50 9.76 1.11 8.89 <.01 * 4.73 BB1 0-12 3.40 1.09 3.83 .05 1.42 BB2 0-28 6.13 1.31 7.71 <.01 * 7.41 BB3 12-33 20.27 0.26 1.02 .61 0.84 CC1 0-15 2.80 1.34 2.84 .09 4.60 CC2 0-17 5.00 0.89 1.56 .22 1.92	Frequency distribution range of average coefficient analysis 5 analysis of varia study inoculum inoculum of  AN1 0-6 0.72 2.10 1.37 .25 1.49 .10>p>.0  AN2 0-4 0.96 1.36 0.06 .83 0.97 >.25  AN3 0-10 1.84 1.37 0.69 .43 1.50 .10>p>.0  AN4 0-8 1.92 1.14 0.34 .58 1.12 >.25  AN5 0-6 2.00 1.12 0.90 .37 1.29 .25>p>.1  AN6 0-8 2.08 0.98 0.57 .47 1.14 >.25  AN7 0-12 2.64 1.43 8.30 <.01 * 2.82 <.01  AN8 0-14 4.96 0.96 8.68 .02 * 2.17 <.01  AN9 0-82 6.32 2.53 9.87 <.01 * 13.65 <.01  AN10 0-50 9.76 1.11 8.89 <.01 * 4.73 <.01  BB1 0-12 3.40 1.09 3.83 .05 1.42 .25>p>.1  BB2 0-28 6.13 1.31 7.71 <.01 * 7.41 <.01  BB3 12-33 20.27 0.26 1.02 .61 0.84 >.25  CC1 0-15 2.80 1.34 2.84 .09 4.60 <.01  CC2 0-17 5.00 0.89 1.56 .22 1.92 .05>p>.0

TABLE 3. (continued)

2

3						Test	of Hyp	othesis <sup>4</sup>	
4 5 6		range of	average	coefficient		y distrib lysis <sup>5</sup>	ution	analysis	of variance <sup>6</sup>
	study	inoculum	inoculum	of	-		Act and the state of	Mr	and professional designation of the last o
7	area <sup>1</sup>	levels <sup>2</sup>	leve1 <sup>2</sup>	variability <sup>3</sup>	X <sup>2</sup>	$p(\chi^2 > \chi$	2)	f	p(F > f)
9	DD1	0-17	6.93	0.58	0.43	.52		1.11	>.25
)	DD2	0-43	12.47	0.82	10.61	<.01	*	2.07	.05>p>.01 *
L	DD3	8-48	26.87	0.42	3.23	.08		2.35	<.01 *
2	-								

<sup>13</sup> Study areas from different fields are indicated by different letters.

22

23

24

<sup>2</sup> Expressed as number of propagules per gram of dry soil.

 $<sup>^3</sup>$ Ratio of the standard deviation to the mean, calculated on the basis of the total

<sup>16</sup> CFU counts for each sample.

Hypothesis of identical soil inoculum level in all the samples taken from a study

<sup>18</sup> area. A star (\*) indicates rejection of the hypothesis at 5% significance level.

 $<sup>^{5}</sup>$  Chi square test for the fit of a Poisson model (see text for details).

<sup>20 &</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>Based on the CFU counts from the plates examined for each sample. The counts were

<sup>21</sup> square-root transformed prior to the analysis (see text for details).

TABLE 4. Frequency of rejection of the hypothesis of a uniform inoculum
density of Verticillium dahliae in four commercial potato fields.

	the section of the se		
ypothesis rejected with1	large3	medium	small
neither AV nor FDA	0	4	10
only AV <sup>2</sup>	0	8	3
both AV and FDA	4	7	6
		Participation and a secondar	MARIO (Semiglios de Persona de Senio de
Total	4	19	19

 $<sup>^{1}</sup>$ The hypothesis was tested with analysis of variance (AV) and frequency distribution analysis (FDA). In both analyses the hypothesis was rejected for P < 0.05. (See Tables 1-3 and text for details).

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$ Rejection of the hypothesis with FDA and not with AV, did not occur.

 $<sup>^{3}{\</sup>rm Results}$  from study areas A, B, C, and D. (See Table 1).

TABLE 5. Patterns of soil inoculum of <u>Verticillium dahliae</u> in the large study
areas

st	ıdy	number of soil	visual		spatial au	itocorrelation ana	lysis <sup>3</sup>
ar	eal	samples	rating2	I	± SE	P value	rating
A		400	A	.18	.03	<0.001	A
В		100	A	.37	.07	<.001	A
В	r	100	A	.23	.07	<.001	A
С		100	A	.65	.07	<.001	A
C	N	50	Γ	.12	.10	0.18	Ľ
С	C	100	A	.66	.07	<.001	A
С	c,w	50	r	09	.10	0.47	r
D		100	A	.45	.07	<.001	A

Study areas from different fields are indicated by different letters. The soil samples were taken from the center of each quadrat, except for the study areas marked "r" for which each sample consisted of 9 cores taken at random throughout the quadrat and bulked. The eastern half of field C had been fumigated and had low populations of <u>V</u>. <u>dahliae</u>. The subscript "w" indicates that the data are shown separately for the western part of the field.

21

22

23

24

TABLE 5. (continued)  $^{2}{\rm The}$  ratings are A= aggregated; r= random; and R= regular.  $^3$ I= Moran's coefficient of spatial autocorrelation; SE= standard error of I; P value is for test of hypothesis of no spatial autocorrelation. (See text for details). 

TABLE 6. Patterns of soil inoculum of <u>Verticillium dahliae</u> in the medium-size study areas

study	number of soil	visual		spatial a	utocorrelation ana	lysis <sup>3</sup>
areal	samples	rating <sup>2</sup>	· I	± SE	P value	rating <sup>2</sup>
A1	25	R	27	.15	0.12	r
A.2	25	A	.32	.15	0.01	A
A3	25	r	19	.15	0.32	r
A4	25	r	02	.15	0.86	r
A.5	25	r	.06	.15	0.52	r
A6	25	R	34	.15	0.05	R
A7	25	r	.11	.15	0.31	г
A8	25	A	.28	.15	0.03	A
A9	25	r	02	.15	0.90	r
A10	25	Α	.04	.15	0.53	r
В1	49	Α	.17	.10	0.07	r
В2	49	Α	.23	.11	0.02	Α
В3	49	r	.13	.11	0.16	r
C1	49	r	10	.09	0.40	r
C2	49	r	11	.10	0.40	r
C3	49	r	.07	.11	0.40	r

TABLE 6. (continued)

number			spatial autocorrelation analysis <sup>3</sup>				
study	of soil	visual					
areal	samples	rating2	I	± SE	P value	rating2	
D1	49	A	.13	.10	0.14	r	
D2	49	r	.00	.11	0.83	r	
D3	49	r	.05	.11	0.48	r	

<sup>1</sup> Study areas from different fields are indicated by different letters.

The ratings are A= aggregated; r= random; and R= regular.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>I= Moran's coefficient of spatial autocorrelation; SE= standard error of
I; P value is for test of hypothesis of no spatial autocorrelation. (See
text for details).

TABLE 7. Patterns of inoculum of <u>Verticillium dahliae</u> in the small scale study areas

	number			spatial	autocorrelation analysis <sup>3</sup>		
stud				<u>+</u> SE	P v	alue ra	ting
AA1		25 A	. 26	.14	0.	04	A
AA2	2	25 r	00	.15	0.	81	r.
AA3	2	25 R	43	.15	0.	01	3
AA4	2	25 r	10	.15	0.	70	r
AA5	2	25 r	32	.15	0.	07	r
AA6	2	25 r	14	.15	0.	50	C.
AA7	2	25 A	.16	.15	0.	17	C'
AA8	2	25 r	18	.15	0.	36	C
AA9	2	25 r	25	.11	0.	06	c
AA1	0 2	25 r	.09	.14	0.	34	r
вв1	2	25 r	.09	.15	0.	38	r.
BB2	2	25 A	.22	.15	0.	07	r
вв3	2	25 r	27	.15	0.	1.2	r
CC1	2	25 r	.19	.15	0.	1.2	r
CC2	2	25 r	.15	.15	0.	19	r
CC3	2	25 r	13	.14	0.	52	r

1 TABLE 7. (continued)

	number			spatial aut	ocorrelation ana	alysis <sup>3</sup>
study	of soil	visual	who have a first make a first make a first make a suppression of the s			
areal	samples	rating <sup>2</sup>	I	± SE	P value	rating2
DD1	25	R	34	.14	0.03	R
DD2	25	r	01	.15	0.83	r
DD3	25	r	.10	.15	0.33	τ

<sup>1</sup> Study areas from different fields are indicated by different letters.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

 $<sup>^2</sup>$ The ratings are A= aggregated; r= random; and R= regular.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>I= Moran's coefficient of spatial autocorrelation; SE= standard error of
14 I; P value is for test of hypothesis of no spatial autocorrelation. (See
15 text for details).

1 Figure 1. Sampling scheme in the large and medium quadrats in 1983. Potato plants are represented by triangles ( $\Delta$ ) and locations of soil cores by circles (o). The nine soil cores taken from each quadrat were bulked into one 3 single sample. A 90cm x 90cm sample area was located at the center of each 5 large quadrat. 6 Figure 2. Effect of sampling location within quadrat on the estimate of soil 7 inoculum density of Verticillium dahliae in the large quadrats of fields B and 8 C. In both graphs, each point represents one of the 100 quadrats of the study 9 area. (If more than one point falls on the same plotting position, the number 10 of points at that position is indicated). The coordinates of each point are 11 the square-root transform of inoculum densities of the fungus, expressed as 12 propagules per gram of soil, in the two soil samples taken from that quadrat. 13 The two soil samples consisted of 9 cores taken at random throughout the 14 quadrat (abscissa) or near the center of the quadrat (ordinate). The circled 15 points indicate quadrats for which the estimates of inoculum density in the 16 two types of samples were significantly different (P=0.05). 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24



