## IMPACT OF MICRONUTRIENTS ON YOUNG HLB-AFFECTED CITRUS TREES



Davie Kadyampakeni and Samuel Kwakye UF/IFAS CREC, Lake Alfred, FL. Citrus Water and Nutrient Management Workshop February 15, 2023

## ROLES OF NUTRIENTS IN IMPROVING PLANT HEALTH

Justud von Liebig's Law of the minimum: The Law of the Minimum, made by Justus von Liebig, describes how plant growth is constrained by resource limitation. Plants need many nutrients to grow well. If only one of these nutrients is deficient, plant growth will be inhibited, even if all the other essential nutrients are available in abundance. This is also true for all other resources such as light, temperature and water for the respective plant species. The scarcest resource always restricts plant growth and therefore is referred to as the limiting factor!!



Figure 1. Liebig's Law of Minimum illustrated for plant growth and nutrition with a leaking barrel. Credit UF/IFAS Communications

## Interactive role of nutrients in defense

Nutritional-related effect Improving plant potential strength.		<b>Nutriti</b> r Interve nat	onal-physiological- elated action ntion in expression of ural plant defense
	Modes of nut	of action rients	mechanisms.
Elicitor-related action Activation of pathways involved in defense mechanisms, even in the absence of attack of the pathogen.		<b>Pestic</b> Inhibitic and gr	<b>ide-related action</b> on of the development rowth of a pathogen.



#### The HLB-Nutrient-Environment Nexus

# **Key Hypotheses**

- Citrus fruit yields, canopy size and development will be enhanced with a balanced nutrition approach for HLB-affected citrus.
- Root health and overall plant health and immunity are strengthened with elevated rates of micronutrients compared to current recommendations.

#### **Role of Mn in HLB Management**



*Goal:* To evaluate the effect of variable rates of Mn on the growth and development of 1-3year-old 'Valencia' (Citrus sinensis) trees on Kuharske citrange rootstock (Citrus sinensis x *Poncirus trifoliata*) under greenhouse conditions.

#### **Effect of Treatment on Height**



#### Effect of Treatment on Trunk Diameter



- Trunk diameter increased over time for all treatments in the year one
- The 2x rate increased trunk diameter by 23% when compared to trees that received 1x and 4x in year two

#### Effect of Treatment on Leaf Mn Content



- Leaf Mn concentration increased over time in all treatments, except the untreated control
- There was a linear response of leaf Mn concentration to increasing Mn application

### Pearson's Correlation of Soil Mn with B, Zn, Fe, and Cu

		HLB			Non HLB
Element	R	<i>P</i> -value		R	<i>P</i> -value
Boron	-0.76	0.0045		-0.58	0.0498
Zinc	-0.69	0.0127		-0.52	0.0837
Iron	0.49	0.1041		-0.02	0.9490
Copper	0.65	0.0215		0.33	0.3008

 Soil Mn correlated positively with Fe and Cu and negatively with B and Zn

• B and Zn seemed to be absorbed better than Fe and Cu

#### Maximum Dry Biomass and Trunk Diameter in Response to Mn Rates



- The 2x rate had the maximum dry weight compared to other rates
- Non HLB trees had an overall biomass between 5-13% greater (P <0.001) than the corresponding fertility level for HLB trees
- Mn rate of 8.9 to 11.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> was calculated as the optimum Mn level

#### **Role of Iron (Fe) in HLB Management**



Goal: To evaluate the effect of variable rates of Fe on the growth and development of 1-3year-old 'Bingo' (*Citrus reticulata*) trees on Kuharske citrange (Citrus sinensis x Poncirus trifoliata) rootstock under greenhouse conditions.

#### Effect on Fe on height, trunk and leaf for 2019 and 2020

HLB status	Fe rate	Height [cn	n]	Trunk di	am [cn	n]		Leaf Fe [	ppm]		_
	kg Fe ha⁻¹										_
HLB					201	19					
	0	35.1 ±	: 5.41 b	0.48	±	0.038	b	44.7	±	3.18	d
	5.6	62.2 ±	4.55 a	0.48	±	0.037	b	62.3	±	3.24	с
	11.2	42.9 ±	5.04 b	0.62	±	0.039	а	81.5	±	2.94	b
	22.4	62.4 ±	5.04 a	0.56	±	0.038	ab	94.9	±	3.17	а
Non HLB									_		
	0	50.9 ±	5.13 a	0.57	±	0.040	а	51.5	±	3.79	d
	5.6	41.4 ±	4.89 a	0.55	±	0.040	а	91.2	±	3.48	с
	11.2	41.3 ±	4.59 a	0.56	±	0.038	а	102.0	±	3.52	b
	22.4	48.9 ±	5.31 a	0.62	±	0.037	а	157.4	±	3.85	а
HLB					202	20					
	0	53.2 ±	4.61 b	0.62	±	0.036	b	29.2	±	3.68	с
	5.6	53.5 ±	6.07 b	0.67	±	0.039	ab	53.4	±	3.64	b
	11.2	77.7 ±	4.79 a	0.75	±	0.039	а	62.2	±	3.51	b
	22.4	65.0 ±	: 4.78 ab	0.63	±	0.038	b	75.3	±	3.63	а
Non HLB											
	0	73.9 ±	4.80 a	0.76	±	0.039	а	35.8	±	2.88	с
	5.6	63.2 ±	5.09 a	0.64	±	0.040	b	54.2	±	3.28	b
	11.2	67.4 ±	5.33 a	0.71	±	0.039	ab	59.5	±	2.92	b
	22.4	62.9 ±	4.56 a	0.74	±	0.041	ab	71.0	±	2.92	а
Sources of vari	iation										
HLB_Status Fe	erate Year	<(	0.001		<0.0	01			<0.001		
Time(HLB Sta	tus*Fe *Year)	<(	0.001		<0.0	01			<0.003	3	
Time*Time(HL	B_Status*Fe*Year)	<(	0.001		<0.0	01			0.487		

 For both years, tree height and trunk diameter were significantly different (P <0.001) among Fe rates

 A linear response of Fe was observed for HLB-affected and non HLB trees

# Relationship between Fe Accumulation and other Nutrients in Plant parts

	Part	Ν	Р	к	Mg	Са	S	В	Zn	Mn	
						r -					
Abo	ve around					HLB					
ADU	l onvos	O Sens	0 51 ns	0 15 ns	0 51 ns	0 52 ns	0 74**	0 57 ns	0 46 ns	0.58*	
	Twice	0.50	0.31 0.42 ns	0.15 0.36 ns	0.31	0.52	0.74	0.37	0.40	0.50	
	Branch	0.00	0.42	0.30	0.72	0.00	0.70	0.70	0.75	0.00	
	Trunk	0.00	0.00 ns	0.00	0.32	0.88***	0.00	0.07	0.00	_0 32 ns	
Relo	w-around	0.72	0.00	0.0	0.04	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	-0.02	
2010	Root (< 1 mm)	0.65*	0.71**	0.62*	0.68*	0.50	0.82**	0.74*	0.80**	0.80**	-
	Root (1-3 mm)	0.73**	0.49 <sup>ns</sup>	0.47 <sup>ns</sup>	0.56	0.58*	0.63*	0.67*	0.91***	0.82**	
	Root (> 3 mm)	0.26 ns	0.36 ns	0 30 ns	0.41 ns	0.3 ns	0.52 ns	0.42 ns	0.45 ns	0.64*	
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				N	on HLB					
Abo	ve-ground										
	Leaves	0.45 <sup>ns</sup>	0.13 <sup>ns</sup>	0.22 <sup>ns</sup>	0.09 <sup>ns</sup>	0.20 <sup>ns</sup>	0.87***	0.86***	0.69**	0.66*	
	Twigs	0.58*	0.29 <sup>ns</sup>	0.21 <sup>ns</sup>	0.34 <sup>ns</sup>	0.39 <sup>ns</sup>	0.48 <sup>ns</sup>	0.42 <sup>ns</sup>	-0.01 <sup>ns</sup>	0.46 <sup>ns</sup>	
	Branch	0.75**	0.67*	0.74**	0.82***	0.85***	0.92***	0.84***	0.83***	0.6*	
	Trunk	0.48 <sup>ns</sup>	0.66*	0.63*	0.40 <sup>ns</sup>	0.35 <sup>ns</sup>	0.82**	0.17 <sup>ns</sup>	0.46 <sup>ns</sup>	0.37 <sup>ns</sup>	
Belc	ow-ground										
Г	Root (< 1 mm)	0.37 <sup>ns</sup>	0.25 <sup>ns</sup>	0.24 <sup>ns</sup>	0.36 <sup>ns</sup>	0.45 <sup>ns</sup>	0.43 <sup>ns</sup>	0.43 <sup>ns</sup>	0.60*	0.68*	
	Root (1-3 mm)	0.37 <sup>ns</sup>	0.18 <sup>ns</sup>	0.13 <sup>ns</sup>	0.34 <sup>ns</sup>	0.32 <sup>ns</sup>	0.45 <sup>ns</sup>	0.15 <sup>ns</sup>	0.98***	0.85***	
	Root (> 3 mm)	0.19 <sup>ns</sup>	0.14 <sup>ns</sup>	0.08 <sup>ns</sup>	0.23 <sup>ns</sup>	0.31 <sup>ns</sup>	0.3 <sup>ns</sup>	0.26 <sup>ns</sup>	0.35 <sup>ns</sup>	0.72*	

- In general Fe had strong correlation with all studied nutrients for HLB-affected trees than for non HLB trees
- In small and medium roots, there was a strong (positive) correlation with Fe and other nutrients in HLB-affected trees

#### Effect of Fe rates on dry weight biomass

	Dry matter [g/plant]							
Fe [kg ba-1]	Total	Above-ground	Relow-ground					
	10(01	Above ground	Delow ground					
		- HL <u>B</u>						
0.0								
(Control)	$275\pm12.2~{ ext{bc}}$	177±9.7 ab	99±9.2 a					
5.6 (1x)	307 ±2.5 a	185±2.1 a	123±3.1 a					
11.2 (2x)	310±7.2 a	199±6.7 a	112±8.7 a					
22.4 (4x)	270 ±8.5 c	162±5.0 b	109±10.2 a					
		Non HLB						
0.0								
(Control)	338 ±5.0 a	209±5.3 a	128±6.5 a					
5.6 (1x)	$306\pm\!\!1.5~b$	191±0.4 b	115±2.5 ab					
11.2 (2x)	$294\pm\!0.3$ c	178±2.0 c	116±2.2 ab					
22.4 (4x)	$310\pm\!\!5.6~b$	199 $\pm$ 7.1 ab	111±0.7 b					
	Source	e of variation						
Status	<0.001	0.001	0.007					
Fe	0.155	0.168	0.304					
Status*Fe	<.0001	0.001	0.009					

- Above-ground biomass for HLB-affected varied between 33% to 44% more than belowground for the corresponding Fe fertilization
- The 1x and 2x rate had the greatest total biomass, 10-12% greater than the control and 4x, respectively

#### Maximum dry biomass in response to Fe rates



#### Effect of Foliar Micronutrient Fertilization on HLBaffected Citrus

Treatment	Fertilization rate (kg nutrient ha <sup>-1</sup> )
1 (control)	Control: Standard fertilization (S) No extra K, Mg, Ca, Mn,
	Fe, B and Zn via fertigation
2	S + (45 & 247) MA via soil + 1x (5.6) MI via foliar
3	S + (45 & 247) MA via soil  + 2x (11.2) MI via foliar
4	S + (45 & 247) MA via soil  + 4x (22.4) MI via foliar
5	S + (90 & 493) MA via soil + 1x (5.6 MI) via foliar
6	S + (90 & 493) MA via soil  + 2x (11.2 MI) via foliar
7	S + (90 & 493) MA via soil  + 4x (22.4) MI via foliar

Goal. To determine the effect of optimal nutrient concentrations on growth, fruit yield and juice quality of HLBaffected citrus trees, by supplementing the standard fertilization with foliar application of micronutrients at two citrus production sites in Florida from 2019 to 2021

MA= macronutrient, MI= micronutrient

K = 247 & 493 kg/ha

Mg and Ca = 45 & 90 kg/ha, Kwakye et al. 2022c. SSSAJ (In press)

#### Effect of treatments on trunk cross sectional area (TCSA)



A = Central Ridge (Lake Alfred) B = Southwest Flatwoods (Clewiston)

	Trt
1	S
2	S + 1 MA + 1 MI
3	S + 1 MA + 2 MI
4	S + 1 MA + 4 MI
5	S + 2 MA + 1 MI
6	S + 2 MA + 2 MI
7	S + 2 MA + 4 MI

- The control had the greatest change (%) in TCSA at the central Ridge (A)
- However, treatments 6 and 7, showed at least 6% increase in TCSA from 2020 to 2021 at southwest Flatwood (B)

#### Effect of Treatments on Canopy Volume



	Trt
1	S
2	S + 1 MA + 1 MI
3	S + 1 MA + 2 MI
4	S + 1 MA + 4 MI
5	S + 2 MA + 1 MI
6	S + 2 MA + 2 MI
7	S + 2 MA + 4 MI

- There was no effect of our treatment on canopy volume at the central Ridge site.
- 15% increase for treatment 5 from 2020 to 2021 at the southwest Flatwoods.

### Effect on Canopy Efficiency



	Trt				
1	S				
2	S + 1 MA + 1 MI				
3	S + 1 MA + 2 MI				
4	S + 1 MA + 4 MI				
5	S + 2 MA + 1 MI				
6	S + 2 MA + 2 MI				
7	S + 2 MA + 4 MI				

- Significantly different for 2020 (P = 0.002) and 2021 (P = 0.005)at the central Ridge site (A)
- For 2021, treatment 5 had a greater canopy efficiency than the rest of the treatments at central Ridge site

# Effect of varied fertilization rates on root growth at Flatwoods Site



- Root growth increased from November 2019 till February 2020 (fall / winter season).
- At the end of study (winter season), root growth had decreased again, and Treatment 5 had the greatest root growth.

	Central	Ridge	Southwest Flatwoods
Trt	2020	2021	2021
		%	
1 (S)	$33.9\pm0.6$	$22.5\pm0.9$	$18.5 \pm 1.3$
2 (S+1MA+1MI)	$16.3\pm0.8$	$20.3 \pm  1.1$	$12.3 \pm  1.5$
3 (S+1MA+2MI)	$13.1\pm0.6$	$9.1\pm0.8$	$16.6 \pm  1.7$
4 (S+1MA+4MI)	$1.5\pm0.9$	$0.1\pm0.9$	7.9 ± 1.4
5 (S+2MA+1MI)	$20.5\pm1.2$	$27.2 \pm 1.1$	$23.4 \pm 1.4$
6 (S+2MA+2MI)	$10.8\pm0.6$	$18.9 \pm  1.0$	$13.7 \pm 1.7$
7 (S+2MA+4MI)	$3.9\pm0.9$	$1.9\pm0.8$	$7.5 \pm 1.7$
	sources of	variation	
Treatment	<.0001		0.614
Year	0.060		-
Treatment*year	0.109		-

#### Effects of Treatments on Yield

- The control showed the highest average yield in 2020
- Treatments 5 showed an increase in yield of 4%, in 2021 at the central Ridge
- Treatment 5 had at least 5% increase over control from 2019 to 2021 at the southwest Flatwoods. 22

#### Effect of treatments on °Brix and Brix acid ratio



	Trt
1	S
2	S + 1 MA + 1 MI
3	S + 1 MA + 2 MI
4	S + 1 MA + 4 MI
5	S + 2 MA + 1 MI
6	S + 2 MA + 2 MI
7	S + 2 MA + 4 MI

A = Central Ridge B = Southwest Flatwoods

Treatments showed similar °Brix and brix/acid ratio within year

#### Impact of Micronutrients (B, Mn, Zn) on Growth and Yields

- Treatment plots contained ten trees where the middle eight trees were used for measurements.
- There were nine rows with each row sub-divided into four plots receiving B+Mn+Zn applications in three splits per year as follows:
- 1) standard soil B+Mn+Zn applied (control),
- 2) standard soil B+Mn+Zn applied + foliar applied B+Mn+Zn based at 1× UF/IFAS recommendations (Morgan and Kadyampakeni, 2020),
- 3) 2× foliar applied B+Mn+Zn at UF/IFAS recommendations+ standard soil B+Mn+Zn application, and 4) 2× soil applied UF/IFAS recommendations (1× = 1.12 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup>; 10.08 kg Mn ha<sup>-1</sup>; 5.60 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup>).
- Nitrogen was applied at 168, 224 and 280 kg N/ha

#### Impact of Micronutrients Canopy Size



Greater growth at lower N rates but with either foliar or soil fertilization in 2020.

Uthman et al. 2022. Plants, Plants **2022**, 11, 638. https://doi.org/10.3390/plants11050638

#### Yield Performance over Time a Function of Fertilization Rate



No yield differences as a result of fertilization rate over control.

### Conclusions and Take-Home Messages

- A Mn rate of 8.9 to 11.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, for young HLB-affected 'Valencia' trees appears to be appropriate.
- An Fe rate of 9.6 to 11.8 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> for young HLB-affected 'Bingo' trees.
- Increases observed in root growth, canopy size and yield over time for trees fertilized with elevated doses of micronutrients.
- Considerations should be made to revise and increase current micronutrient recpommendations for HLB-affected trees.

### Acknowledgments

K. Morgan (UF/IFAS SWFREC)

A. Wright, L. Rossi and F. Zambon (UF/IFAS IRREC)

T. Vashisth, E. Johnson, J. Grosser (UF/IFAS CREC)

My Lab Team Members: A. Atta, S. Kwakye, Q. Uthman, E. Esteves, W. Bandaranayake, W. Pihilla, A. Hernandez and T. Chinyukwi

Citrus Pathology Lab Members: D. Bright, T. McIntosh and K. Gerberich



Facebook: Water and Nutrient Lab At CREC Website: <u>https://crec.ifas.ufl.edu/people/faculty/davie-kadyampakeni/publications/</u> E-mail: <u>dkadyampakeni@ufl.edu</u>