Nested PCR for Ultrasensitive Detection of the Potato Ring Rot Bacterium, *Clavibacter michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus*

I.-M. LEE,^{1*} I. M. BARTOSZYK,¹ D. E. GUNDERSEN,¹ B. MOGEN,² and R. E. DAVIS¹

*Molecular Plant Pathology Laboratory, USDA Agricultural Research Service, Beltsville, Maryland,*¹ *and Department of Biology, University of Wisconsin, River Falls, Wisconsin*²

Received 9 September 1996/Accepted 15 April 1997

Oligonucleotide primers derived from sequences of the 16S rRNA gene (CMR16F1, CMR16R1, CMR16F2, and CMR16R2) and insertion element IS*1121* **of** *Clavibacter michiganensis* **subsp.** *sepedonicus* **(CMSIF1, CMSIR1, CMSIF2, and CMISR2) were used in nested PCR to detect the potato ring rot bacterium** *C. michiganensis* **subsp.** *sepedonicus***. Nested PCR with primer pair CMSIF1-CMSIR1 followed by primer pair CMSIF2- CMSIR2 specifically detected** *C. michiganensis* **subsp.** *sepedonicus***, while nested PCR with CMR16F1-CMR16R1 followed by CMR16F2-CMR16R2 detected** *C. michiganensis* **subsp.** *sepedonicus* **and the other** *C. michiganensis* **subspecies. In the latter case,** *C. michiganensis* **subsp.** *sepedonicus* **can be differentiated from the other subspecies by restriction fragment length polymorphism (RFLP) analyses of the nested PCR products (16S rDNA sequences). The nested PCR assays developed in this work allow ultrasensitive detection of very low titers of** *C. michiganensis* **subsp.** *sepedonicus* **which may be present in symptomless potato plants or tubers and which cannot be readily detected by direct PCR (single PCR amplification). RFLP analysis of PCR products provides for an unambiguous confirmation of the identity of** *C. michiganensis* **subsp.** *sepedonicus.*

Phytopathogenic coryneform bacteria have been recently classified into two genera, *Clavibacter* and *Rathayibacter* (3, 5, 30). Some species and subspecies in these genera cause serious diseases in various plant species (5). Potato ring rot disease of potato, caused by *Clavibacter michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus*, is one such serious disease. Because potato ring rot has been assigned a zero tolerance level for both import and export of seed potatoes in Canada, the United States, and countries in the European Community (20–22, 27, 29), an ability to detect very low titers of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* in seed potatoes is indispensable for disease control.

Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay and immunofluorescence based on monoclonal antibodies have been used widely in potato indexing for detection of bacterial ring rot in commercial seed potatoes (6–8, 10, 12). Recently, DNA-based techniques involving DNA probes in DNA hybridization or involving primers based on cloned DNA sequences in PCR have been developed to specifically detect the ring rot bacterium (4, 10, 11, 13, 18, 20, 23, 25, 29). PCR with primers based on the sequences of randomly cloned DNA probes or of plasmid DNA probes or from the 16S-23S rRNA spacer region is more sensitive and more specific than serological procedures and DNA hybridization assays (10, 23, 29).

Due to a zero tolerance level of potato ring rot and the possible presence of reaction inhibitors in tissue extracts (24, 28), a more sensitive PCR assay is needed to increase the sensitivity of detection. The present study was undertaken to develop nested PCR assays with primers designed based on the highly repeated segment of DNA, the insertion element IS*1121*, present in the chromosome of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* (4, 19, 20) and based on 16S rDNA sequences for an ultrasensitive detection of the potato ring rot bacterium.

(Preliminary reports on these studies were presented previously [14, 15].)

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Bacterial strains. The species and subspecies of *Clavibacter* and *Rathayibacter* and other prokaryotes used in this study and their sources of origin are shown in Table 1.

Primer pairs and PCR conditions. The primer pairs CMR16F1-CMR16R1 and CMR16F2-CMR16R2 were designed based on unique 16S rDNA sequences commonly present in all subspecies of *C. michiganensis*. The primer pairs CMSIF1-CMSIR1 and CMSIF2-CMSIR2 were designed based on the sequence of the 1.3-kb insertion element IS*1121*, a highly repeated segment of DNA that is present in plasmid pCS1 and in the chromosome of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* (4, 19). For PCR amplification, 35 cycles were conducted in an automated thermocycler (Hybaid, Teddington, United Kingdom) with AmpliTaq or AmpliTaq Gold polymerase. PCR were performed as described previously (26) in mixtures containing each deoxynucleoside triphosphate at a concentration of 200 μ M and each primer at a concentration of 0.4 to 1.0 μ M (CMSI series). The following parameters were used: denaturation at 94°C for a 1 min (2 min with AmpliTaq or 12 min with AmpliTaq Gold for the first cycle), annealing for 2 min at 62°C, and primer extension for 3 min (10 min in the final cycle) at 72°C. Formamide (final concentration, 3%) was added to the reaction mixture when the primer pairs CMSIF1-CMSIR1 and CMSIF2-CMSIR2 were used. The oligonucleotide sequences of the eight primers and base locations are as follows: CMSIF1, 5'-tgt act cgg cca tga cgt tgg-3' (bases 6 to 26 of RS sequence [4]); CMSIR1, $5'$ -tac tgg gtc atg acg ttg gt-3 $'$ (bases 1052 to 1071); CMSIF2, $5'$ -tcc cac ggt aat gct cgt ctg-3' (bases 105 to 125); CMSIR2, 5'-gat gaa ggg gtc aag ctg gtc-3' (bases 969 to 989); CMR16F1, $5'$ -gtg atg tca gag ctt gct ctg gcg gat c-3' (bases 68 to 95, according to the numbering system in *Escherichia coli* [2]); CMR16R1, $5'$ -gta cgg cta cct tgt tac gac tta gt- $3'$ (bases 1489 to 1514); CMR16F2, $5'$ -ccc cga ctc tgg gat aac tgc ta-3' (bases 136 to 158); and CMR16R2, $5'$ -cgg tta ggc cac tgg ctt cgg gtg tta ccg a-3' (bases 1420 to 1450).

The PCR products (5 to 10 μ l) were analyzed by electrophoresis on a 1% agarose gel followed by staining with ethidium bromide and visualization of the DNA bands with a UV transilluminator.

Restriction fragment length polymorphism (RFLP) analyses of PCR products. The CBR16F2-CBR16R2 PCR products, 16S rDNA sequences, amplified from five subspecies of *C. michiganensis* were analyzed by restriction endonuclease digestions. Between 3 and 5 μ l (100 to 200 ng of DNA) of each PCR product was digested separately with two restriction enzymes, *Hae*III and *Hha*I (GIBCO BRL, Gaithersburg, Md.). The restriction products were then separated by electrophoresis on a 5% polyacrylamide gel and stained with ethidium bromide (16).

DNA extraction and nested PCR assay. Strains of *Clavibacter* and *Rathayibacter* were grown in RSD broth (5). A 5-ml volume of each culture was centrifuged, and the pellet was resuspended for 1 h at room temperature in TEN buffer (10 mM Tris, 6 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA [pH 8.0]) containing 4 mg of lysozyme per ml. The extraction then proceeded according to the procedure for preparation of genomic DNA from bacteria as described by Ausubel et al. (1). The bacterial nucleic acid was resuspended in 50 ml of TE buffer (10 mM Tris, 1 mM EDTA * Corresponding author. [pH 8.0]). A 1-ml volume of diluted (1:30) nucleic acid preparations was used for

TABLE 1. Species and subspecies of *Clavibacter* and *Rathayibacter* and other prokaryotes tested in PCR amplification with primer pairs designed based on sequences from 16S rRNA gene and repeated segment of chromosomal DNA of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus*

^a Nested PCR was performed with CMR16F1-CMR16R1 followed by CMR16F2-CMR16R2 and with CMSIf1-CMSIR1 followed by CMSIF2-CMSIR2-, respectively.

^b Abbreviations are those used in Fig. 1 to 3. *^c* ATCC, American Type Culture Collection. *^d* ND, not done.

FIG. 1. Direct and nested PCR amplification of various species and subspecies of *Clavibacter* and *Rathayibacter* and other prokaryotes. Direct PCR was performed with the primer pair CMSIF1-CMSIR1, while nested PCR was performed initially with primer pair CMSIF1-CMSIR1 for 35 cycles followed by a second PCR amplification (35 cycles) with the universal primer pair CMSIF2-CMSIR2. PCR products were separated by electrophoresis through a 1% agarose gel. Lane S1 contains a 1-kb DNA ladder (GIBCO BRL); lane W-cont. contains the water control. For descriptions of abbreviations, refer to Table 1.

the PCR assay. To determine the sensitivity of nested PCR (with primer pairs CMR16F1-CMR16R1 and CMR16F2-CMR16R2) for detecting the potato ring rot bacterium, nucleic acid extracts from healthy potato tissues artificially mixed with a pure culture of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* were used. A 5-ml culture of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* (approximately 108 bacteria/ml estimated by the procedure of Liao and Chen [17]) was centrifuged, and the pellet was resuspended in 400 μ l of grinding buffer (95 mM K₂HPO₄ · 3H₂O, 30 mM KH_2PO_4 , 10% sucrose, 0.15% bovine serum albumin fraction V, 2% polyvinylpyrrolidone 10, 0.53% ascorbic acid [pH 7.6]) (16). A 50-µl volume was added to the ground potato veinal tissue $(0.2 g)$, and the total nucleic acid of the mix was extracted accordingly. The total nucleic acid extracted was resuspended
in 50 μ l of TE buffer. A serial dilution (10⁻² to 10⁻⁹) of the nucleic acid was prepared, and direct PCR (with primer pair CMR16F1-CMR16R1) was performed to detect the presence of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus*. The PCR products amplified from each dilution were diluted $1:100$, and 1μ l of each diluted product was used as a template in nested PCR (second amplification with the second primer pair, CMR16F2-CMR16R2).

PCR for detection of *C. michiganensis* **subsp.** *sepedonicus* **in potato tubers.** Potato tuber samples (cv. Russet Burbank and Norchip) were kindly provided by N. Gudmestad (North Dakota State University). These tubers were harvested from field plots planted with seed potatoes that were inoculated with one of the five *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* strains: OFF1 and AS1 (mucoid) INM1 and Wi2 (intermediate), and SD1 (nonmucoid). The seed tubers were inoculated with a 10^8 population of bacteria, planted in May, grown in the field, and harvested in fall 1996. Four tubers were sampled from plants infected with each of the strains OFF1, AS1, INM1, Wi2, and SD1. Each tuber was surface cleaned and air dried aseptically. Nucleic acid was extracted from potato tuber tissue taken from underneath the stolon end. Six symptomless potato tubers (three each of cv. Russet Burbank and Red) purchased from a local supermarket in Maryland were also included in the test. Approximately 2 g of tissue was cut and chopped with a razor blade in a sterile petri plate and then rinsed in 1 ml of freshly prepared grinding buffer described above (16). Then 200 ml of the extract was transferred to an Eppendorf tube and centrifuged at $16,000 \times g$ for 10 min. The pellet was resuspended in 100 μ l of TEN buffer containing lysozyme (4 mg/ml) and kept at room temperature for 1 h, and then 200 μ l of buffer (10 mM EDTA, 50 mM Tris [pH 8.0]) and 10 μ l of mercaptoethanol were added to the suspension. The nucleic acid was extracted by the simple minipreparation procedures described by Dellaporta et al. (9). This procedure did not involve extractions with organic solvents. The final pellet was resuspended in 30 μ l of TE buffer. A 1- μ l sample of diluted (1:20) nucleic acid preparations was used for the first (direct) PCR amplification, and a 1- μ l sample of diluted (1:30) direct PCR products was used as a template for the second (nested) PCR amplification. Two sets of primers (I [CMSIF1-CMSIR1] and CMSIF2-CMSIR2] and II [CMR16F1-CMR16R1 and CMR16F2-CMR16R2]) were used separately in direct and nested PCRs. PCR conditions were applied as described above. One to eight negative controls without DNA template were included in each experiment. AmpliTaq Gold polymerase was used in these assays. PCR amplifications were repeated two or three times (or six times for some symptomless samples). The PCR products (10 μ l) were analyzed by electrophoresis on a 1% agarose gel.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Nested PCR with the primer pairs CMSIF1-CMSIR1 and CMSIF2-CMSIR2, designed from a repeated insertion ele-

FIG. 2. Direct and nested PCR amplification of a 16S rDNA sequence from various species and subspecies of *Clavibacter* and *Rathayibacter* and other prokaryotes. Direct PCR was performed with primer pair CMR16F1-CMR16R1, while nested PCR was performed initially with primer pair CMR16F1- CMR16R1 for 35 cycles followed by second PCR amplification (35 cycles) with primer pair CMR16F2-CMR16R2. Lane S1 contains a 1-kb DNA ladder; lane W-cont. contains the water control. For description of abbreviations, refer to Table 1.

ment, IS*1121*, present in plasmid and chromosomal DNA of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus*, specifically detected (the 0.9-kb fragment was amplified) strains of this subspecies, including the plasmidless strains *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* P45 and 106 (19), while direct PCR with primer pair CMSIF1-CMSIR1 detected (the 1.0-kb fragment was amplified) the subspecies *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* and the closely related subspecies *C. michiganensis* subsp. *insidiosus* (Fig. 1; Table 1). No PCR products were amplified from the other species and subspecies in the genera *Clavibacter* and *Rathayibacter* or from other unrelated prokaryotes tested. Direct PCR with primer pair CMR16F1-CMR16R1 and nested PCR with the primer pairs CMR16F1-CMR16R1 followed by CMR16F2-CMR16R2, designed from 16S rDNA sequences, detected all members (five subspecies) of *C. michiganensis* but did not detect other species and subspecies in the genera *Clavibacter* and *Rathayibacter* or other prokaryotes (Fig. 2; Table 1). The two primer pairs are *C. michiganensis* specific. Most members of *C. michiganensis* are important plant pathogens. Therefore, using these primers to detect all members of *C. michiganensis* is valuable for general screening of plants for

FIG. 3. RFLP analysis of 16S rDNA amplified by nested PCR with primer pairs CMR16F1-CMR16R1 and CMR16F2-CMR16R2. Nested PCR products were digested with restriction enzymes (*Hae*III and *Hha*I). Lane S1 contains a fX174 RF I DNA *Hae*III digest; the fragment sizes in base pairs (from top to bottom) are 1,353, 1,078, 872, 603, 310, 281, 271, 234, 194, 118, and 72. Lane S2 contains a pBR322 DNA *Msp*I digest; the fragment sizes in base pairs (from top to bottom) are 622, 527, 404, 307, 242, 238, 217, 201, 190, 180, 160, 147, 123, 110, 90, 76, 67, 34, 26, 15, and 9.

FIG. 4. Direct and nested PCR amplification of a 16S rDNA sequence from various titers of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* in potato tissue. Direct PCR amplification was performed with CMR16F1-CMR16R1; nested PCR amplification was performed with CMR16F1-CMR16R1 followed by CMR16F2- CMR16R2. Lane S1 contains a 1-kb DNA ladder; lane W-cont. contains the water control.

these pathogens. The potato ring rot bacterium, *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus*, could be differentiated from other subspecies of *C. michiganensis* by RFLP analysis (with restriction enzymes *Hae*III and *Hha*I) of the nested PCR products. For example, *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* has RFLP patterns distinct from those of the other four subspecies, *C. michiganensis* subspp. *michiganesis*, *nebraskensis*, *tessellarius*, and *insidiosus* (Fig. 3). Furthermore, since no subspecies other than *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* was reported to infect potato, this set of primer pairs is as good as the *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus*-specific primers for detection of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* in potato tissue.

The two primer pairs CMR16F1-CMR16R1 and CMR16F2- CMR16R2 were used in nested PCR to detect *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* in potato tissues. Under our experimental conditions, nested PCR detected (visible DNA bands on agarose gel) titers as low as 10^{-6} dilution (about 100 bacteria/ reaction mixture) whereas direct PCR did not readily detect *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* when its titers in the potato tissue were below 10^{-4} dilution (Fig. 4). Taking into consideration the dilution factor (100-fold) of template DNA prepared for nested PCR, we expect that nested PCR can detect fewer than 100 bacteria/reaction mixture. Compared to direct PCR assays, the sensitivity of detection increased 100- to 1,000-fold in nested PCR. The results underscore the necessity to apply more sensitive means such as nested PCR in screening for the potato ring rot pathogen in commercial seed potatoes. Direct (single-amplification) PCR is sensitive enough to detect as few as 5 to 50 CFU of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* (pure culture) per $20-\mu$ l PCR mixture (29), but the sensitivity of detecting *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* in potato tissues by direct PCR may decrease because of the presence of potential reaction inhibitors in potato tissue extracts. Due to a zero tolerance policy for potato ring rot pathogen in potato, a very sensitive means is needed to detect very low titers of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* in commercial seed potatoes.

The results of PCR assays for the detection of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* in commercial potato tubers or tubers obtained from experimental field plots are shown in Fig. 5 and summarized in Table 2. Nested PCR was needed to determine the presence of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* in more than 40% of the symptomless tubers tested, consistent with a low titer of the bacterium in these tubers. In PCRs with either set of nested PCR primers, all duplicate or triplicate reaction mixtures yielded positive *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* detection in tests of symptomatic tubers. *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* DNA was detected in all duplicate or triplicate reaction mixtures for most symptomless tubers. RFLP analyses confirmed that only *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* was detected in all samples listed in Table 2 (data not shown).

The results also reflected a difference in the efficiency of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* detection depending on the primers used in nested PCR. For example, *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* was detected in 14 of 17 symptomless tubers when nested PCRs were primed with CMSIF1-CMSIR1 followed by CMSIF2-CMSIR2 but in only 11 of the 17 symptomless tubers when nested PCRs were primed with CMR16F1-

FIG. 5. Direct and nested PCR amplification of the 16S rDNA sequence of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* in nucleic acid extracts prepared from potato tubers collected from experimental plots artificially inoculated with various strains of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus*. (A) Direct PCR with primer pair CMSIF1-CMSIR1; (B) nested PCR with CMSIF1-CMSIR1 followed by CMSIF2-CMSIR2. Lane S contains 1-kb DNA ladder; lanes Rus-C1 to Rus-C3 and Red-C1 to Red-C3 contain symptomless samples purchased from a local supermarket in Maryland; lanes W-C1 to W-C4 contain water controls. *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* strains: mucoid, OFF-1 and AS1; nonmucoid, SD1; intermediate, INM1 and Wi2.

TABLE 2. Results of direct and nested PCR assays for detection of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* in field-collected potato tubers

	Cultivar	Symptom rating b	Bacterial detection by ^c :			
Sample ^{a}			Direct PCR		Nested PCR	
			T	H	T	П
1 (OFF1-1)	Russet Burbank	θ	$^{+}$	$+$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$
2 (OFF1-2)	Russet Burbank	3	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$
3 (OFF1-3)	Russet Burbank	$\overline{2}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$
4 (OFF1-4)	Russet Burbank	θ		$\overline{}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$
5 (Wi2-1)	Russet Burbank	1	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$
6 (Wi2-2)	Russet Burbank	Ω	$^{+}$	$\overline{}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$
$7 (Wi2-3)$	Russet Burbank	Ω	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$
8 (Wi2-4)	Russet Burbank	θ	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$
$9(SD1-1)$	Russet Burbank	θ	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$
$10(SD1-2)$	Russet Burbank	\overline{c}	$+$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$
11 $(SD1-3)$	Russet Burbank	1	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$
$12(SD1-4)$	Russet Burbank	1	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$
$13 (AS1-1)$	Norchip	1			$^{+}$	$+$ ^d
14 (AS1-2)	Norchip	Ω	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$
$15 (AS1-3)$	Norchip	Ω	$^{+}$	$\overline{}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$
16 (AS1-4)	Norchip	θ	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$
17 (INM1-1)	Russet Burbank	0		$\overline{}$	$+^d$	
18 (INM1-2)	Russet Burbank	θ	$\overline{}$	-		$+$ ^d
19 (INM1-3)	Russet Burbank	\overline{c}	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$
20 (INM1-4)	Russet Burbank	1	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$	$^{+}$
21 (Rus-C1)	Russet Burbank	Ω			$\overline{}$	
22 (Rus-C2)	Russet Burbank	θ		-	$^{+}$	
23 (Rus-C3)	Russet Burbank	Ω		$\overline{}$	$+^d$	
24 (Red-C1)	Red	θ			$^{+}$	$^{+}$
25 (Red-C2)	Red	θ		-	$+^d$	
26 (Red-C3)	Red	θ				

^a Samples 1 to 20 were harvested from a potato field experimentally inoculated with various strains of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus*. OFF1 and AS1 are mucoid strains; INM1 and Wi2 are intermediate strains; and SD1 is a nonmucoid strain. Samples 21 to 26 were purchased from a local supermarket.

^b Symptom rating: 0, symptomless; 1, slightly brownish discoloration of vascular ring; 2, obvious discoloration; 3, severe symptom with canker rot.

I, primer pair CMSIF1-CMSIR1 for direct PCR; CMSIF1-CMSIR1 followed by CMSIF2-CMSIR2 for nested PCR. II, primer pair CMR16F1-CMR16R1 for direct PCR; CMR16F1-CMR16R1 followed by CMR16F2-CMR16R2 for nest-ed-PCR.

Samples in which *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* could not be readily detected in every duplicate test. The frequency of detection ranged from 50 to 75% for all duplicate tests.

CMR16R1 followed by CMR16F2-CMR16R2. Presumably, the higher frequency of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* detection in the PCRs with CMSI primers was due to the greater abundance of template sequences for these primers, since the CMSI primers were designed on the basis of the nucleotide sequence of insert element IS*1121*, a highly repeated (up to 50 repeats) sequence in the chromosome of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* (4, 19).

It is also noteworthy that *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* was detected in only one of two duplicate reaction mixtures for three tubers (tubers 17, 23, and 25) when the CMSI primers were used and for two tubers (tubers 13 and 18) when the CMR16 primers were used (Table 2). Although the use of higher template DNA concentrations in PCRs for *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* detection would conceivably reduce the number of negative assays, such a step was not carried out because it would potentially increase the concentration of PCR inhibitors in the reaction mixture. Because of the inconsistency, we carried out an experiment in which four reaction mixtures were prepared for each of the five symptomless tubers. The frequency of positive assays ranged from 50 to 75% for these five samples. The experiment included two other symptomless tubers that consistently tested negative in previous experiments and eight water blanks (PCR control mixtures devoid of added template DNA), none of which yielded the PCR product, indicating that positive assays were genuine and were not due to cross-contaminations with template. Based on dilution factors in the preparation of template DNA used in the test reactions, low levels (as low as 1.5×10^3 organisms per g of tuber tissue) could be detected when duplicate assays were carried out for a given sample. Since a single PCR mixture could fail to detect the presence of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* at such low levels in tubers, the results underscore the need for duplicate or triplicate assays of samples suspected to contain low titers of the target template.

The nested PCR assays developed in this study provided a means for ultrasensitive detection of the potato ring rot bacterium, *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus*, at very low titers in tubers. These assays should facilitate the screening of imported germplasms for the presence of the pathogen and aid the production of *C. michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus*-free commercial seed potato stock. The use of pathogen-free seed potato in commercial production could be the most efficient avenue to achieve the goal of zero tolerance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank M. Davis, D. T. Kingsbury, C.-H. Liao, and L. N. Chiykowski for providing DNA preparations or cultures of various prokaryotes used in this study and L. Lukaesko and R. Jomantiene for excellent technical assistance. We also thank N. C. Gudmestad for providing infected potatoes.

REFERENCES

- 1. **Ausubel, F. M., R. Brent, R. E. Kingston, D. D. Moore, J. G. Seidman, J. A.** Smith, and K. Stuhl. 1987. Current protocols in molecular biology. Wiley Interscience, New York, N.Y.
- 2. **Carbon, P. C., C. Ehresmann, B. Ehresmann, and J. P. Ebel.** 1979. The complete nucleotide sequence of the ribosomal 16S rRNA from *Escherichia coli*: experimental details and cistron heterogeneities. Eur. J. Biochem. **100:** 399–410.
- 3. **Carlson, R. R., and A. K. Vidaver.** 1982. Taxonomy of *Corynebacterium* plant pathogens, including a new pathogen of wheat, based on polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis of cellular proteins. Int. J. Syst. Bacteriol. **32:**315–326.
- 4. **Chuang, L.-Y.** 1994. Insertion sequence-targeted approaches to detection and differentiation of strains of *Clavibacter michiganensis* subspecies sepe *donicus*. Ph.D. dissertation. North Dakota State University, Fargo.
- 5. **Davis, M. J., A. G. Gillaspie, A. K. Vidaver, and R. W. Harris.** 1984. *Clavibacter*: a new genus containing some phytopathogenic coryneform bacteria, including *Clavibacter xyli* subsp. *xyli* sp. nov., subsp. nov. and *Clavibacter xyli* subsp. *cynodontis* subsp. nov., pathogens that cause ratoon stunting disease of sugarcane and bermudagrass stunting disease. Int. J. Syst. Bacteriol. **34:**107–117.
- 6. **De Boer, S. H., J. D. Janse, D. E. Stead, J. Van Vaerenbergh, and A. R. McKenzie.** 1992. Detection of *Clavibacter michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* in potato stems and tubers grown from seed pieces with various levels of inoculum. Potato Res. **35:**207–216.
- 7. **De Boer, S. H., D. E. Stead, A. S. Alivizatos, J. D. Janse, J. Van Vaerenbergh, T. L. De Haan, and J. Mawhinney.** 1994. Evaluation of serological tests for detection of *Clavibacter michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* in composite potato stem and tuber samples. Plant Dis. **78:**725–729.
- 8. **De Boer, S. H., A. Wieczorek, and A. Kummer.** 1988. An ELISA test for bacterial ring rot of potato with a new monoclonal antibody. Plant Dis. **72:**874–878.
- 9. **Dellaporta, S. L., J. Wood, and J. B. Hicks.** 1983. A plant DNA minipreparation: version II. Plant Mol. Biol. Rep. **1:**19–21.
- 10. **Drennan, J., S. Slack, A. Westra, A. Collmer, N. Gudmestad, and A. Oleson.** 1994. Specific detection of *Clavibacter michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* with the polymerase chain reaction. Phytopathology **84:**1087.
- 11. **Firrao, G.** 1990. Cloned diagnostic probe for the detection of *Clavibacter michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus*. EPPO Bull. **20:**207–213.
- 12. **Gudmestad, N. C., D. Baer, and C. J. Kurowski.** 1991. Validating immunoassay test performance in the detection of *Corynebacterium sepedonicum* during the growing season. Phytopathology **81:**475–480.
- 13. **Johansen, I. E., O. F. Rasmussen, and M. Heide.** 1989. Specific identification of *Clavibacter michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicum* by DNA-hybridization

probes. Phytopathology **79:**1019–1023.

- 14. **Lee, I.-M., I. M. Bartoszyk, D. E. Gundersen, B. Mogen, and R. E. Davis.** 1996. Nested PCR assays for ultrasensitive detection of potato ring rot bacterium, *Clavibacter michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus*. Phytopathology **86:** S96.
- 15. **Lee, I.-M., D. E. Gundersen, B. Mogen, and R. E. Davis.** 1995. Universal amplification and analysis of 16S rDNA for classification and identification of *Clavibacter* spp. and subsp. Phytopathology **85:**1179.
- 16. **Lee, I.-M., R. W. Hammond, R. E. Davis, and D. E. Gundersen.** 1993. Universal amplification and analysis of pathogen 16S rDNA for classification and identification of mycoplasmalike organisms. Phytopathology **83:**834–842.
- 17. **Liao, C. H., and T. A. Chen.** 1977. Culture of corn stunt spiroplasma in a simple medium. Phytopathology **67:**802–807.
- 18. **Mirza, M. S., J. L. W. Rademaker, J. D. Janse, and A. D. L. Akkermans.** 1993. Specific 16S ribosomal RNA targeted oligonucleotide probe against *Clavibacter michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus*. Can. J. Microbiol. **39:**1029– 1034.
- 19. **Mogen, B. D., A. E. Oleson, R. B. Sparks, N. C. Gudmestad, and G. A. Secor.** 1988. Distribution and partial characterization of pCS1, a highly conserved plasmid present in *Clavibacter michiganense* subsp. *sepedonicum*. Phytopathology **78:**1381–1386.
- 20. **Mogen, B. D., H. R. Olson, R. B. Sparks, N. C. Gudmestad, and A. E. Olson.** 1990. Genetic variation in strains of *Clavibacter michiganense* subsp. *sepedonicum*: polymorphisms in restriction fragments containing a highly repeated sequence. Phytopathology **80:**90–96.
- 21. **Munro, J.** 1978. Seed potato improvement in Canada. Can. Plant Dis. Surv. **58:**26–28.
- 22. **Nelson, G. A.** 1982. *Corynebacterium sepedonicum* in potato: effect of inoc-

ulum concentration on ring rot symptoms and latent infection. Can. J. Plant Pathol. **4:**129–133.

- 23. **Rademaker, J. L. W., and J. D. Janse.** 1994. Detection and identification of *Clavibacter michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* and *Clavibacter michiganensis* subsp. *michiganensis* by nonradioactive hybridization, polymerase chain reaction, and restriction enzyme analysis. Can. J. Microbiol. **40:**1007–1018.
- 24. **Rossen, L., P. Noskov, K. Holmstrom, and O. F. Rasmussen.** 1992. Inhibition of PCR components of food samples, microbial diagnostic assays and DNAextraction solution. Int. J. Food Microbiol. **17:**37–45.
- 25. **Schneider, B. J., J. L. Zhao, and C. S. Orser.** 1993. Detection of *Clavibacter michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* by DNA amplification. FEMS Microbiol. Lett. **109:**207–212.
- 26. **Shaff, D. A., I.-M. Lee, and R. E. Davis.** 1992. Sensitive detection and identification of mycoplasmalike organisms by polymerase chain reactions. Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun. **186:**1503–1509.
- 27. **Shepard, J. F., L. E. Claflin.** 1975. Critical analyses of the principle of seed potato certification. Annu. Rev. Phytopathol. **13:**271–293.
- 28. **Tsai, Y. L., and B. H. Olson.** 1992. Detection of low numbers of bacterial cells in soils and sediments by polymerase chain reaction. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. **58:**754–757.
- 29. **Xiang, L., and S. H. De Boer.** 1995. Selection of polymerase chain reaction primers from an RNA intergenic spacer region for specific detection of *Clavibacter michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus*. Phytopathology **85:**837–842.
- 30. **Zgurskaya, H. I., L. I. Evtushenko, V. N. Akimov, and L. V. Kalakoutskii.** 1993. *Rathayibacter* gen. nov., including the species *Rathayibacter rathayi* comb. nov., *Rathayibacter tritici* comb. nov., *Rathayibacter iranicus* comb. nov., and six strains from annual grasses. Int. J. Syst. Bacteriol. **43:**143–149.