

1 **Evaluation of the phytopathological reaction of wild and cultivated olives as a**  
2 **mean of finding promising new sources of genetic diversity for resistance to root-**  
3 **knot nematodes**

4

5 **Juan E. Palomares-Rius**<sup>†</sup>, Institute for Sustainable Agriculture (IAS), Spanish  
6 National Research Council (CSIC), Avda. Menéndez Pidal s/n, 14004, Córdoba,  
7 Campus de Excelencia Internacional Agroalimentario, ceiA3, Spain; **Angjelina Belaj**,  
8 IFAPA Centro Alameda del Obispo, Córdoba, Spain; **Lorenzo León**, IFAPA **Raúl De**  
9 **la Rosa**, IFAPA; **Hava F. Rapoport**, IAS-CSIC; and **Pablo Castillo**, IAS-CSIC

10

11

12 <sup>†</sup>Corresponding author: Juan E. Palomares-Rius

13 E-mail: palomaresje@ias.csic.es

14

15 running title: olive reactions to *Meloidogyne*

16

---

17 **Abstract**

18 Olive (*Olea europaea* L.) is one of the most important fruit-crops in the Mediterranean  
19 Basin, occupying significant acreage in these countries and often accompanied with  
20 important cultural heritage and landscape value. This crop can be infected by several  
21 *Meloidogyne* species (*M. javanica*, *M. arenaria* and *M. incognita*, among others), and  
22 only a few cultivars have been found with some level of resistance to these nematodes.  
23 Recent innovations in intensive olive growing using high planting densities, irrigation  
24 and substantial amounts of fertilizers, could increase the nematode population to further  
25 damaging levels. In order to further understand the interactions involved between olive  
26 and pathogenic nematodes and in the hope of finding solutions to the agricultural risks,  
27 this research aimed to determine the reaction of important olive cultivars in Spain and  
28 wild olives to *M. javanica* infection, including genotypes of the same and other *O.*  
29 *europaea* subspecies. All the olive cultivars tested were found to be good hosts for *M.*  
30 *javanica*, but substantially different high levels of reproduction were found in three  
31 cultivars (cv. Gordal Sevillana, cv. Hojiblanca and cv. Manzanilla de Sevilla). In the wild  
32 accessions, the *O. europaea* subsp. *cerasiformis* (genotype W147) and the subsp.  
33 *europaea* var. *sylvestris* (genotype W224) were resistant to *M. javanica* at different levels,  
34 with strong resistance in W147 (Reproduction factor (Rf) = 0.0003) and moderate  
35 resistance in W224 (Rf = 0.79). The defense reaction of W147 to *M. javanica* showed a  
36 strong increase of phenolic compounds but no hypersensitive reaction.

37

38 **Keywords:** histopathology, *Meloidogyne*, olive, reproduction, resistance, root-knot  
39 nematodes

## 40 **Introduction**

41 Olive (*Olea europaea* L.) is one of the most important fruit-crops in the  
42 Mediterranean Basin, occupying significant acreage in these countries and often  
43 accompanied with important cultural heritage and landscape value. Furthermore, this crop  
44 is expanding worldwide because of the high demand for olive oil related to health benefits  
45 (Rallo et al. 2016). In addition to oil production, some cultivars are specifically cultivated  
46 for consumption as table olives, while others are used for both purposes. The cultivated  
47 olive tree belongs to the *O. europaea* complex which consists of six different subspecies  
48 associated with specific, often isolated, geographical areas (Green 2002; Besnard et al.  
49 2018): (i) subsp. *europaea* with two botanical varieties [var. *sylvestris* (namely oleasters  
50 or wild olive) and var. *europaea* (cultivated olive)] distributed in the Mediterranean  
51 Basin; (ii) subsp. *laperrinei* in the Saharan mountains; (iii) subsp. *cuspidata* distributed  
52 from southern Africa to southern Egypt and from Arabia to China); (iv) subsp. *guanchica*  
53 native from the Canary Islands; (v) subsp. *maroccana* in southern Morocco; and, (vi)  
54 subsp. *cerasiformis* in Madeira Islands. This broad range of wild relatives, including both  
55 genotypes of other subspecies and those pertaining to the var. *sylvestris* of its own  
56 subspecies, represents promising new sources of genetic diversity for resistance to plant  
57 pathogens, including root-knot nematodes (*Meloidogyne* spp.).

58 The olive tree rhizosphere has been found to be a good habitat for many species  
59 of plant-parasitic nematodes (Castillo et al. 2010; Ali et al. 2014). Only some of them,  
60 however, have been shown to be pathogenic or to directly feed on olive roots, among  
61 which one of the most widespread and damaging is the genus *Meloidogyne* (Castillo et  
62 al. 2010; Ali et al. 2014; Archidona-Yuste et al. 2018). A number of species of this genus  
63 have been found to infect olive (Tarjan 1957; Minz 1961; Yang and Zhong 1980;  
64 Abrantes et al. 1991; Castillo et al. 2003; Archidona-Yuste et al. 2018): *M. javanica*

65 (Treub, 1885) Chitwood, 1949; *M. incognita* (Kofoid & White, 1919) Chitwood, 1949,  
66 *M. hapla* Chitwood, 1949, *M. arenaria* (Neal, 1889) Chitwood, 1949, *M. lusitanica*  
67 Abrantes & Santos, 1991, *M. baetica* Castillo, Vovlas, Subbotin & Troccoli, 2003, and  
68 *M. oleae* Archidona-Yuste, Cantalapiedra-Navarrete, Liebanas, Rapoport, Castillo &  
69 Palomares-Rius, 2018.

70 The aforementioned *Meloidogyne* spp. have been reported associated with olive  
71 in 19 countries, representing a real threat for olive culture worldwide (Ali et al. 2014).  
72 Plant-parasitic nematodes can also be found in sporadic distributions in wild olives, olive  
73 nurseries, and established orchards, and have been demonstrated to cause heavy root  
74 galling and severe reduction in plant growth in pathogenicity tests (Castillo et al. 2010;  
75 Lamberti et al. 1969; Nico et al. 2002; 2003; Sasanelli et al. 2002; Sasanelli et al. 1997).  
76 Estimates of olive losses in the United States due to *Meloidogyne* spp. and *Tylenchulus*  
77 *semipenetrans* (Cobb, 1913) ranged from 5 to 10% (Koenning et al. 1994; Singh et al.  
78 2013). In some cases plant-parasitic nematodes are associated with damaging syndromes  
79 such as “drying syndrome” in newly established olive orchards in Argentina (Pérez et al.  
80 2001) or with vascular diseases (Lamberti et al. 2001; Saeedizadeh et al. 2003). Damage  
81 in nursery plants is more severe due to nematode parasitism and more importantly, plant-  
82 parasitic nematode populations are disseminated from nurseries to uninfested areas (Nico  
83 et al. 2002). Furthermore, the olive crop is changing from traditional low-input orchards  
84 without irrigation to new, highly mechanized orchards, with irrigation, high fertilizer  
85 inputs, and high planting densities, often belonging to new cultivars adapted to these crop  
86 conditions (Rallo et al. 2016). These new high-density irrigated orchards tend to have soil  
87 conditions more conducive for the establishment of the diseases caused by nematodes,  
88 mainly *Meloidogyne* spp. (Ali et al. 2016).

89 Host-plant resistance could be the easiest, safest, and cheapest long-term approach  
90 to controlling the damage caused by plant-parasitic nematodes (Castillo et al. 2010),  
91 provided, for example by breeding for resistant rootstocks. Previous studies have  
92 identified a few olive cultivars associated with some degree of resistance to the most  
93 common species of *Meloidogyne*, such as *M. incognita*, *M. javanica*, *M. arenaria*, and *M.*  
94 *hapla* (Lamberti and Baines 1968; Al-Sayed and Abdel-Hameed 1991; Sasanelli et al.  
95 1997). In general, commercial cultivars are grown self-rooted, but the use of resistant  
96 rootstocks, alternative cultivars such as cv. Allegra in California (McKenry 1994), or  
97 wild types, could also be of great interest. Apart from the indications above, most  
98 preliminary reports indicate that most olive cultivars are good, rather than resistant, hosts  
99 for *Meloidogyne* spp., such as cv. Arbequina and cv. Picual as hosts for *M. javanica*, *M.*  
100 *incognita* and *M. arenaria* (Nico et al. 2003), and cv. Cima di Bitonto as a host for *M.*  
101 *javanica* (Sasanelli et al., 2009). Knowledge of resistance or susceptibility of wild olives  
102 is absent. Thus searching for resistance in traditional cultivars and/or newly bred  
103 cultivars, as well as in wild olive genotypes, requires further attention. Progress in  
104 understanding the reaction of olive cultivars, wild olive genotypes, and other related  
105 subspecies to *Meloidogyne* spp. represents a critical step to finding new solutions for  
106 sustainable olive agriculture.

107 The specific objectives of this research were to: (i) determine the host suitability  
108 of widely used, mainly Spanish, commercial olive cultivars, wild olive genotypes, and  
109 related subspecies of the *O. europaea* complex to *M. javanica*, and (ii) to assess the  
110 histopathological plant-nematode interaction in susceptible and resistant hosts in order to  
111 understand the mechanisms involved. The species *M. javanica*, currently found to be the  
112 most prevalent *Meloidogyne* species in both cultivated and wild olives in Spain  
113 (Archidona-Yuste et al. 2018), was used for standardized evaluation.

114

115

## 116 **Material and methods**

117 **Nematode inocula.** An isolate of *M. javanica* from a commercial orchard, cv.  
118 Manzanilla de Sevilla, in La Campana, Sevilla province, was identified to species level  
119 based on features of the female perineal pattern, isozyme malate and esterase patterns and  
120 molecular data (SCAR-based polymerase-chain-reaction assays, *coxII*-16S rRNA and  
121 specific PCR) (Esbenshade and Triantaphyllou 1985; Hartman and Sasser 1985; Zijlstra  
122 et al. 2000). Inoculum of the *M. javanica* isolate was increased on tomato (*Solanum*  
123 *lycopersicon* L. cv. Tres Cantos) grown in clay pots filled with an autoclaved (120°C, 2  
124 h) sandy soil mixture, starting from a single egg mass in a growth chamber adjusted to 25  
125 ± 1°C, 60 to 90% relative humidity, and a 16-h photoperiod of fluorescent light at 360 ±  
126 25 µE m<sup>-2</sup>s<sup>-1</sup> for 2 months. The inoculum consisted of eggs and second-stage juveniles  
127 (J2) extracted from 2-month-old tomato plants using 1% sodium hypochlorite (Hussey  
128 and Barker 1973) followed by centrifugal flotation (Coolen 1979).

129 **Plant material.** The wild olive genotypes and the related subspecies were  
130 obtained from the *ex situ* wild repository established at IFAPA Centre “Alameda del  
131 Obispo” (Belaj et al. 2016; León et al. 2018), Córdoba, while the olive cultivars (Table  
132 1) came from the World Olive Germplasm Collection of IFAPA (WOGC) which is also  
133 maintained at the same research centre (Belaj et al. 2016). While both the wild and the  
134 cultivated genotypes are represented by two-three trees per genotype in their respective  
135 collections, the plant material utilized and further vegetatively propagated by semi-  
136 hardwood cuttings, was obtained from one and always the same tree. The following  
137 procedure was followed to rapidly produce homogeneous plants suitable for the  
138 experiments: Cuttings from branches of the preceding year’s growth (0.5 cm of diameter,

139 and with a length of 12-14 cm approximately) were selected from each tree under study  
140 for vegetative propagation. The stem cuttings were surface-disinfested with fungicide (a  
141 1% CuSO<sub>4</sub> solution) for 5 min and washed four times in sterile distilled water to prevent  
142 fungal contamination. Afterwards, the lower end of the cuttings was dipped for 5 seconds  
143 in 3000 ppm indole butyric acid powder (Rootone<sup>®</sup> F, Compo, Barcelona, Spain) to  
144 promote rhizogenesis. After that, the treated and dried stem cuttings were planted in  
145 propagation trays filled with perlite and kept under suitable conditions for rooting (25 ±  
146 1°C, 60 to 90% relative humidity) for 2 months in the greenhouse chamber. The rooted  
147 cuttings were transferred into 1 l plastic pots filled with peat and maintained for  
148 approximately 6 months in a shade house for hardening (Del Río and Caballero, 2005).

149       Plants of uniform root system and shoot size were selected and transplanted into  
150 75 mm x 77 mm x 180 mm plastic pots (one plant per pot) filled with an autoclaved  
151 (120°C, 1 h, twice) soil mixture (sand/clay loam, 2:1, vol/vol). Plants were watered on  
152 alternate days with 100 ml of sterilized tap water and fertilized with 100 ml of a 0.1%  
153 solution of a 20-5-32 (N-P-K) + micronutrients fertilizer (Poly-Feed<sup>™</sup>, Haifa, Israel) and  
154 pruned to maintain a single shoot every week. After a 7-day recovery period the plants  
155 were inoculated with *M. javanica* inoculum.

156       **Growth chamber experiments.** The experiments were conducted in a growth  
157 chamber under the conditions described above, which are considered optimal for the  
158 development and reproduction of *M. javanica* (Trudgill and Perry 1994). Plants were  
159 inoculated individually by adding 10,000 eggs + J2 of *M. javanica* in 10 ml of sterile  
160 distilled water. The nematode suspension, corresponding to a theoretical inoculum  
161 density of 10 nematodes/cm<sup>3</sup> soil, was added to four holes in the soil around the base of  
162 the plant. The nematode inoculum density of the water suspension was determined by  
163 counting nematode specimens in 10 1 ml aliquots.

164 Plants were watered with 100 ml of water on alternate days and fertilized weekly  
165 with 100 ml of the previously mentioned nutrient solution. Each genotype was replicated  
166 eight times and the experiment was arranged in a completely randomized design. The  
167 experiment was conducted twice, with a duration of 120 days after nematode inoculation.

168 **Assessment of plant growth variables and data analyses.** Plant growth, root  
169 galling, and nematode reproduction were rated at the end of both trials. Plant growth of  
170 the genotypes was assessed by comparing root fresh weight with that of un-inoculated  
171 control plants. Before assessment of root weight, the root system of a plant was gently  
172 washed free of adhering soil and debris, and root galling rated on a 0 to 6 scale, where 0  
173 = no galls; 1 = 1–10; 2 = 11–20; 3 = 21–40; 4 = 41–70; 5 = 71–90; and 6  $\geq$  91 galls (Nico  
174 et al. 2003).

175 Final soil and root nematode population densities (*Pf*) were determined. Soil was  
176 washed thoroughly with tap water through a 710- $\mu$ m mesh sieve and the filtered water  
177 was collected in a beaker and thoroughly mixed with 4% kaolin (v/v). This mixture was  
178 centrifuged at 1100 g for 4 min, the supernatants were discarded, pellets were re-  
179 suspended in 250 mL MgSO<sub>4</sub> ( $\delta = 1.16$ ), and the new suspensions were centrifuged at  
180 1100 g for 3 min. The new supernatants were sieved through 5  $\mu$ m mesh, and nematodes  
181 collected on the sieve were washed with tap water, transferred to Petri dishes and counted  
182 under a stereomicroscope (Coolen 1979). To assess nematode population in  
183 *Meloidogyne*-infected roots, the complete root system of a plant was washed free of soil  
184 and cut into 1-2-cm segments, and *M. javanica* (eggs, sedentary stages and J2s) were  
185 extracted by maceration followed by centrifugation. Root tissues were homogenized in  
186 250 mL of a 1% solution of NaOCl using a Waring blender at 1800 g for 1 min, and  
187 homogenates were centrifuged and extracted as described above (Coolen 1979; Hussey  
188 and Barker 1973). Population densities were used to calculate the reproduction index [Rf



189 = final population density in soil and roots ( $P_f$ ) divided by initial population density ( $P_i$ ].  
190 All data of root symptom severity, nematode reproduction and root fresh weight were  
191 transformed into  $\log_{10}(X + 1)$ , before analyses (Gómez and Gómez 1984). Similarity  
192 between the experiment repetitions was tested by preliminary analyses of variance  
193 (ANOVA) using experimental runs as factors, which determined that the experiment  $\times$   
194 genotype interaction was not significant ( $P \geq 0.05$ ) and thus permitted combining the data  
195 of both experimental runs for further analyses (Gómez and Gómez 1984). Analyses of  
196 variance were carried out using Statistix 10.0 (NH Analytical Software, Roseville, MN,  
197 USA). Significant differences among means of root weight, gall rating, and nematode  
198 reproduction were estimated using the least significant difference multiple range test ( $P$   
199 = 0.05). Data from uninoculated control treatments were not included in analyses of gall  
200 ratings and nematode reproduction, to avoid the use of zero in the ANOVA.

201       **Histopathological study.** Galled roots from the different subspecies of olive and  
202 cultivated plants infected by *M. javanica* and controls (similar root zones from  
203 uninoculated plants) were selected at the end (120 days) of the experiments (2-3  
204 roots/plant from 3-4 plants in every genotype and treatment for each experiment  
205 repetition), gently washed free of adhering soil and debris, fixed in FAE solution  
206 [formalin, acetic acid, 95% ethanol and distilled water (10:5:50:35 v/v/v/v)] for at least  
207 48 h, dehydrated in a tertiary butyl alcohol series (70-85-90-100%) and embedded in  
208 paraffin (58°C melting point; Merck, Darmstadt, Germany) for histopathological  
209 observations. Embedded tissues were sectioned longitudinally and transversely at 12  $\mu$ m  
210 with a rotary microtome and stained with a combination of tannic acid - ferric chloride,  
211 safranin and fast green, by which nuclei, chromosomes, and lignified or suberized cell  
212 walls stain red, cytoplasm and cellulosic cell walls stain green, and the tannic acid – iron  
213 chloride aids in cell wall definition and is considered to be a general test for phenols

214 (Reeve, 1951; Jensen, 1962; Ruzin, 1999). The stained sections were examined  
215 microscopically (optical microscope Leica DMRBFHC, Leica Microsystems, Heerbrugg,  
216 Switzerland), and photographed (digital camera Leica DFC450C).

217 Two genotypes (cv. Ayvalik and the wild genotype W19) developed typical galls  
218 but were damaged during histological processing, so no microphotographs could be  
219 obtained. The wild olive genotype from Morocco (W224) was not included in the final  
220 histological analysis because of the few and small galls produced. Similarly, genotype  
221 W147 from Madeira Island and belonging to subsp. *cerasiformis* was also excluded from  
222 this analysis because roots were not galled in the two experimental repetitions.

223 In an additional experiment, 12 plants from genotype W147 were inoculated with  
224 a high inoculum level of 15,000 J2s in order to further explore early interactions with the  
225 host plant, such as a possible hypersensitive reaction or repellence of the nematode by the  
226 root. These plants were sampled at 4, 11, 25 and 70 days after inoculation (DAI) (3 plants  
227 per sampling time). Half of the roots for each plant were processed according to the  
228 histopathological procedure described above, and the other half processed for fuchsine  
229 acid staining following Byrd et al. (1983). Unfortunately, wild olive plantlets of genotype  
230 W224 were not available for the additional study of resistance.

231

## 232 **Results**

233 **Suitability of wild and cultivated olive genotypes as hosts of *Meloidogyne***  
234 ***javanica*.** Symptoms on aboveground plant parts did not appear, either on nematode-  
235 inoculated nor un-inoculated plants. In some cases differences in root fresh weight were  
236 detected between inoculated and un-inoculated plants. For the wild olives, W166 was the  
237 only genotype with a significant difference in root fresh weight between inoculated and  
238 un-inoculated plants, with greater root fresh weight in un-inoculated plants (Table 2).

239 Root fresh weights were great for the inoculated cv. Hojiblanca and cv. Manzanilla de  
240 Sevilla (Table 3), while cv. Gordal Sevillana and cv. Picual had lower root fresh weight  
241 when inoculated with *M. javanica*. In the other five cultivars there was no difference in  
242 fresh root weights between the inoculated and un-inoculated plants (Table 3). Variation  
243 in fresh root weights were observed, however, among the genotypes of wild olive and  
244 commercial cultivars, likely related to the original plant size and growth level at the  
245 beginning of the experiment (Table 2 and 3).

246 While differing among olive genotypes, relative levels of root galling and Rf  
247 values followed similar patterns. The wild genotype W158 belonging to subsp. *cuspidata*  
248 had the highest levels of root galling and Rf value, followed by the two genotypes (W1048  
249 and W46) belonging to *O. europaea* subsp. *guanchica*, as well as the subsp. *maroccana*  
250 genotype W215 (Table 2). Most of the other wild genotypes and related subspecies had  
251 statistically lower levels of root galling and Rf values than the corresponding non-  
252 inoculated plants. Two genotypes, W147 and W224, belonging to subsp. *cerasiformis* and  
253 subsp. *europaea* var. *sylvestris*, respectively, had exceptionally low levels of root galling  
254 and Rf values ( $Rf < 1$ ) when inoculated with *M. javanica*. In regard to the commercial  
255 cultivars, all had high to moderate root galling (from 0.95 to 3.00) and high Rf values (Rf  
256 from 2.17 to 8.64) (Table 3). However substantially higher Rf values were observed in  
257 cv. Gordal Sevillana, cv. Hojiblanca and cv. Manzanilla de Sevilla in comparison to the  
258 other cultivars (Table 3).

### 259 **Root morphological and histopathological reaction of olive genotypes to** 260 ***Meloidogyne* spp.**

261 The root-system morphology had typical galls produced by *M. javanica* (Fig. 1),  
262 characterized by galling at the tips of growing roots. Histopathological sections of the  
263 root galls of wild olives (Fig. 2) and olive cultivars (Fig. 3) infected by *M. javanica* had

264 typical feeding sites with 5-6 giant cells close to each nematode female, with bigger galls  
265 having more than one female per gall (Figs. 2 and 3). The giant-cell cytoplasm was dense,  
266 granulated and homogenous, and contained numerous hypertrophied nuclei. Disruption  
267 of xylem vessels was detected close to the massively enlarging giant cells.

268         The genotypes W147 and W224 produced no or minimal nodulation in response  
269 to *M. javanica* infection, and small rates of reproduction (Table 2). The genotype W147  
270 (subsp. *cerasiformis*) at 4 DAI had very few juveniles in the few roots tips. During this  
271 period, nematodes were moving within the root tip searching for specific suitable cells in  
272 order to induce feeding sites. These juveniles were surrounded by high levels of phenolic  
273 compounds and some necrotic cells (Fig 4-l, m, and n). At 11 DAI, a few nematodes were  
274 sedentary, but the others were still in the process of looking for appropriate cells for  
275 inducing the feeding site. The root tissue where nematodes were present was darker than  
276 other areas of the root, due to the presence of phenolic compounds. Some root tips were  
277 very slightly galled (Fig 4-b and c). At 25 DAI, the nematodes in feeding sites with giant  
278 cells visible were crowded in specific galls, and exhibited different stages of development  
279 inside the gall ranging from J2 sedentary, J3 (Fig. 4-d, e and f), or J4 (Fig. 4-g). Males  
280 were also detected at this time. Viewed in histopathological sections, the nematodes were  
281 surrounded by feeding sites, but these were saturated with very dark areas due to the  
282 presence of phenolic compounds. Also the cytoplasm of the giant cells was generally  
283 denser and darker than the surrounding uninfected tissues. However the nematodes were  
284 feeding on those cells and clearly undergoing development (Fig. 4-d, e, p, q, s and t). At  
285 70 DAI, only a few small females had developed which were solitary and occupied tip  
286 positions (from 2 to 5 females per plant), and only a small number of eggs were produced  
287 inside them and in the egg mass (Fig. 4-h-k). Overall, fewer nematodes were detected in  
288 the roots than observed at 25 DAI using fuchsine acid. Because of the low number of

289 females present within the root tissue it was not possible to locate females in the  
290 histological sections.

291

## 292 **Discussion**

293 Olive production in the Mediterranean Basin is threatened by soil pathogens such  
294 as *Verticillium dahliae* and *Meloidogyne* spp., and biotic interactions with soil  
295 microorganisms. In the case of nematodes of the genus *Meloidogyne*, extensive sampling  
296 in Morocco found this group of nematodes in 23% and 52% of in olive orchards and  
297 nurseries, respectively (Hamza et al. 2017). Studies in Andalusia (Spain) revealed the  
298 frequent presence of *Meloidogyne* spp. in both cultivated and wild olives, with *M.*  
299 *javanica* being the most prevalent species in Spain (Archidona-Yuste et al. 2018).  
300 Furthermore, the recent transition to intensive olive growing, with high-density planting,  
301 irrigation and substantial amounts of fertilizers, could increase the nematode population  
302 densities to further damaging levels. Based on confirmed levels of pathogenesis  
303 (Sasanelli, 2009) and frequent association with olive (Hamza et al. 2017; Archidona-  
304 Yuste et al. 2018), *M. javanica* was used as a standard species for the study. This species  
305 proved to be suitable to this role, and, following controlled inoculations, produced levels  
306 of infection readily measurable by root galling and nematode reproduction. Overall, both  
307 the cultivated and wild olive genotypes were found to be suitable hosts, although among  
308 the cultivars studied some appeared to be particularly susceptible, and within the wild  
309 genotypes there may be candidates for resistance or for better understanding resistance  
310 mechanisms.

311 Consistent with the findings of this study, Mediterranean olive cultivars are  
312 generally considered good hosts for *Meloidogyne* spp. (Nico et al. 2003; Castillo et al.  
313 2010). However, interestingly, statistically significant higher Rf values were found in

314 three olive cultivars (cv. Gordal Sevillana, cv. Hojiblanca and cv. Manzanilla de Sevilla)  
315 in comparison to other cultivars used in Spain and other tested in this study. These  
316 cultivars, in particular cv. Hojiblanca and cv. Manzanilla de Sevilla are planted in  
317 extensive areas of Spain (MAGRAMA 2017). Information about the susceptibility of  
318 cultivars to nematodes is critical when establishing orchards in areas infested with  
319 *Meloidogyne* spp., as the plants could increase populations up to damaging levels in only  
320 a few years after planting. Furthermore, the nematode damage risk is particularly high  
321 when the plant is still young and more susceptible. Other olive cultivars considered in this  
322 study, those associated with high density plantings in hedgerows, cv. Arbequina, cv.  
323 Sikitita and cv. Koroneiki, had similarly lower Rf values, however, were still good hosts  
324 for *M. javanica*. The high intensity field conditions in which these cultivars are often  
325 grown commercially could be particularly risky for nematode infection and long-term  
326 experiments are necessary to assess the nematode pressure under these conditions.

327 Perennial plants such as the olive present a particular challenge for combating  
328 infection. Resistance genes are exposed to much longer periods of continual pressure than  
329 plants in annual production systems (Saucet et al. 2016), increasing the risk that  
330 nematodes will 'break' the plant resistance (Lespinasse et al. 2003). Nematicides are  
331 restricted in their use in woody plants and in a low-income crop such as olive are not  
332 economically feasible, thus alternative control measures are required. Wild olives offer  
333 the possibility of resistance sources for *Meloidogyne* spp., specifically as rootstocks.  
334 Recently, the use of resistant rootstocks for other diseases (Verticillium wilt) has proven  
335 useful, even in the presence of *Meloidogyne* spp. (Palomares-Rius et al. 2016).

336 In contrast to the majority of the interactions studied in the experiments, the  
337 genotype W147, which belonged to subsp. *cerasiformis*, showed a resistant reaction to  
338 *M. javanica*. This genotype had a minimal number of nematodes in the roots and

339 surrounding soil, and the slight gall-like swellings observed were probably due to the  
340 presence of very few females developing at a slow rate, as we found in the fuchsine acid  
341 staining experiment (Fig 4. h-k). Other cultivars with resistance specific to *Meloidogyne*  
342 spp. (as cv. Coratina and cv. Leccino) (Sasanelli, 2009) had low Rf values ( $< 1$ ), which  
343 differed from the resistance behavior observed in the genotype of the subsp. *cerasiformis*,  
344 in which the Rf value was extremely low (Rf = 0.0003). In that genotype, only when  
345 inoculated with high numbers of juveniles, did very few of them penetrate the roots at 4  
346 and 11 DAI and they seemed aggregated to only certain roots. This parameter, however,  
347 could be difficult to assess in experimental conditions due to root heterogeneity in woody  
348 plantlets. However, this is not the normal situation in field soil, in which the majority of  
349 the inoculum is in the form of eggs which will hatch sequentially. The genotype W147,  
350 even with the high inoculation number of juveniles, did not break resistance and only a  
351 few females were detected. Nonetheless the fuchsine staining and histological sections  
352 showed a substantial nematode reaction to the plant once inside the root, with strong  
353 staining of phenolic compounds in tissues close to the nematodes, and in some cases the  
354 necrosis of some cells (Fig. 4-l, m and n).

355         The mechanisms providing resistance to nematodes may be too complex to easily  
356 determine, and the genotype W147 does not seem to be an exception. One concern is that  
357 the nematodes only penetrated a few roots in this genotype when high numbers of  
358 juveniles were used for inoculation in the histopathological and fuchsine acid stain study.  
359 This might have occurred because of low attraction to the juveniles for the large  
360 proportion of roots which are not rapidly growing, a situation often found in woody plant,  
361 especially olive, root systems which are characterized by highly varied rates of growth.  
362 This hypothesis, however, is difficult to clearly test.

363 We suggest that what might occur is that competition for use of the feeding sites  
364 and the presence of phenolic compounds could lead to nematode death or lack of  
365 completion of the adult stage for the majority of nematodes in the roots, allowing only a  
366 few of them to create a proper feeding site and enable minimum reproduction. The few  
367 observed female nematodes were found alone in isolated positions of the root, supporting  
368 the hypothesis that strong competition among nematodes for scarce resources could  
369 induce the death of developing nematodes in egg and/or juvenile inoculated plants. This  
370 resistance is not associated with the typical hypersensitive response of giant cell death,  
371 such as occurs with the gene *Mi* (Williamson and Hussey, 1996), because the few giant  
372 cells detected in W147 contained developed nuclei and vacuolization was not present. A  
373 similar reaction to that observed in W147 has been observed in resistant grape rootstocks  
374 (RS-3 and 10-23B), which express genetic resistance during *Meloidogyne* spp  
375 penetration, development and reproduction (Anwar and McKenry, 2000). The resistance  
376 to *M. exigua* Göeldi, 1887 in *Coffea canephora* L. (gene *Mex-1*) is also expressed during  
377 nematode penetration and development (Alpizar et al. 2007).

378 Among the wild olives it was interesting to observe the variability in host  
379 suitability among different genotypes of the same subspecies. This was seen with *O.*  
380 *europaea* subsp. *europaea* var. *sylvestris* to which the majority of the tested genotypes  
381 belonged. The second most resistant genotype to *M. javanica* was the accession W224  
382 (*O. europaea* subsp. *europaea* var. *sylvestris*). In this case, similar to W147, only a few  
383 and small galls were detected. For W224 *M. javanica* Rf values was also low, but not as  
384 low as W147 (Table 2), as some females were able to reproduce on the roots. A small Rf  
385 value (< 1) have also been reported for olive cultivars (cv. Coratina, cv. Leccino, cv.  
386 Ascolana and cv. Moraiolo) resistant to *Meloidogyne* and a selection of the wild olive DA  
387 12I (Sasanelli, 2009).



388 In conclusion, this research provides considerable new data about the broad  
389 susceptibility of olive cultivars used in commercial groves, and new and valuable sources  
390 of resistance that require future study. Future studies on these olive genotypes should  
391 include other species of *Meloidogyne* spp. (*M. arenaria*, *M. incognita* and *M. lusitanica*)  
392 and other kinds of nematodes (*Xiphinema* spp. and *Rotylenchus* spp.) affecting olive. The  
393 potential of the two genotypes W147 and W224, belonging to subsp. *cerasiformis* and  
394 subsp. *europaea* var. *sylvestris*, respectively, as resistant rootstocks is promising. Further  
395 effort is necessary in the characterization of the defensive reaction, grafting capabilities,  
396 and adaptability of these genotypes to the olive agricultural system.

397

#### 398 **Acknowledgments**

399 The authors thank J. Martín-Barbarroja (IAS-CSIC) and G. León Roperro (IAS-CSIC) for  
400 their excellent technical assistance. This research was supported by grants P12-AGR 1486  
401 and AGR-136 from the ‘Consejería de Economía, Innovación y Ciencia’ of the Junta de  
402 Andalucía, and Union Europea, Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo regional, ‘Una manera de  
403 hacer Europa’, grant 201740E042, “Análisis de diversidad molecular, barcoding, y  
404 relaciones filogenéticas de nematodos fitoparásitos en cultivos mediterráneos” from  
405 Spanish National Research Council (CSIC), grant 219262 ArimNET\_ERANET FP7  
406 2012–2015 Project PESTOLIVE ‘Contribution of olive history for the management of  
407 soil-borne parasites in the Mediterranean basin’ from the Instituto Nacional de  
408 Investigación y Tecnología Agraria y Alimentaria (INIA).

409

#### 410 **Literature cited**

411 Abrantes, I. M. de O., and Santos, M. S. N. 1991. *Meloidogyne lusitanica* n. sp.

412 (Nematoda: Meloidogynidae), a root-knot nematode parasitizing olive tree (*Olea*  
413 *europaea* L.). J. Nematol. 23:210-224.

414 Ali, N., Chapuis, E., Tavoillot, J., and Mateille, T. 2014. Plant-parasitic nematodes  
415 associated with olive tree (*Olea europaea* L.) with a focus on the Mediterranean  
416 Basin: A review. C. R. Biol. 337:423-442.

417 Ali, N., Tavoillot, J., Chapuis, E., and Mateille, T. 2016. Trend to explain the distribution  
418 of root-knot nematodes *Meloidogyne* spp. associated with olive trees in Morocco.  
419 Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 225:22-32.

420 Alpizar, E., Etienne, H., and Bertrand, B. 2007. Intermediate resistance to *Meloidogyne*  
421 *exigua* root-knot nematode in *Coffea arabica*. Crop Prot. 26:903-910.

422 Al-Sayed, A., and Abdel-Hameed, S. H. 1991. Resistance and susceptibility of olives to  
423 *Meloidogyne incognita* and *Rotylenchulus reniformis*. Ann. Agric. Sci. Moshtohor  
424 29:1221-1226.

425 Anwar, S. A., and M. V. McKenry. 2000. Penetration, development and reproduction of  
426 *Meloidogyne arenaria* on two new resistant *Vitis* spp. Nematropica 30:9-17.

427 Archidona-Yuste, A., Cantalapiedra-Navarrete, C., Liébanas, G., Rapoport, H. F.,  
428 Castillo, P., and Palomares-Rius, J. E. 2018. Diversity of root-knot nematodes of the  
429 genus *Meloidogyne* Göeldi, 1892 (Nematoda: Meloidogynidae) associated with olive  
430 plants and environmental cues regarding their distribution in southern Spain. PLoS  
431 ONE 13:e0198236. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0198236.

432 Belaj, A. Gurbuz, M., Sikaoui, H., Moukhli, A., Khadari, B., Mariotti, R., and Baldoni,  
433 L. (2016). *Olive genetic resources*. Pages 27-54 in: The Olive Tree Genome,  
434 Compendium of Plant Genomes. E. Rugini, L. Baldoni, R. Muleo and L. Sebastiani,  
435 eds. Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-48887-5\_3

436 Besnard, G., Dupuy, J., Larter, M., Cuneo, P., Cooke, D., and Chikhi, L. 2014. History of

437 the invasive African olive tree in Australia and Hawaii: evidence of sequential  
438 bottlenecks and hybridization with the Mediterranean olive. *Evol. Appl.* 7:195-211.

439 Besnard, G., Terral, J.-F., and Cornille, A. 2018. On the origins and domestication of the  
440 olive: a review and perspectives. *Ann. Bot.* 121:385-403.

441 Byrd, D. W. Jr., T. Kirkpatrick, and K. R. Barker. 1983. An improved technique for  
442 clearing and staining tissues for detection of nematodes. *J. Nematol.* 15:142–143.

443 Castillo, P., Nico, A., Navas-Cortés, J.A., Landa, B. B., Jiménez-Díaz, R. M., and Vovlas,  
444 N. 2010. Plant-parasitic nematodes attacking olive trees and their management. *Plant*  
445 *Dis.* 94:148-162.

446 Castillo, P., Vovlas, N., Subbotin, S., and Troccoli, A. 2003. A new root-knot nematode,  
447 *Meloidogyne baetica* n. sp. (Nematoda: Heteroderidae), parasitizing wild olive in  
448 Southern Spain. *Phytopathology* 93: 1093-1102.

449 Coolen, W. A. 1979. Methods for the extraction of *Meloidogyne* spp. and other nematodes  
450 from roots and soil. Pages 317-329 in: *Root-knot Nematodes (Meloidogyne species)*  
451 *Systematics, Biology and Control*. F. Lamberti, and C. E. Taylor, eds. Academic  
452 Press, London, UK.

453 Esbenshade, P. R., and Triantaphyllou, A. C. 1985. Use of enzyme phenotypes for  
454 identification of *Meloidogyne* species. *J. Nematol.* 17:6-20.

455 Gómez, K. A., and Gómez, A. A. 1984. *Statistical Procedures for Agricultural Research*.  
456 2nd ed. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, USA.

457 Green, P. 2002. A revision of *Olea* L. (Oleaceae)., *Kew Bull.* 57:91-140.

458 Hamza, M. A., Ali, N., Tavoillot, J., Fossati-Gaschignard, O., Boubaker, H., El  
459 Mousadik, A., and Mateille, T. 2017. Diversity of root-knot nematodes in Moroccan  
460 olive nurseries and orchards: does *Meloidogyne javanica* disperse according to  
461 invasion processes? *BMC Ecol.* 17:41. doi: 10.1186/s12898-017-0153-9.

462 Hartman, K. M., and Sasser, J. N. 1985. Identification of *Meloidogyne* species on the  
463 basis of differential host test and perineal pattern morphology. Pages 69-77 in: An  
464 Advanced Treatise on *Meloidogyne*. Vol. II: Methodology. K. R. Barker, C. C. Carter,  
465 and J. N. Sasser, eds. NCSU Graphics, Raleigh, USA.

466 Hussey, R. S., and Barker, K. R. 1973. A comparison of methods of collecting inocula of  
467 *Meloidogyne* spp., including a new technique. *Plant Dis. Rep.* 57:1025-1028.

468 Jensen, W. A. 1962. *Botanical Histochemistry*. W.H. Freeman and Co., San Francisco  
469 and London.

470 Koenning, S. R., Overstreet, C., Noling, J. W., Donald, P. A., Becker, J. O., and Fortnum,  
471 B. A. 1999. Survey of crop losses in response to phytoparasitic nematodes in the  
472 United States for 1994. *J. Nematol.* 31:587-618.

473 Lamberti, F., and Baines, R. C. 1969. Pathogenicity of four species of *Meloidogyne* on  
474 three varieties of olive trees. *J. Nematol.* 1:111-115.

475 Lamberti, F., Sasanelli, N., D'Addabbo, T., Ambrico A., Ciccarese, F., and Schiavone,  
476 D. 2001. Relationship between plant-parasitic nematodes and *Verticillium dahliae* on  
477 olive [*Olea europaea* L.]. *Nematol. Mediterr.* 29:3-9.

478 León, L., de la Rosa, R., Velasco, L., and Belaj, A. 2018. Using wild olives in breeding  
479 programs: implications on oil quality composition. *Front. Plant Sci.* 9:1-9.

480 Lespinasse, Y., Durel, C. E., Eskes, A., Esmenjaud, D., and Poessel, J. L. 2003.  
481 Resistance to biotic stress in fruit trees. *Acta Hort.* 622:303-315.

482 McKenry, M. V. 1994. Nematodes of olive. Pages 97-99 in: *Olive Production Manual*. L.  
483 Ferguson, G. S. Sibett, and G. C. Martin, eds. University of California, Oakland,  
484 Publ. 3353.

485 Minz, G. 1961. Additional hosts of the root-knot nematode, *Meloidogyne* spp. recorded  
486 in Israel during 1958–1959. *Ktavim* 11:69-70

487 Nico, A. I., Jiménez-Díaz, R. M., and Castillo, P. 2003. Host suitability of the olive  
488 cultivars Arbequina and Picual for plant-parasitic nematodes. *J. Nematol.* 35:29-34.

489 Nico, A. I., Rapoport, H. F., Jiménez-Díaz, R. M., and Castillo, P. 2002. Incidence and  
490 population density of plant-parasitic nematodes associated with olive planting stocks  
491 at nurseries in southern Spain. *Plant Dis.* 86:1075-1079.

492 Palomares-Rius, J. E., Castillo, P., Trapero-Casas, J.L., and Jiménez-Díaz, R.M. 2016.  
493 Infection by *Meloidogyne javanica* does not breakdown resistance to the defoliating  
494 pathotype of *Verticillium dahliae* in selected clones of wild olive. *Sci. Hortic.*  
495 199:149-157.

496 Pérez, B. A., Barreto, D., Docampo, D., Otero, L., Costilla, M., Roca, M., and Babbitt, S.  
497 2001. Current status of the drying syndrome (seca) of olive trees in Argentina.  
498 (Abstr.) *Phytopathology* 91:S71.

499 Powers, T. O., and Harris, T. S. 1993. A polymerase chain reaction method for  
500 identification of five major *Meloidogyne* species. *J. Nematol.* 25:1-6.

501 Rallo, L., Caruso, T., Díez, C. M., and Campisi G. 2016. Olive Growing in a Time of  
502 Change: From Empiricism to Genomics. Pages 55-64 in: *The Olive Tree Genome.*  
503 *Compendium of Plant Genomes.* E. Rugini, L. Baldoni, R. Muleo, and L. Sebastiani,  
504 eds. Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands.

505 Reeve, R. M. 1951. Histochemical tests for polyphenols in plant tissues. *Stain Tech.*  
506 26:91-106.

507 Ruzin, S. E. 1999. *Plant Microtechnique and Microscopy.* Oxford University Press, New  
508 York.

509 Saeedizadeh, A., Kheiri, A., Okhovat, M., and Hoseininejad, A. 2003. Study on  
510 interaction between root-knot nematode *Meloidogyne javanica* and wilt fungus  
511 *Verticillium dahliae* on olive seedlings in greenhouse. *Commun. Agric. Appl. Biol.*

512 Sci. 68:139-143.

513 Sasanelli, N. 2009. Olive Nematodes and their control. Pages 275-315 in: Integrated  
514 Management of Fruit Crops Nematodes. Integrated Management of Plant Pests and  
515 Diseases, vol 4. A. Ciancio and K. Mukerji, eds. Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands.

516 Sasanelli, N., D'Addabbo, T., and Moura Lemos, R. 2002. Influence of *Meloidogyne*  
517 *javanica* on growth of olive cuttings in pots. *Nematropica* 32:59-63.

518 Sasanelli, N., Fontanazza, G., Lamberti, F., D'Addabbo, T., Patumi, M., and Vergari, G.  
519 1997. Reaction of olive cultivars to *Meloidogyne* species. *Nematol. Mediterr.* 25:183-  
520 190.

521 Saucet, S. B., Van Ghelder, C., Abad, P., Duval, H., and Esmenjaud, D. 2016. Resistance  
522 to root-knot nematodes *Meloidogyne* spp. in woody plants. *New Phytol.* 211:41-56.

523 Singh, S. K., Hodda, M., and Ash, G. J., 2013. Plant-parasitic nematodes of potential  
524 phytosanitary importance, their main hosts and reported yield losses. *EPPO Bull.*  
525 43:334-374.

526 Tarjan, A. C. 1953. Geographic distribution of some *Meloidogyne* spp. in Israel. *Plant*  
527 *Dis. Rep.* 37:315-316.

528 Trudgill, D. L., and Perry, J. N. 1994. Thermal time and ecological strategies - a unifying  
529 hypothesis. *Ann. Appl. Biol.* 125:521-532.

530

531 Williamson, V.M., and Hussey, R.S. 1996. Nematodes pathogenesis and resistance in  
532 plants. *Plant Cell.* 8: 1735-1745.

533 Yang, B., and Zhong, X. 1980. The identification of root-knot nematodes in *Olea*  
534 *europaea* L. *Sci. Silvae Sin.* 16: 264-265.

535 Zijlstra, C., Donkers-Venne. D.T.H.M., and Fargette, M. 2000. Identification of  
536 *Meloidogyne incognita*, *M. javanica* and *M. arenaria* using sequence characterised

537 amplified region (SCAR) based PCR assays. *Nematology* 2:847-53.

538

539  
540  
541

**Table 1.** Olive (*Olea europaea*) wild genotypes, related subspecies and cultivars included in the study with their respective passport code in the ex situ wild repository and World Olive Germplasm Collection of IFAPA, and geographic origin.

<b>Plant material type</b>	<b>Passport code</b>	<b>Geographic Origin</b>
<b>Wild olive genotypes/related subspecies</b>		
<i>Olea europaea</i> subsp. <i>cerasiformis</i>	W147	Portugal, Madeira
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>cuspidata</i>	W158	Ethiopia
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>europaea</i> var. <i>sylvestris</i>	W224	Morocco
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>europaea</i> var. <i>sylvestris</i>	W223	Morocco
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>europaea</i> var. <i>sylvestris</i>	W166	Spain, Extremadura
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>europaea</i> var. <i>sylvestris</i>	W19	Spain, Jaén
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>guanchica</i>	W33	Spain, Canary Islands
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>guanchica</i>	W46	Spain, Canary Islands
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>guanchica</i>	W1048	Spain, Canary Islands,
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>maroccana</i>	W215	Morocco
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>maroccana</i>	W228	Morocco
<b>Cultivars (<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>europaea</i> var. <i>europaea</i>)</b>		
Arbequina	231	Spain
Ayvalik	97	Turkey
Gordal Sevillana	234	Spain
Hojiblanca	v 2	Spain
Koroneiki	218	Greece
Lechín de Sevilla	5	Spain
Manzanilla de Sevilla	21	Spain
Picual	9	Spain
Sikitita	1920	Spain

542



543 **Table 2.** Host-suitability of wild olive (*Olea europaea*) genotypes (including subspecies other than *europaea*, and var. *sylvestris* of subsp.  
544 *europaea* with their respective passport code in the ex situ wild repository and World Olive Germplasm Collection of IFAPA) to *Meloidogyne*  
545 *javanica* and effects of root growth<sup>a</sup>.

Host genotype	Passport code	Inoculation treatment	Variables <sup>b</sup>		
			Root fresh weight (g)	Root symptoms <sup>c</sup>	Rf <sup>d</sup>
<i>Olea europaea</i> subsp. <i>cerasiformis</i>	W147	Uninoculated control	23.43±5.08 CD	-	-
		<i>M. javanica</i>	18.31±7.02 F	0.5±0.0000 G	0.0003±0.0005F
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>cuspidata</i>	W158	Uninoculated control	69.80±1.98 A	-	-
		<i>M. javanica</i>	92.68±15.17 A	4.13±0.44 A	20.64±9.12 A
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>europaea</i> . var. <i>sylvestris</i>	W224	Uninoculated control	26.10±3.88 BCD	-	-
		<i>M. javanica</i>	32.77±7.10 CD	0.60±0.21 G	0.79±0.43 E
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>europaea</i> . var. <i>sylvestris</i>	W223	Uninoculated control	30.48±2.18 B	-	-
		<i>M. javanica</i>	40.01±11.30 BC	1.08±0.34 F	3.98±2.27 D
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>europaea</i> . var. <i>sylvestris</i>	W166	Uninoculated control	81.50±21.38 a A	-	-
		<i>M. javanica</i>	49.40±19.01 b B	2.34±0.60 CD	7.45±2.24 BC
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>europaea</i> . var. <i>sylvestris</i>	W19	Uninoculated control	25.93±6.46 BCD	-	-
		<i>M. javanica</i>	25.09±8.04 E	1.73±0.47 E	3.33±1.14 CD
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>guanchica</i>	W33	Uninoculated control	19.55±3.89 D	-	-
		<i>M. javanica</i>	24.58±12.63 E	1.28±0.55 F	3.78±2.29 D
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>guanchica</i>	W46	Uninoculated control	11.90±0.36 E	-	-
		<i>M. javanica</i>	12.36±3.86 G	3.15±1.11 B	3.43±0.86 CD
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>guanchica</i>	W1048	Uninoculated control	11.67±1.24 E	-	-
		<i>M. javanica</i>	12.36±3.86 G	3.15±1.11 B	3.43±0.86 BCD
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>maroccana</i>	W215	Uninoculated control	26.78±3.99 BCD	-	-
		<i>M. javanica</i>	26.86±9.69 DE	2.68±0.59 BC	12.60±8.57 AB
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>maroccana</i>	W228	Uninoculated control	28.90±5.66 BC	-	-

*M. javanica*

24.21±14.28 EF

2.28±1.35 DE

10.80±10.17 ABC

---

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

<sup>a</sup> Data are the mean of 16 replicated plants per treatment combination from two replicated experiments. Inoculated plants received 10,000 eggs + J2 (Pi) of *M. javanica* while uninoculated plants did not receive nematodes. For each *O. europaea* genotype lowercase letters refers to differences between uninoculated and inoculated treatments within each genotype and are only shown when differences are significant ( $P \geq 0.05$ ) according to LSD test. Upper case letters refer to comparisons of all means of the same treatment (either *M. javanica* inoculated or un-inoculated control) among the different genotypes. Means followed by the same upper case letter do not differ significantly ( $P \geq 0.05$ ) according to LSD test.

<sup>b</sup> Average percentage and standard deviation of each variable during the experiment.

<sup>c</sup> Assessed on a 0 to 6 rating scale according to the number of root galls, where 0 = no galls; 1 = 1–10; 2 = 11–20; 3 = 21–40; 4 = 41–70; 5 = 71–90; and 6  $\geq$  91 galls.

<sup>d</sup> Rf (nematode reproduction factor) = Pf (final nematode numbers per plant) / Pi (initial nematode inoculum per plant).

**Table 3.** Host-suitability of several olive (*Olea europaea*) commercial cultivars to *Meloidogyne javanica* and effects of root growth<sup>a</sup>

Host genotype	Cultivar	Inoculation treatment	Variables <sup>b</sup>		
			Root fresh weight (g)	Root symptoms <sup>c</sup>	Rf <sup>d</sup>
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>europaea</i> . var. <i>europaea</i>	Arbequina	Uninoculated control	3.08±0.71CD	-	-
		<i>M. javanica</i>	3.91±1.36 E	1.75±0.72 B	2.40±2.89 B
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>europaea</i> . var. <i>europaea</i>	Ayvalik	Uninoculated control	38.23±3.68 A	-	-
		<i>M. javanica</i>	38.33±12.29 A	0.95±0.16 C	2.61±1.56 B
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>europaea</i> . var. <i>europaea</i>	Gordal Sevillana	Uninoculated control	5.08±1.28 a BC	-	-
		<i>M. javanica</i>	3.05±1.30 b DE	2.83±0.38 A	7.11±8.99 A
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>europaea</i> . var. <i>europaea</i>	Hojiblanca	Uninoculated control	3.05±0.66 a CD	-	-
		<i>M. javanica</i>	7.51±2.57 b B	3.00±0.84 A	7.26±5.22 A
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>europaea</i> . var. <i>europaea</i>	Koroneiki	Uninoculated control	3.20±1.37 CD	-	-
		<i>M. javanica</i>	2.85±1.00 E	2.08±0.63 B	2.17±1.93 B
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>europaea</i> . var. <i>europaea</i>	Lechín de Sevilla	Uninoculated control	2.15±1.08 D	-	-
		<i>M. javanica</i>	3.00±1.88 E	1.88±1.11 B	3.27±4.49B
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>europaea</i> . var. <i>europaea</i>	Manzanilla de Sevilla	Uninoculated control	2.35±0.73 a D	-	-
		<i>M. javanica</i>	5.63±1.38 b C	2.78±0.47 A	8.64±6.03 A
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>europaea</i> . var. <i>europaea</i>	Picual	Uninoculated control	7.40±6.10 a B	-	-
		<i>M. javanica</i>	3.91±1.36 b D	1.75±0.72 B	2.40±2.90 B
<i>O. europaea</i> subsp. <i>europaea</i> . var. <i>europaea</i>	Sikitita	Uninoculated control	6.93±2.52 B	-	-
		<i>M. javanica</i>	8.33±5.84 B	1.75±0.80 B	3.33±3.74 B

560

561

562

563

564

<sup>a</sup> Data are the mean of 16 replicated plants per treatment combination from two replicated experiments. Inoculated plants received 10,000 eggs + J2 (Pi) of *M. javanica* while uninoculated plants did not receive nematodes. For each *O. europaea* genotype lowercase letters refers to differences between uninoculated and inoculated treatments of that genotype and are only shown when differences are significant ( $P < 0.05$ ) according to LSD test. Upper case letters refers to comparisons of all means of the same treatment (either *M. javanica* inoculated or un-

565 inoculated control) among the different genotypes. Means followed by the same upper-case letter do not differ significantly ( $P \geq 0.05$ )  
566 according to LSD test.

567 <sup>b</sup> Average percentage and standard deviation of each variable during the experiment.

568 <sup>c</sup> Assessed on a 0 to 6 rating scale according to the number of root galls, where 0 = no galls; 1 = 1–10; 2 = 11–20; 3 = 21–40; 4 = 41–70; 5 =  
569 71–90; and 6  $\geq$  91 galls.

570 <sup>d</sup> Rf (nematode reproduction factor) =  $Pf$  (final nematode numbers per plant) /  $Pi$  (initial nematode inoculum per plant).  
571

572

573

574

575 **Figure legends**

576 **Fig. 1.** Root systems of olive (*Olea europaea* subsp. *europaea*. var. *europaea*) cv. ‘Picual’  
577 (a) and cv. ‘Gordal Sevillana’ (b) infected by *Meloidogyne javanica* showing typical  
578 galls. (c-f) Details of severely nodulated roots in olive cv. Gordal Sevillana.

579 **Fig. 2.** Light micrographs of root cross-sections of wild olives (subspecies other than  
580 *europaea*, and var. *sylvestris* of subsp. *europaea*) including the feeding site induced by  
581 *Meloidogyne javanica*. a-d, *Olea europaea* subsp. *cuspidata* W158; e-h, *O. europaea*  
582 subsp. *europaea* var. *sylvestris* W223; i-l, *O. europaea* subsp. *europaea* var. *sylvestris*  
583 W166; m-p, *O. europaea* subsp. *guanchica* W33; q-t, *O. europaea* subsp. *guanchica*  
584 W46; u-x, *O. europaea* subsp. *guanchica* W1048; y-b’, *O. europaea* subsp. *maroccana*  
585 W215; and c’-f’, *O. europaea* subsp. *maroccana* W228. Abbreviations: **gc** = Giant cells  
586 in a feeding site, (\* = individual giant cell); **N** = nematode. Scale bars: 200 µm (a, b, e, f,  
587 i, j, m, n, q, u, v, y, z, c’ and d’), 100 µm (all the rest).

588 **Fig. 3.** Light micrographs of root cross sections including the feeding site induced by  
589 *Meloidogyne javanica* in commercial olive cultivars (*Olea europaea* subsp. *europaea*.  
590 var. *europaea*). a-d, cv. Arbequina; e-h, cv. Gordal Sevillana’; i-l, cv. Hojiblanca; m-p,  
591 cv. Koroneiki; q-t, cv. Lechín de Sevilla, u-x, cv. Manzanilla de Sevilla; y-b’, cv. Picual,  
592 c’-f’, cv. Sikitita. Abbreviations: **gc** = Giant cells in a feeding site, (\* = individual giant  
593 cell); **N** = nematode. Scale bars: 200 µm (a, b, e, i, j, m, q, r, u, y, z, c’ and d’), 100 µm  
594 (all the rest).

595 **Fig. 4.** Light micrographs of fuchsine acid stained roots (a-k) and root cross-sections (l-  
596 t) of the wild olive genotype W147. a, Gall at 4 days after *Meloidogyne javanica*  
597 inoculation (DAI); b and c, galls at 11 DAI; d and e, galls at 25 DAI; f and g, nematodes  
598 at 25 DAI; h and i, galls at 70 DAI; j, female with eggs at 70 DAI, h, eggs at 70 DAI; l-

599 **n**, gall and root sections at 4 DAI; **o-t**, gall and root sections at 25 DAI. Abbreviations:  
600 **gc** = Giant cells in a feeding site, (\* = individual giant cell); **N** = nematode. Scale bars:  
601 100  $\mu\text{m}$  (j), 200  $\mu\text{m}$  (all the rest).