



Università degli Studi Mediterranea di Reggio Calabria
Archivio Istituzionale dei prodotti della ricerca

Alternative management technologies for postharvest disease control: The journey from simplicity to complexity

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Original

Alternative management technologies for postharvest disease control: The journey from simplicity to complexity / Wisniewski, M; Droby, S; Norelli, J; Liu, J; Schena, L. - In: POSTHARVEST BIOLOGY AND TECHNOLOGY. - ISSN 0925-5214. - 122:(2016), pp. 3-10. [10.1016/j.postharvbio.2016.05.012]

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12318/688> since: 2020-11-23T19:57:33Z

Published

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.postharvbio.2016.05.012>

The final published version is available online at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/postharvest->

Terms of use:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website

Publisher copyright

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università Mediterranea di Reggio Calabria (<https://iris.unirc.it/>) When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

1 This is the peer reviewed version of the following article

2
3 ***Wisniewski M, Droby S, Norelli J, Liu J, Schena L, 2016. Alternative management***
4 ***technologies for postharvest disease control: The journey from simplicity to***
5 ***complexity. POSTHARVEST BIOLOGY AND TECHNOLOGY, Vol. 122, Pages 3-***
6 ***10, ISSN: 0925-5214***

7
8 which has been published in final doi

9 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.postharvbio.2016.05.012>

10
11 The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified
12 in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's
13 website

14

1 **Alternative management technologies for postharvest disease** 2 **control: The journey from simplicity to complexity**

3 Michael Wisniewski^{a,*}, Samir Droby^b, John Norelli^a, Jia Liu^c, Leonardo Schena^d

4

5 ^a *U.S. Department of Agriculture—Agricultural Research Service (USDA-ARS), 2217 Wiltshire Road,*
6 *Kearneysville, WV 25430, United States*

7 ^b *Department of Postharvest Science of Fresh Produce ARO, The Volcani Center P.O. Box 6, Bet Dagan 50250,*
8 *Israel*

9 ^c *School of Biotechnology and Food Engineering, Hefei University of Technology, Hefei 230009, China*

10 ^d *Dipartimento di Agraria, Università Mediterranea di Reggio Calabria, Località Feo di Vito, 89124 Reggio*
11 *Calabria, Italy*

12

13 **Abstract**

14 Finding safe and effective alternatives to synthetic fungicides for reducing postharvest
15 losses of harvested commodities has been a focus of much research over the past three
16 decades. Identifying alternatives that are widely accepted and commercially viable has,
17 however, been a challenge. The search to identify alternative approaches to postharvest
18 disease management must be viewed in relation to a complex regulatory environment, the
19 need to address disease problems in a wide array of commodities and conditions, industry
20 and consumer acceptance, and last but not least, commercial viability. In order for
21 companies to invest in new technologies, they must be able to clearly see both the value of
22 a product and the financial return on their investment. The present review attempts to
23 highlight how the search for alternative postharvest disease management technologies has
24 been a journey from simplicity to complexity. Plant pathologists developing alternative
25 technologies are slowly moving away from the “silver bullet” concept where a single
26 intervention can be used to control a disease to viewing plant disease as a process where
27 multiple interventions may be required at different points in the disease process. Over the
28 past thirty years, alternatives have moved from the simple idea of applying high
29 concentrations of biocontrol agents to a harvested commodity, to using a wide array of other
30 alternatives, and integrating them together into a systems approach based on the multiple
31 decrement or multiple hurdle concept. The ease of sequencing genomes and obtaining
32 related genotypic, transcriptomic, proteomic, and metabolomic information is leading to the
33 development of new commercial technologies where problems are solved “biologically.”

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

Keywords: Biological control; Multiple decrement concept; Natural products; Physical treatments

Introduction

And so, from hour to hour we ripe and ripe, And then from hour to hour we rot and rot, And thereby hangs a tale. William Shakespeare (As You Like It, Act II, Scene vii)

Finding safe and effective alternatives to synthetic, chemical fungicides for reducing postharvest losses of harvested commodities has been the focus of much research over the past three decades (Table 1). Finding alternatives that are widely accepted and commercially viable has, however, been a challenge. Nevertheless, there is a real imperative to continue this line of research, since regulations on the use of new and existing fungicides are becoming more and more stringent. For example, depending on the commodity, the postharvest use of fungicides is completely prohibited in some European countries or limited to just a few registered chemicals. Even if their use is allowed to some limited degree, many large supermarket chains and wholesale fruit suppliers are setting their own standards for chemical residues and the number of active ingredients allowed to be present on harvested commodities. As detailed by Sanzani et al. (2016), safety concerns about mycotoxins and foodborne pathogens also increase the need to find viable alternatives. Additionally, potential restrictions on the use of some fungicides used before harvest could also result in increased levels of inoculum of postharvest pathogens and the number of latent infections that are established.

The search to identify alternative approaches to postharvest disease management must be viewed in relation to a complex regulatory environment, the need to address disease problems in a wide array of commodities and conditions, industry and consumer acceptance, and last but not least, commercial viability. In order for companies to invest in new technologies, they must be able to clearly see both the value of a product and the financial return on their investment. The present review attempts to highlight how the search for alternative postharvest disease management technologies has been a journey from simplicity to complexity. This simplicity began with the idea of using microbial antagonists as postharvest biocontrol agents, and then grew in complexity as other methods were explored

1 to either enhance the use of microbial antagonists or to be used as stand-alone methods. This
2 complexity was eventually encompassed by an expanded defini- tion of biological control
3 and this review is meant to serve as an introduction to the other timely contributions
4 presented in this Special Issue that reflect the complexity and diversity of alternative
5 approaches to postharvest disease management.

6

7 **A simple idea-the birth of postharvest biocontrol and the pursuit of alternative** 8 **strategies**

9 The use of biocontrol agents, natural compounds, and assorted physical treatments as
10 alternatives to the use of synthetic fungicides was a relatively obscure topic of research until
11 the mid-1980's. For instance, prior to late 1980's, one could count on the fingers of one hand
12 the number of publications that investigated the use of microbial antagonists for managing
13 postharvest diseases (Tronsmo and Dennis, 1977; Wilson and Pusey, 1985). The search for
14 alternative strategies that were commercially viable was launched into the mainstream by
15 several factors, but primarily by a report by US National Research Council (NRC) (1987)
16 which stated, "As a class, fungicides present special difficulties because nine oncogenic
17 compounds account for about 90% of all fungicide sales." The report also indicated that
18 fungicides represented 60% of the oncogenic risk among all pesticides. This created a great
19 concern that loss of these compounds, either from being banned by regulatory agencies or
20 an unwillingness of manufacturers to renew their registrations, would have a severe
21 economic impact on the production of several crops. Health concerns were further
22 exacerbated by a later report by the NRC (1993) which indicated the increased vulnerability
23 of children to exposure to synthetic pesticides. Concern about the widespread development
24 of fungicide resistance also helped to fuel the search for alternative methods of disease
25 control.

26 The studies by the NRC resulted in a negative perception of synthetic, chemical
27 pesticides and served as the basis for limiting the number of registered active ingredients, by
28 eliminating those with negative effects on human and animal health, both in the United States
29 (Food Quality Protection Act) and in the European Union (Regulation 1107/2009). Several
30 of the discontinued fungicides (e.g. benomyl, captan, maneb, thiophanate methyl, and
31 chlorothalonil) have been replaced by new less toxic fungicides. Nevertheless, the NRC
32 report is still cited in many of the recent reports and reviews published on alternative

1 postharvest disease management practices, as one of the major factors driving this research
2 effort. There is still a great concern on the part of the public, however, to further restrict the
3 use of synthetic chemicals, and their residues. The ability to preserve the quality of harvested
4 produce throughout the various aspects of the supply chain (storage, shipment, shelf-life,
5 etc.) has also been recently recognized as an important tool in providing an adequate food
6 supply to an ever increasing world population (Wisniewski et al., 2014). Farmers, industry,
7 regulatory agencies, the research community, and consumers all have a vested interest in
8 finding safe, effective, and economically-viable approaches to managing and reducing
9 postharvest losses of harvested commodities.

10 The use of various microbes (yeast, yeast-like fungi, and bacteria), isolated from
11 plant, fruit, and soil, as antagonists (biocontrol agents) to manage postharvest diseases came
12 from the observation that administering high concentrations (in the range of 1×10^6 to 1×10^8
13 CFUs/ml) of some microbes to wounded fruit tissue~~s~~ followed by inoculation with pathogen ^x
14 spores (1×10^3 to 1×10^4 spores/ml, or higher), prevented infections from being established
15 when the fruit was stored at either room or low temperatures. Wilson and Pusey (1985)
16 highlighted the potential of this technology and this field of research has grown
17 exponentially in the past 20–30 years. The literature on this topic has grown from a handful
18 of publications each year to literally hundreds each year. Numerous reviews on this subject
19 have been and continue to be published (Wilson and Wisniewski, 1989; Wisniewski and
20 Wilson, 1992; Ippolito and Nigro, 2000; Janisiewicz and Korsten, 2002; Spadaro and
21 Gullino, 2004; Droby et al., 2009; Sharma et al., 2009; Jijakli, 2011; Nunes, 2012; Liu et
22 al., 2013; Sui et al., 2015; Spadaro and Droby, 2016). New antagonists, new ways to use the
23 antagonists, and new ways to integrate their use with other alternatives approaches are
24 continually being published. Despite hundreds of reports documenting potential,
25 commercially-viable, antagonists, the widespread use of a single product has not been
26 achieved. Several products initially reached the market but were later discontinued, while
27 others have achieved success in limited niche markets (Table 2). This has been due to several
28 factors (Droby et al., 2009; Droby et al., 2016), including inconsistent performance, lack of
29 industry acceptance, cost relative to synthetic fungicides, registration hurdles, and
30 formulation problems. What started as a simple idea, using microbial antagonists to manage
31 postharvest diseases, slowly evolved in complexity, as attempts to overcome these problems
32 have been pursued. This complexity grew out of the initial idea of using microbial

1 antagonists and finding ways to improve their efficacy. This effort eventually led to using
2 other approaches as both stand-alone approaches in their own right or in combination with
3 more traditional biocontrol approaches. The postharvest environment, including packing-
4 house treatments, storage, shipping, and all other aspects of the supply chain are now being
5 viewed as a system requiring a broad, holistic view to address a wide range of quality issues.
6 Truly, our basic understanding of and practical experience in developing alternative postharvest
7 strategies has grown from simplicity to complexity.

8

9 **Expanding the alternatives for postharvest disease management**

10 Soon after the potential of using microbial antagonists as postharvest biocontrol
11 agents was recognized, methods to enhance their performance and reliability were explored.
12 Since some of the early yeast antagonists were known to have been isolated from high-salt
13 food environments (soy sauce, pickle juice, etc.), the use of salts as an additive to biocontrol
14 protocols was explored (McLaughlin et al., 1990; Droby et al., 1997; Smilanick et al., 1999).
15 This research focused mainly on the use of calcium and sodium salts, primarily CaCl_2 and
16 NaHCO_3 (Conway et al., 2004; Ippolito et al., 2005; Janisiewicz et al., 2008b). Other
17 methods that were explored included the use of chitosan (El- Ghaouth et al., 2000; Meng et
18 al., 2010; Romanazzi et al., 2016a), glucose (Sui and Liu, 2014), the integration of UV-C
19 with antagonists (Stevens et al., 1997), combining the use of antagonists with heat
20 treatments (Conway et al., 2004; Liu et al., 2011), organic salts and surfactants (Nigro et
21 al., 2006), modified atmosphere storage (Spotts et al., 2002; Karabulut and Baykal, 2004),
22 and ethylene inhibitors (Osman et al., 2011). The use of various physical treatments, natural
23 plant and animal products and the identification and potential of plant and fungal derived
24 volatile organic compounds (VOCs) are detailed in this issue by Usall et al. (2016), Palou et
25 al. (2016) and Mari et al. (2016), respectively. The search for stress resistant antagonists was
26 also pursued (Sui et al., 2015). The importance of sanitation in reducing inoculum levels has
27 also been recognized as both a standalone practice and integrated with other alternative
28 management strategies (Feliziani et al., 2016).

29 Two new concepts were gradually incorporated into the development of alternative
30 methods of postharvest disease management. One was an expanded definition of biological
31 control conceived by Dr. Charles Wilson (discussed in Wisniewski et al., 2007; Droby et al.,
32 2009) in which biological control is defined as “the management of a plant disease by a

1 biological process or the product of a biological process.” This new definition, incorporated
2 the new approaches and ideas that were being explored for developing alternative
3 approaches to postharvest disease management. In addition to the use of antagonists, the
4 exploration of innate and induced resistance and the use of natural antimicrobials (including
5 VOCs) were also seen as an alternative biological approach to disease management. Romanazzi
6 et al. (2016b) presents a review of induced resistance and Gonzalez-Candelas and Tian (2016)
7 review the molecular aspects of virulence and resistance.

8 The second concept that has evolved within the search for alternative approaches to
9 postharvest disease control is the idea of a multiple decrement approach (Smilanick, *pers.*
10 *comm.*). The foundation of this principle is that the prevention of disease is brought about by
11 the use of several approaches that each reduce the percentage of decay by a specific amount.
12 The various approaches act together additively or synergistically to bring about commercial
13 levels (97–99%) of disease control (Fig. 1). This multi-step approach may include: Action 1
14 - Reduce inoculum levels through sanitation and or careful harvesting and handling; Action
15 2 - Exposure to a wet or dry heat treatment, Action 3 - Application of a microbial antagonist,
16 and Action 4 - use of modified or controlled atmosphere storage and/or packaging.

17 In the food industry the multiple hurdle approach is used to manage foodborne
18 pathogens. In practice, no single intervention can completely eliminate pathogenic bacteria
19 from a food product (Leistner, 2000). To ensure the product is safe and presents the lowest
20 risk possible, a robust multiple-hurdle approach is implemented. Each step in the handling
21 and processing of food material provides an opportunity to control bacteria, prevent cross-
22 contamination, and prevent the spread of bacterial contamination to downstream processes.
23 This approach is based on the use of intervention technologies at critical points throughout
24 the harvesting, handling, storage, shipping, and marketing process. Perhaps the model used
25 to deal with foodborne pathogens should also be used to develop effective strategies for
26 preventing postharvest diseases. It seems that integrating approaches, from the field to the
27 supermarket, will be the key to success in developing safe, effective, and reliable
28 alternatives.

29

30 **Alternative products: from the frying pan into the fire**

31 In their seminal publication, Wilson and Wisniewski (1989) outlined the criteria of
32 an ideal antagonist. While most of the designated criteria mentioned in that report are still

1 relevant, they also made a case for favoring yeast over bacterial antagonists as biocontrol
2 agents. This was based on the perceived premise that consumers would be more comfortable
3 with food that had been treated with yeast (used in baking and making beer) than with
4 bacteria (often associated with foodborne diseases), and potential problems with the
5 registration of bacterial antagonists producing antibiotics. While in theory this may have been
6 true, and is actually reflected in the number of reports using antagonistic yeasts rather than
7 bacteria, in a practical and historical sense it did not turn out to be the case. In fact one of the
8 first and longest available postharvest biocontrol products, BioSave (JetHarvest Solutions,
9 Longwood, Florida, USA), is based on the bacterium *Pseudomonas syringae* (Janisiewicz
10 and Jeffers, 1997). Other successful pre- and postharvest biocontrol products are also based
11 on bacteria, primarily *Bacillus subtilis* (known to produce the antibiotic, iturin) and its
12 fermentation products. So the challenge of developing a successful yeast-based biocontrol
13 product still exists. While the product Aspire (Ecogen, Inc.), based on the yeast *Candida*
14 *oleophila*, was developed at the same time as BioSave, poor marketing and company
15 management resulted in its disappearance from the market place. Other postharvest
16 biocontrol products have moved toward commercial status but remain in limbo due to
17 regulatory problems and lack of company support.

18 Droby et al. (2009) in their twenty-year review of postharvest biological control
19 research discussed in detail the major obstacles facing the commercialization of postharvest
20 biocontrol products. While they focused on the use of microbial antagonists, similar
21 obstacles exist for any new technology. An essential aspect of commercial development is
22 for the technology to be protected by patents to ensure that a company can capitalize on their
23 investment. Demonstrating the originality of new technology that will withstand the “prior art
24 and obviousness test” to which it will be subjected to during the patent review process is a
25 difficult challenge. Perhaps the greatest obstacle is consistent and reliable performance under
26 a wide array of conditions (different packing lines, different inoculum levels, use of other
27 technologies used to maintain quality). Whether or not a package of treatments specifically
28 designed for each individual crop is an acceptable commercial model remains to be seen.
29 The costs associated with product development, marketing, and industry acceptance are the
30 other factors that have limited the adoption of alternative technologies. There is a wealth of
31 information on alternative approaches to postharvest diseases management, yet none of these
32 approaches have been implanted on a large scale, although the use of heated solutions of

1 sodium carbonate/sodium bicarbonate have been in widespread use in the citrus industry in
2 California since the early 1930's (Barger, 1928). There is a critical need to find a way to bridge
3 the gap between research and industry so that these alternatives can become commercial
4 successes. These are the challenges and opportunities facing the development of alternative
5 approaches to postharvest disease control.

6 7 **The Big Bang: moving from simplicity to complexity**

8 The past twenty years has seen a revolution in systems biology fostered by the
9 advances in omic technologies (genomics, transcriptomics, metabolomics, proteomics, and
10 metagenomics). Undoubtedly, these tools are greatly enhancing our understanding of the
11 interactions between microbial antagonists, host tissues, pathogens, biotic and abiotic
12 elicitors of defense mechanisms and the environment. In particular, elucidating the role of
13 reactive oxygen species and oxidative stress in biocontrol systems has greatly enhanced our
14 understanding of what happens when antagonists are applied to the wound site in the
15 presence and absence of pathogens (Macarisin et al., 2010). The induction of host defense
16 responses by several alternative approaches, including antagonists (Ippolito et al., 2000;
17 Hershkovitz et al., 2012), natural compounds (e.g. chitosan) (El-Ghaouth et al., 2000;
18 Feliziani et al., 2015), and heat (Spadoni et al., 2014, 2015) have all been reported. A greater
19 understanding of the role of abiotic stress in biocontrol systems has also been developed
20 (Sui et al., 2015).

21 Massive sequencing of polymerase chain reaction (PCR) amplicons from specific
22 barcode genes (amplicon metagenomics or metabarcoding) has proved to be a powerful
23 culture-independ-ent technique for investigating microbial diversity and for determining the
24 relative quantity of community members in environmental samples (Lindahl et al., 2013).
25 The identification and quantification of endophytic and epiphytic microflora present in and
26 on plants may provide information that can facilitate an understanding of the complex
27 interactions that take place between plants and resident fungal microflora, including
28 pathogenic and beneficial species (Schena et al., 2003; Ottesen et al., 2013; Pinto et al., 2014;
29 Abdelfattah et al., 2015). Furthermore, these techniques enable an in-depth investigation of
30 the effect of conventional and alternative control methods, including the application of
31 biocontrol agents, on the composition and diversity of microbial communities (Sylla et al.,
32 2013).

1 More recently, Janisiewicz et al. (2008a) and Jurick et al. (2011) have identified
2 resistance to *Penicillium expansum* and *Colletotrichum* sp. in a number of accessions of wild
3 apple species, including *Malus sieversii*. Use of a mapping population ('Royal Gala' X *M.*
4 *sieversii* PI 613981), that segregates for blue mold resistance, has enabled the identification
5 of a quantitative trait locus (QTL) on chromosome 3 of apple (Norelli et al., 2014;
6 Wisniewski et al., 2016, in press). Development of a DNA test for this genetic locus will
7 allow apple breeders to screen for blue mold resistance in seedlings and juvenile trees prior
8 to fruiting. In stark contrast to many other crops, few fruit cultivars with both postharvest
9 disease resistance and superior horticultural quality are commercially available. Numerous
10 challenges have severely limited breeders' ability to deliver cultivars with both attributes.
11 Resistance to many disease threats is present in crop wild relatives and these donor parents
12 usually have small fruit and numerous other highly undesirable horticultural attributes such
13 as bitterness, astringency, and poor keeping qualities. In most cases, little is known about the
14 nature and inheritance of the disease resistance. Using traditional backcrossing strategies,
15 many generations are required to regain sufficient horticultural quality, a process that can
16 require decades for most tree fruit crops and in all cases requires extensive and expensive
17 field testing.

18 DNA-informed breeding for disease resistance and horticultural quality is expected to
19 overcome the traditional breeding impasse of past decades. Firstly, DNA-informed breeding
20 can improve breeding efficiency by selecting parents known to carry critical alleles, by
21 accurately designing crosses to achieve desired genetic combinations that avoid inefficient
22 or useless crosses and by identifying inferior offspring prior to field planting. Additionally,
23 marker assisted breeding (MAB) allows the efficient pyramiding of multiple sources of
24 resistance which could enhance the durability of resistance. Identifying individuals with
25 pyramided disease resistant genes is often not even possible without DNA markers linked
26 to the resistance because it is impossible to select on phenotype alone for the presence of a
27 second resistance gene. Finally, because the presence or absence of a DNA locus is not
28 affected by environmental conditions or host physiology, DNA tests can be more reliable than
29 traditional phenotypic methods of selection. For example, the infection of apple fruit by *P.*
30 *expansum* is affected by fruit ripeness (Villanova et al., 2012), yet the progeny of any specific
31 cross is likely to segregate for harvest date, fruit firmness and starch content at maturity
32 making the phenotypic evaluation of resistance both difficult and prone to variation. In

1 contrast, a DNA test which can be conducted using leaf tissue or any other source of DNA
2 is not affected by fruit ripening or other host physiological effects.

3 As discussed above and by Droby et al. (2016), the field of metagenomics provides
4 the opportunity to investigate communities of microbes that exist on plant surfaces, how they
5 interact, and how they change over time. In the future, this knowledge will allow a systems
6 approach to disease control and perhaps lead to the ability to create synthetic communities
7 of organisms for enhanced disease management. Essential to all the-omic technologies that
8 have been developed is the ability to analyze and mine large data sets (millions to hundreds
9 of millions of data from different sources). Every biologist has come to appreciate the value
10 and necessity of a good bioinformatics pipeline.

11 12 **Conclusions**

13 It has been often stated that we have moved from an age of chemistry to an age of
14 biology. The ease of sequencing genomes and obtaining related genotypic, transcriptomic,
15 proteomic, and metabolomic information is leading to the development of new commercial
16 technologies where problems are solved “biological- ly.” In regards to postharvest disease
17 control, truly we have moved from simplicity to complexity in our understanding of how we
18 can manage postharvest diseases in a cost-effective, and reliable manner and how various
19 alternative technologies (antagonists, natural compounds, physical treatments) impact the
20 host and the community of microorganisms that we are attempting to manage and regulate.
21 Plant pathologists developing alternative technologies are slowly moving away from the
22 “silver bullet” concept where a single intervention can be used to control a disease to viewing
23 plant disease as a process where multiple interventions may be required at different points
24 in the disease process. Over the past thirty years, alternatives have moved from the simple
25 idea of applying high concentrations of biocontrol agents to a harvested commodity, to using
26 a wide array of other approaches, and integrating them together into a systems approach based
27 on the multiple decrement or multiple hurdle concept. It has been a long journey from
28 simplicity to complexity, and as Shakespeare reveals in the quote at the beginning of this
29 contribution, thereby hangs a tale.

30 31 **Acknowledgement**

32 The current review was not designed to be comprehensive and inclusive of the many

1 hundreds of reports that have been published on this topic. Rather, it was designed to provide
2 a ‘historical’ view of how the field has developed over the past thirty years and the ideas and
3 concepts that helped to shape it. We would like to extend our gratitude to all those researchers,
4 mentioned and unmentioned, who have diligently worked to find and develop safe and
5 effective alternatives for the management of postharvest diseases. In many traditions, the
6 earth was originally perceived as a “Garden of Eden.” As the activities of humans, both in
7 industry and population growth, begin to represent a real challenge to the health and
8 sustainability of the planet, let us hope that science and ethical conviction can provide a safe
9 and bountiful harvest for all the people of future generations. A portion of the research
10 described in this review was partially funded by a grant (US-4774- 14C) from the U.S. Israel
11 Binational Agricultural Research and Development Fund.

12
13
14
15

References

- Abdelfattah, A., Li Destri Nicosia, M.G., Cacciola, S.O., Droby, S., Schena, L., 2015. Metabarcoding analysis of fungal diversity in the phyllosphere and carposphere of olive (*Olea europaea*). PLoS One 10 (7), e0131069.
- Arrebola, E., Sivakumar, D., Bacigalupo, R., Korsten, L., 2010. Combined application of antagonist *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* and essential oils for the control of peach postharvest diseases. Crop Prot. 29, 369–377.
- Barger, W.R., 1928. Sodium bicarbonate as a citrus fruit disinfectant. California Citrograph 13, 172–174.
- Boonkorn, P., Gemma, H., Sugaya, S., Setha, S., Uthaibutra, J., Whangchai, K., 2012. Impact of high-dose, short periods of ozone exposure on green mold and antioxidant enzyme activity of tangerine fruit. Postharvest Biol. Technol. 67, 25–28.
- Cañamás, T.P., Viñas, I., Torres, R., Usall, J., Solsona, C., Teixidó, N., 2011. Field applications of improved formulations of *Candida sake* CPA-1 for control of *Botrytis cinerea* in grapes. Biol. Control 56, 150–158.
- Cerioni, L., Sepulveda, M., Rubio-Ames, Z., Volentini, S.I., Rodríguez-Montelongo, L., Smilanick, J.L., Ramallo, J., Rapisarda, V.A., 2013. Control of lemon postharvest diseases by low-toxicity salts combined with hydrogen peroxide and heat. Postharvest Biol. Technol. 83, 17–21.
- Charles, M.T., Tano, K., Asselin, A., Arul, J., 2009. Physiological basis of UV-C induced resistance to *Botrytis cinerea* in tomato fruit. V. Constitutive defence enzymes and inducible pathogenesis-related proteins. Postharvest Biol. Technol. 51, 414–424.
- Cia, P., Pascholati, S.F., Benato, E.A., Camili, E.C., Santos, C.A., 2007. Effects of gamma and UV-C irradiation on the postharvest control of papaya anthracnose. Postharvest Biol. Technol. 43, 366–373.
- Conway, W.S., Leverentz, B., Janisiewicz, W.J., Blodgett, A.B., Saftner, R.A., Camp, M.J., 2004. Integrating heat treatment, biocontrol and sodium bicarbonate to reduce postharvest decay of apple caused by *Colletotrichum acutatum* and *Penicillium expansum*. Postharvest Biol. Technol. 34, 11–20.
- Conway, W.S., Janisiewicz, W.J., Leverentz, B., Saftner, R.A., Camp, M.J., 2007. Control of blue mold of apple by combining controlled atmosphere, an antagonist mixture, and sodium bicarbonate. Postharvest Biol. Technol. 45, 326–333.
- de Sousa, L.L., de Andrade, S.C.A., Athayde, A.J.A., de Oliveira, C.E.V., de Sales, C.V., Madruga, M.S., de Souza, E.L., 2010. Efficacy of *Origanum vulgare* L. and *Rosmarinus officinalis* L. essential oils in combination to control postharvest pathogenic Aspergilli and autochthonous mycoflora in *Vitis labrusca* L. (table grapes). Int. J. Food Microbiol. 165, 312–318.
- Deng, L., Zhou, Y., Zeng, K., 2015. Pre-harvest spray of oligochitosan induced the resistance of harvested navel oranges to anthracnose during ambient temperature storage. Crop Prot. 70, 70–76.
- Droby, S., Wisniewski, M.E., Cohen, L., Weiss, B., Touitou, D., Eilam, Y., Chalutz, E., 1997. Influence of CaCl₂ on *Penicillium digitatum*, grapefruit peel tissue, and biocontrol activity of *Pichia guilliermondii*. Phytopathology 87, 310–315.
- Droby, S., Wisniewski, M., Macarasin, D., Wilson, C., 2009. Twenty years of postharvest biocontrol research: is it time for a new paradigm? Postharvest Biol. Technol. 52, 137–145.
- Droby, S., Wisniewski, M., Teixidó, N., Spadaro, D., Jijakli, H., 2016. Biocontrol of

- 1 postharvest pathogens: quatritrophic interactions between the antagonist, the host,
2 the pathogen, and resident microflora. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* (this issue).
- 3 El-Ghaouth, A., Smilanick, J.L., Wilson, C.L., 2000. Enhancement of the performance
4 of *Candida saitoana* by the addition of glycolchitosan for the control of postharvest
5 decay of apple and citrus fruit. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 19, 103–110.
- 6 Elshafie, H.S., Mancini, E., Camele, I., Martino, L.D., Feo, V.D., 2015. In vivo
7 antifungal activity of two essential oils from Mediterranean plants against
8 postharvest brown rot disease of peach fruit. *Ind. Crop. Prod.* 66, 11–15.
- 9 Fan, Q., Tian, S., 2001. Postharvest biological control of grey mold and blue mold on
10 apple by *Cryptococcus albidus* (Saito) Skinner. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 21, 341–
11 350.
- 12 Feliziani, E., Landi, L., Romanazzi, G., 2015. Preharvest treatments with chitosan and
13 other alternatives to conventional fungicides to control postharvest decay of
14 strawberry. *Carbohydr. Polym.* 132, 111–117.
- 15 Feliziani, E., Smilanick, J.L., Lichter, A., Ippolito, A., 2016. Disinfecting agents to
16 controlling fruit and vegetable diseases after harvest. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.*
17 122, 53–69.
- 18 Gonzalez-Candelas, L., Tian, S., 2016. Molecular aspects in pathogen-fruit interactions:
19 virulence and resistance. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 122, 11–21.
- 20 Hao, W., Li, H., Hu, M., Yang, L., Rizwan-ul-Haq, M., 2011. Integrated control of citrus
21 green and blue mold and sour rot by *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* in combination
22 with tea saponin. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 59, 316–323.
- 23 Hershkovitz, V., Ben-Dayan, C., Raphael, G., Pasmanik-Chor, M., Liu, J., Belausov, E.,
24 Aly, R., Wisniewski, M., Droby, S., 2012. Global changes in gene expression of
25 grapefruit peel tissue in response to the yeast biocontrol agent *Metschnikowia*
26 *fructicola*. *Mol. Plant Pathol.* 13, 338–349.
- 27 Hershkovitz, V., Sela, N., Taha-Salaime, L., Liu, J., Rafael, G., Kessler, C., Aly, R.,
28 Wisniewski, M., Droby, S., 2013. De-novo assembly and characterization of the
29 transcriptome of *Metschnikowia fructicola* reveals differences in gene expression
30 following interaction with *Penicillium digitatum* and grapefruit peel. *BMC*
31 *Genomics* 14, 168.
- 32 Holb, I.J., Balla, B., Vámos, A., Gáll, J.M., 2012. Influence of preharvest calcium
33 applications, fruit injury, and storage atmospheres on postharvest brown rot of
34 apple. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 67, 29–36.
- 35 Huang, K., Zou, Y., Luo, J., Liu, Y., 2015. Combining UV-C treatment with biocontrol
36 yeast to control postharvest decay of melon. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* 22, 14307–
37 14313.
- 38 Ippolito, A., Nigro, F., 2000. Impact of preharvest application of biological control
39 agents on postharvest diseases of fresh fruits and vegetables. *Crop Prot.* 19, 715–
40 723.
- 41 Ippolito, A., El-Ghaouth, A., Wilson, C.L., Wisniewski, M., 2000. Control of
42 postharvest decay of apple fruit by *Aureobasidium pullulans* and induction of
43 defense responses. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 19, 265–272.
- 44 Ippolito, A., Schena, L., Pentimone, I., Nigro, F., 2005. Control of postharvest rots of
45 sweet cherries by pre- and postharvest applications of *Aureobasidium pullulans* in
46 combination with calcium chloride or sodium bicarbonate. *Postharvest Biol.*
47 *Technol.* 36, 245–252.
- 48 Janisiewicz, W., Jeffers, S., 1997. Efficacy of commercial formulation of two

- 1 biofungicides for control of blue mold and gray mold of apples in cold storage.
2 Crop Prot. 16, 629–633.
- 3 Janisiewicz, W.J., Korsten, L., 2002. Biological control of postharvest diseases of fruits.
4 Annu. Rev. Phytopathol. 40, 411–441.
- 5 Janisiewicz, W., Saftner, R.A., Conway, W.S., Forsline, P.L., 2008a. Preliminary
6 evaluation of apple germplasm from Kazakhstan for resistance to postharvest blue
7 mold in fruit caused by *Penicillium expansum*. HortScience 43, 420–426.
- 8 Janisiewicz, W.J., Saftner, R.A., Conway, W.S., Yoder, K.S., 2008b. Control of blue
9 mold decay of apple during commercial controlled atmosphere storage with yeast
10 antagonists and sodium bicarbonate. Postharvest Biol. Technol. 49, 374–378.
- 11 Jijakli, M.H., 2011. *Pichia anomala* in biocontrol for apples: 20 years of fundamental
12 research and practical applications. Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek 99, 93–105.
- 13 Jurick II, W.M., Janisiewicz, W.J., Saftner, R.A., Vico, I., Gaskins, V.L., Park, E.,
14 Forsline, P.L., Fazio, G., Conway, W.S., 2011. Identification of wild apple
15 germplasm (*Malus* sp.) accessions with resistance to the postharvest decay
16 pathogens, *Penicillium expansum* and *Colletotrichum acutatum*. Plant Breed. 130,
17 481–486.
- 18 Karabulut, O.A., Baykal, N., 2004. Integrated control of postharvest diseases of peaches
19 with a yeast antagonist, hot water and modified atmosphere packaging. Crop Prot.
20 23, 431–436.
- 21 Lassois, L., Bellaire, L.D.L.D., Jijakli, M.H., 2008. Biological control of crown rot of
22 bananas with *Pichia anomala* strain K and *Candida oleophila* strain O. Biol. Control
23 45, 410–418.
- 24 Leistner, I., 2000. Basic aspects of food preservation by hurdle technology. Int. J. Food
25 Microbiol. 55, 181–186.
- 26 Lindahl, B.D., Nilsson, R.H., Tedersoo, L., Abarenkov, K., Carlsen, T., Kjølner, R.,
27 Kõljalg, U., Pennanen, T., Rosendahl, S., Stenlid, J., Kauserud, H., 2013. Fungal
28 community analysis by high-throughput sequencing of amplified markers—a
29 user’s guide. New Phytol. 199, 288–299.
- 30 Liu, J., Tian, S., Meng, X., Xu, Y., 2007. Effects of chitosan on control of postharvest
31 diseases and physiological responses of tomato fruit. Postharvest Biol. Technol.
32 44, 300–306.
- 33 Liu, J., Wisniewski, M., Droby, S., Tian, S., Hershkovitz, V., Tworkoski, T., 2011.
34 Effect of heat shock treatment on stress tolerance and biocontrol efficacy of
35 *Metschnikowia fructicola*. FEMS Microbiol. Ecol. 76, 145–155.
- 36 Liu, J., Sui, Y., Wisniewski, M., Droby, S., Tian, S., Norelli, J., Hershkovitz, V., 2012a.
37 Effect of heat treatment on inhibition of *Monilinia fructicola* and induction of
38 disease resistance in peach fruit. Postharvest Biol. Technol. 65, 61–68.
- 39 Liu, J., Wisniewski, M., Droby, S., Norelli, J., Hershkovitz, V., Tian, S., Farrell, R.,
40 2012b. Increase in antioxidant gene transcripts, stress tolerance and biocontrol
41 efficacy of *Candida oleophila* following sublethal oxidative stress exposure. FEMS
42 Microbiol. Ecol. 80, 578–590.
- 43 Liu, J., Sui, Y., Wisniewski, M., Droby, S., Liu, Y., 2013. Review: utilization of
44 antagonistic yeasts to manage postharvest fungal disease of fruit. Int. J. Food
45 Microbiol. 167, 153–160.
- 46 Lydakakis, D., Aked, J., 2003. Vapour heat treatment of Sultanina table grapes. I: control
47 of *Botrytis cinerea*. Postharvest Biol. Technol. 27, 109–116.
- 48 Ma, X., Wang, X., Cheng, J., Nie, X., Yu, X., Zhao, Y., Wang, W., 2015.

- 1 Microencapsulation of *Bacillus subtilis* B99-2 and its biocontrol efficiency against
2 *Rhizoctonia solani* in tomato. *Biol. Control* 90, 31–41.
- 3 Macarisin, D., Droby, S., Bauchan, G., Wisniewski, M., 2010. Superoxide anion and
4 hydrogen peroxide in the yeast antagonist-fruit interaction: a new role for reactive
5 oxygen species in postharvest biocontrol? *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 58, 194–202.
- 6 Mari, M., Martini, C., Spadoni, A., Rouissi, W., Bertolini, P., 2012. Biocontrol of apple
7 postharvest decay by *Aureobasidium pullulans*. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 73, 56–
8 62.
- 9 Mari, M., Sivakumar, D., Bautista-Baños, S., 2016. Decay control in the postharvest
10 system: role of microbial and plant volatile organic compounds. *Postharvest Biol.*
11 *Technol.* 122, 70–81.
- 12 Maxin, P., Weber, R.W.S., Pedersen, H.L., Williams, M., 2012. Control of a wide range
13 of storage rots in naturally infected apples by hot-water dipping and rinsing.
14 *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 6, 9–15.
- 15 McLaughlin, R.J., Wisniewski, M.E., Wilson, C.I., Chalutz, E., 1990. Effect of
16 inoculum concentration and salt solutions on biological control of postharvest
17 diseases of apples with *Candida* sp. *Phytopathology* 80, 456–461.
- 18 Meng, X.H., Qin, G.Z., Tian, S.P., 2010. Influences of preharvest spraying *Cryptococcus*
19 *laurentii* combined with postharvest chitosan coating on postharvest diseases and
20 quality of table grapes in storage. *LWT—Food Sci. Technol.* 43, 596–601.
- 21 Mercier, J., Wilson, C.L., 1995. Effect of wound moisture on the biocontrol by *Candida*
22 *oleophila* of gray mold rot (*Botrytis cinerea*) of apple. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.*
23 70, 25–31.
- 24 Milkota Gabler, F.M., Mercier, J., Jiménez, J.I., Smilanick, J.L., 2010a. Integration of
25 continuous biofumigation with *Muscodor albus* with pre-cooling fumigation with
26 ozone or sulfur dioxide to control postharvest gray mold of table grapes.
27 *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 55, 78–84.
- 28 Milkota Gabler, F.M., Smilanick, J.L., Mansour, M.F., Karaca, H., 2010b. Influence of
29 fumigation with high concentrations of ozone gas on postharvest gray mold and
30 fungicide residues on table grapes. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 55, 85–90.
- 31 Montesinos-Herrero, C., Palou, L., 2016. Synergism between potassium sorbate dips
32 and brief exposure to high CO₂ or O₂ at curing temperature for the control of citrus
33 postharvest green and blue molds. *Crop Prot.* 81, 43–46.
- 34 Morales, H., Sanchis, V., Usall, J., Ramos, A.J., Marín, S., 2008. Effect of biocontrol
35 agents *Candida sake* and *Pantoea agglomerans* on *Penicillium expansum* growth
36 and patulin accumulation in apples. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* 122, 61–67.
- 37 Moscoso-Ramírez, P.A., Montesinos-Herrero, C., Palou, L., 2013. Control of citrus
38 postharvest penicillium molds with sodium ethylparaben. *Crop Prot.* 46, 44–51.
- 39 United States National Research Council, Board Agric, 1993. *Pesticides in the Diets of*
40 *Infants and Children.* Nat. Acad. Press, Washington D.C., USA 408 pp.
- 41 United States National Research Council, Board Agric, 1987. *Regulating Pesticides in*
42 *Food—the Delaney Paradox.* Nat. Acad. Press, Washington D.C., USA 272 pp.
- 43 Nigro, F., Schena, L., Ligorio, A., Pentimone, I., Ippolito, A., Salerno, M.G., 2006.
44 Control of table grape storage rots by pre-harvest applications of salts. *Postharvest*
45 *Biol. Technol.* 42, 142–149.
- 46 Norelli, J., Wisniewski, M., Droby, S., 2014. Identification of a QTL for postharvest
47 disease resistance to *Penicillium expansum* in *Malus sieversii*. *Acta Hortic.* 1053,
48 199–203.

- 1 Nunes, C.A., 2012. Biological control of postharvest diseases of fruit. *Eur. J. Plant*
2 *Pathol.* 133, 181–196.
- 3 Osman, M.S., Sivakumar, D., Korsten, L., 2011. Effect of biocontrol agent *Bacillus*
4 *amyloliquefaciens* and 1-methyl cyclopropene on the control of postharvest
5 diseases and maintenance of fruit quality. *Crop Prot.* 30, 173–178.
- 6 Ottesen, A.R., Peña, A.G., White, J.R., Pettengill, J.B., Li, C., Allard, S., Rideout, S.,
7 Allard, M., Hill, T., Evans, P., Strain, E., Musser, S., Knight, R., Brown, E., 2013.
8 Baseline survey of the anatomical microbial ecology of an important food plant
9 *Solanum lycopersicum* (tomato). *BMC Microbiol.* 13, 114.
- 10 Palou, L., Ali, L., Fallik, E., Romanazzi, G., 2016. GRAS, plant- and animal-derived
11 compounds as alternatives to conventional fungicides for the control of postharvest
12 diseases of fresh horticultural produce. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 122, 41–52.
- 13 Pavoncello, D., Lurie, S., Droby, S., Porat, R., 2001. A hot water treatment induces
14 resistance to *Penicillium digitatum* and promotes the accumulation of heat shock
15 and pathogenesis-related proteins in grapefruit flavedo. *Physiol. Plant.* 111, 17– 22.
- 16 Pinto, C., Pinho, D., Sousa, S., Pinheiro, M., Egas, C., Gomes, A.C., 2014. Unravelling
17 the diversity of grapevine microbiome. *PLoS One* 9, e85622.
- Romanazzi, G., Karabulut, O.A., Smilanick, J.L., 2007. Combination of chitosan and
ethanol to control postharvest gray mold of table grapes. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.*
45, 134–140.
- Romanazzi, G., Smilanick, J.L., Feliziani, E., Droby, S., 2016a. Integrated management
of postharvest gray mold on fruit crops. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 113, 69–76.
- Romanazzi, G., Sanzani, S.M., Bi, Y., Tian, S., Gutierrez-Martinez, P., Alkam, N.,
2016b. Induced resistance to control postharvest decay of fruit and vegetables.
Postharvest Biol. Technol. 122, 82–94.
- Sanzani, S.M., Reverberi, M., Geisen, R., 2016. Mycotoxins in harvested fruits and
vegetables: insights in managing contamination by postharvest mycotoxigenic
fungi. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 122, 95–105.
- Schena, L., Nigro, F., Pentimone, I., Ligorio, A., Ippolito, A., 2003. Control of
postharvest rots of sweet cherries and table grapes with endophytic isolates of
Aureobasidium pullulans. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 30, 209–220.
- Sellamuthu, P.S., Mafune, M., Sivakumar, D., Soundy, P., 2013. Thyme oil vapor and
modified atmosphere packaging reduce anthracnose incidence and maintain fruit
quality in avocado. *J. Sci. Food Agric.* 93, 3024–3031.
- Shao, X., Wang, H., Xu, F., Cheng, S., 2013. Effects and possible mechanisms of tea
tree oil vapor treatment on the main disease in postharvest strawberry fruit.
Postharvest Biol. Technol. 77, 94–101.
- Sharma, R.R., Singh, D., Singh, R., 2009. Biological control of postharvest diseases of
fruits and vegetables by microbial antagonists: a review. *Biol. Control* 50, 205–
221.
- Smilanick, J.L., Margosan, D.A., Mlikota-Gabler, F., Usall, J., Michael, I.F., 1999.
Control of citrus green mold by carbonate and bicarbonate salts and the influence
of commercial postharvest practices on their efficacy. *Plant Dis.* 83, 139–145.
- Spadaro, D., Droby, S., 2016. Development of biocontrol products for postharvest
diseases of fruit: the importance of elucidating the mechanisms of action of yeast
antagonists. *Trends Food Sci. Technol.* 47, 39–49.
- Spadaro, D., Gullino, M.L., 2004. State of the art and future prospects of the biological
control of postharvest fruit diseases. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* 91, 185– 194.

- Spadoni, A., Guidarelli, M., Sanzani, S.M., Ippolito, A., Mari, M., 2014. Influence of hot water treatment on brown rot of peach and rapid fruit response to heat stress. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 94, 66–73.
- Spadoni, A., Guidarelli, M., Phillips, J., Mari, M., Wisniewski, M., 2015. Transcriptional profiling of apple fruit in response to heat treatment: involvement of a defense response during *Penicillium expansum* infection. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 101, 37–48.
- Spotts, R.A., Cervantes, L.A., Facteau, T.J., 2002. Integrated control of brown rot of sweet cherry fruit with a preharvest fungicide, a postharvest yeast, modified atmosphere packaging, and cold storage temperature. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 24, 251–257.
- Stevens, C., Khan, V.A., Lu, J.Y., Wilson, C.L., Pusey, P.L., Igwegbe, E.C.K., Kabwe, M.K., Mafolo, Y., Liu, J., Chalutz, E., Droby, S., 1997. Integration of ultraviolet (UV-C) light with yeast treatment for control of postharvest storage rots of fruits and vegetables. *Biol. Control* 10, 98–103.
- Stevens, C., Liu, J., Khan, V.A., Lu, J.Y., Kabwe, M.K., Wilson, C.L., Igwegbe, E.C.K., Chalutz, E., Droby, S., 2004. The effect of low-dose ultraviolet light-C treatment on polygalacturonase activity, delay ripening and *Rhizopus* soft rot development of tomatoes. *Crop Prot.* 23, 551–554.
- Sui, Y., Liu, J., 2014. Effect of glucose on thermotolerance and biocontrol efficacy of the antagonistic yeast *Pichia guilliermondii*. *Biol. Control* 74, 59–64.
- Sui, Y., Wisniewski, M., Droby, S., Liu, J., 2015. Responses of yeast biocontrol agents to environmental stress. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 81, 2968–2975.
- Sylla, J., Alsanius, B.W., Krüger, E., Reineke, A., Bischoff-Schaefer, M., Wohanka, W., 2013. Introduction of *Aureobasidium pullulans* to the phyllosphere of organically grown strawberries with focus on its establishment and interactions with the resident microbiome. *Agronomy* 3, 704–731.
- Tronsmo, A., Dennis, C., 1977. The use of *Trichoderma* species to control strawberry fruit rots. *Neth. J. Plant Pathol.* 83, 449–455.
- Usall, J., Smilanick, J., Palou, L., Denis-Arrue, N., Teixidó, N., Torres, R., Viñas, I., 2008. Preventive and curative activity of combined treatments of sodium carbonates and *Pantoea agglomerans* CPA-2 to control postharvest green mold of citrus fruit. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 50, 1–7.
- Usall, J., Ippolito, A., Sisquella, M., Neri, F., 2016. Physical treatments to control postharvest pathogens. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 122, 30–40.
- Villanova, L., Teixido, N., Torres, R., Usall, J., Vinas, I., 2012. The infection capacity of *P. expansum* and *P. digitatum*. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* 157, 39–49.
- Wang, L., Jin, P., Wang, J., Gong, H., Zhang, S., Zheng, Y., 2015. Hot air treatment induces resistance against blue mold decay caused by *Penicillium expansum* in sweet cherry (*Prunus cerasus* L.) fruit. *Sci. Hortic.* 189, 74–80.
- Wei, Y., Mao, S., Tu, K., 2014. Effect of preharvest spraying *Cryptococcus laurentii* on postharvest decay and quality of strawberry. *Biol. Control* 73, 68–74.
- Whangchai, K., Saengnil, K., Uthaibutra, J., 2006. Effect of ozone in combination with some organic acids on the control of postharvest decay and pericarp browning of longan fruit. *Crop Prot.* 25, 821–825.
- Whangchai, K., Saengnil, K., Singkamanee, C., Uthaibutra, J., 2010. Effect of electrolyzed oxidizing water and continuous ozone exposure on the control of

- Penicillium digitatum* on tangerine cv. 'Sai Nam Pung' during storage. *Crop Prot.* 29, 386–389.
- Williamson, S.M., Guzmán, M., Marin, D.H., Anasa, O., Jin, X., Sutton, T.B., 2008. Evaluation of *Pseudomonas syringae* strain ESC-11 for biocontrol of crown rot and anthracnose of banana. *Biol. Control* 46, 279–286.
- Wilson, C.L., Pusey, P.L., 1985. Potential for biological control of postharvest plant diseases. *Plant Dis.* 69, 375–378.
- Wilson, C.L., Wisniewski, M., 1989. Biological control of postharvest diseases of fruits and vegetables: an emerging technology. *Annu. Rev. Phytopathol.* 27, 425–441.
- Wisniewski, M., Wilson, C.L., 1992. Biological control of postharvest diseases of fruits and vegetables: recent advances. *HortScience* 27, 94–98.
- Wisniewski, M., Biles, C., Droby, S., McLaughlin, R., Wilson, C., Chalutz, E., 1991. Mode of action of the postharvest biocontrol yeast, *Pichia guilliermondii*. I. Characterization of attachment to *Botrytis cinerea*. *Physiol. Mol. Plant Pathol.* 39, 245–258.
- Wisniewski, M., Wilson, C., Droby, S., Chalutz, E., El Ghaouth, A., Stevens, C., 2007. Postharvest biocontrol: the discovery of new concepts and applications. In: Vincent, C., Goettal, M., Lazarovits, G. (Eds.), *Biological Control: International Case Studies*. CABI Publishing, UK 440 pp. pp. 262–273.
- Wisniewski, M., Droby, S., Wilson, C., 2014. Feeding a hungry world: the challenge of developing safe and effective methods of food preservation. *Chron. Hortic.* 54, 9–13.
- Wisniewski, M., Norelli, J., Droby, S., Levin, E., Ballester, A.-R., Abdelfattah, A., 2016. Genomic tools for developing markers for postharvest disease resistance in Rosaceae fruit crops. *Acta Hortic.* (in press).
- Yan, J., Cao, J., Jiang, W., Zhao, Y., 2012. Effects of preharvest oligochitosan sprays on postharvest fungal diseases storage quality, and defense responses in jujube (*Zizyphus jujuba* Mill. cv. Dongzao) fruit. *Sci. Hortic.* 142, 196–204.
- Yang, L., Zhao, P., Wang, L., Filippus, I., Meng, X., 2010. Synergistic effect of oligochitosan and silicon on inhibition of *Monilinia fructicola* infections. *J. Sci. Food Agric.* 90, 630–634.
- Youssef, K., Ligorio, A., Sanzani, S.M., Nigro, F., Ippolito, A., 2012. Control of storage diseases of citrus by pre- and postharvest application of salts. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 72, 57–63.
- Zhang, D., Spadaro, D., Garibaldi, A., Gullino, M.L., 2010. Efficacy of the antagonist *Aureobasidium pullulans* PL5 against postharvest pathogens of peach, apple and plum and its modes of action. *Biol. Control* 54, 172–180.
- Zhu, Z., Chen, Y., Zhang, X., Li, M., 2016. Effect of foliar treatment of sodium selenate on postharvest decay and quality of tomato fruits. *Sci. Hortic.* 198, 304–310.

Table 1. Alternative management technologies for postharvest disease control.^a

Treatment	Fruit host	Target pathogen	Reference
Biological Control			
Yeast antagonist			
<i>Candida oleophila</i>	Apple	<i>Penicillium expansum</i> , <i>Botrytis cinerea</i>	Mercier and Wilson (1995), Liu et al. (2012b)
<i>Candida sake</i>	Apple, Grape	<i>P. expansum</i> , <i>B. cinerea</i>	Morales et al. (2008), Cañamás et al. (2011)
<i>Metschnikowia fructicola</i>	Grapefruit, Apple	<i>Penicillium digitatum</i> , <i>P. expansum</i>	Hershkovitz et al. (2013), Liu et al. (2011)
<i>Cryptococcus albidus</i>	Apple	<i>P. expansum</i> , <i>B. cinerea</i>	Fan and Tian (2001)
<i>Cryptococcus laurentii</i>	Strawberry	<i>B. cinerea</i>	Wei et al. (2014)
<i>Pichia anomala</i>	Banana	<i>Colletotrichum musae</i> , <i>Fusarium moniliforme</i>	Lassois et al. (2008)
<i>Pichia guilliermondii</i>	Apple, Kiwifruit	<i>B. cinerea</i>	Wisniewski et al. (1991), Sui and Liu (2014)
<i>Aureobasidium pullulans</i> (yeast-like fungus)	Peach, Apple, Plum	<i>Monilinia laxa</i> , <i>P. expansum</i> , <i>B. cinerea</i> , <i>Colletotrichum acutatum</i>	Zhang et al. (2010), Mari et al. (2012)
Bacterial antagonist			
<i>Pantoea agglomerans</i>	Apple	<i>P. expansum</i>	Morales et al. (2008)
<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	Tomato	<i>Rhizopus stolonifer</i>	Ma et al. (2015)
<i>Pseudomonas syringae</i>	Banana	<i>Fusarium pallidoroseum</i> , <i>F. proliferatum</i>	Williamson et al. (2008)
<i>Bacillus amyloliquefaciens</i>	Citrus	<i>Penicillium italicum</i> , <i>P. digitatum</i>	Hao et al. (2011)
Physical Treatment			
Heat			
Hot water dipping	Peach Apple	<i>Monilia fructicola</i> , <i>M. laxa</i> , <i>P. expansum</i>	Liu et al. (2012a), Spadoni et al. (2014) Spadoni et al. (2015)
Hot water rinsing	Apple	<i>Neofabraea alba</i>	Maxin et al. (2012)
Hot water brushing	Grapefruit	<i>P. digitatum</i>	Pavoncello et al. (2001)
Hot air treatment	Sweet cherry	<i>P. expansum</i>	Wang et al. (2015)
Vapor heat treatment	Table grape	<i>B. cinerea</i>	Lydakis and Aked (2003)
UV-C			
	Tomato	<i>Rhizopus stolonifer</i> , <i>B. cinerea</i>	Steven et al. (2004), Charles et al. (2009)
	Papaya Melon	<i>Colletotrichum gloeosporioides</i> <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> , <i>Alternaria alternata</i>	Cia et al. (2007) Huang et al. (2015)
Modified Atmosphere			
	Sweet cherry Peach Apple	<i>M. fructicola</i> <i>P. expansum</i> , <i>B. cinerea</i> <i>P. expansum</i>	Spotts et al. (2002) Karabulut and Baykal (2004) Conway et al. (2007), Janisiewicz et al. (2008)
Natural Compounds			
Chitosan			
	Tomato Table grape Strawberry	<i>P. expansum</i> , <i>B. cinerea</i> <i>B. cinerea</i> <i>B. cinerea</i>	Liu et al. (2007) Romanazzi et al. (2007) Feliziani et al. (2015)
Oligochitosan			
	Jujube Apple Orange	<i>M. fructicola</i> , <i>A. alternata</i> <i>M. fructicola</i> <i>C. gloeosporioides</i>	Yan et al. (2012) Yang et al. (2012) Deng et al. (2015)
Essential oil			
Vervain oil	Peach	<i>Monilinia fructigena</i> , <i>M. laxa</i> , <i>M. fructicola</i>	Elshafie et al. (2015)
Thyme oil	Avocado	<i>C. gloeosporioides</i>	Sellamuthu et al. (2013)

Lemongrass oil	Peach	<i>R. stolonifer, B. cinerea</i>	Arrebola et al. (2010)
Tea tree oil	Strawberry	<i>B. cinerea</i>	Shao et al. (2013)
Oregano oil	Table grape	<i>Aspergillus flavus, Aspergillus niger</i>	de Sousa et al. (2010)

^a There are numerous published reports on these alternative strategies. An attempt was made to list representative references, and apologize to investigators whose specific results could not be cited due to space limitations.

Table 2 - Alternative Technologies that have been developed into products.

Product	Active Ingredient	Country and/or Company	Fruit	Target Pathogens	In Use
Aspire	<i>Candida oleophila</i>	Ecogen USA	Pome Fruit, Citrus, Strawberry, Stone Fruit	<i>Botrytis</i> , <i>Penicillium</i> , <i>Monilinia</i>	No
YieldPlus	<i>Cryptococcus albidus</i>	Lallemand South Africa	Pome Fruit, Citrus	<i>Botrytis</i> , <i>Penicillium</i> , <i>Mucor</i>	No
Candifruit	<i>Candida sake</i>	IRTA/Sipcam-Inagra Spain	Pome Fruit	<i>Penicillium</i> , <i>Botrytis</i> , <i>Rhizopus</i>	No
Biosave	<i>Pseudomonas syringae</i>	Jet Harvest USA	Pome Fruit, Citrus, Strawberry, Cherry, Potato	<i>Penicillium</i> , <i>Botrytis</i> , <i>Mucor</i>	Yes
Avogreen	<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	South Africa	Avocado	<i>Cercospora</i> , <i>Colletotrichum</i>	No
Nexy	<i>Candida oleophila</i>	Leasafree Belgium	Pome Fruit	<i>Botrytis</i> , <i>Penicillium</i>	Yes
BoniProtect	<i>Aureobasisium pullulans</i>	Austria	Pome Fruit	<i>Penicillium</i> , <i>Botrytis</i> , <i>Monilinia</i>	Yes
Pantovital	<i>Pantoea agglomerans</i>	IRTA/Sipcam-Inagra Spain	Citrus, Pome Fruit	<i>Penicillium</i> , <i>Botrytis</i> , <i>Monilinia</i>	No
Shemer	<i>Metschnikowia fructicola</i>	Bayer/Koppert The Netherlands	Table Grape, Pome Fruit, Strawberry, Stone Fruit, Sweet Potato	<i>Botrytis</i> , <i>Penicillium</i> , <i>Rhizopus</i> , <i>Aspergillus</i>	Yes




Fig. 1. The multiple decrement approach to managing postharvest decay. Various approaches act together additively or synergistically to bring about commercial levels (97– 99%) of disease control. This multi-step approach may include the use of one or more of the approaches discussed in this Special Issue. For example, Action 1—reduce inoculum levels through sanitation and or careful harvesting and handling; Action 2—exposure to a wet or dry heat treatment, Action 3—application of a microbial antagonist, and Action 4—use of modified or controlled atmosphere storage and/or packaging.