

# Journal of Visualized Experiments

## A technique to screen American beech for resistance to the beech scale insect (Cryptococcus fagisuga Lind.)

--Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	JoVE51515R2
<b>Full Title:</b>	A technique to screen American beech for resistance to the beech scale insect (Cryptococcus fagisuga Lind.)
<b>Article Type:</b>	Invited Methods Article - JoVE Produced Video
<b>Keywords:</b>	American beech, Fagus grandifolia, beech scale, Cryptococcus fagisuga, resistance, screen, bioassay
<b>Manuscript Classifications:</b>	10.1.576.430: Forestry; 2.1.50.500.131.617: Insects; 7.15.602.250: Disease Resistance
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	Jennifer L Koch, PhD US Forest Service Delaware, OH UNITED STATES
<b>Corresponding Author Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Corresponding Author E-Mail:</b>	jkoch@fs.fed.us
<b>Corresponding Author's Institution:</b>	US Forest Service
<b>Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:</b>	
<b>First Author:</b>	Jennifer L Koch, PhD
<b>First Author Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Other Authors:</b>	David W Carey
<b>Order of Authors Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Abstract:</b>	<p>Beech bark disease (BBD) results in high levels of initial mortality, leaving behind survivor trees that are greatly weakened and deformed. The disease is initiated by feeding activities of the invasive beech scale insect, Cryptococcus fagisuga, that creates entry points for infection by one of the Neonectria species of fungus. Without scale infestation, there is little opportunity for fungal infection. Using scale eggs to artificially infest healthy trees in heavily BBD impacted stands demonstrated that these trees were resistant to the scale insect portion of the disease complex (Houston, 1982). Here we present a protocol that we have developed, based on this early artificial infestation technique by Houston (1983), that can be used to screen for scale-resistant trees in the field and in smaller potted seedlings and grafts. The identification of scale-resistant trees is an important component of management of BBD through tree improvement programs and silvicultural manipulation.</p>
<b>Author Comments:</b>	<p>Due to environmental conditions, scale eggs are sparse this year. We have set up traps to try to maximize collection efforts for filming, but will need to confirm they were successful prior to filming. If not, we will be unable to film until next summer (late June, early July).</p> <p>Filming has been completed, disregard.</p>
<b>Additional Information:</b>	
<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest  
Service

[NRS-04]

[359 Main Road]  
[Delaware, OH 43015]  
[740-368-0188]

**File Code:**

**Date:** August 6, 2013

Dear Dr. Singh:

Thank you for the invitation to submit our work to the Journal of Visualized Experiments. Please find our manuscript entitled, "A technique to screen American beech for resistance to the beech scale insect (*Cryptococcus fagisuga* Lind.)," attached for your consideration.

We feel that the multimedia format of JoVE is an ideal way to publish our protocol. We are frequently contacted by university researchers, graduate students, state and national forest managers requesting details of our protocol so that they may use it for their own purposes ranging from research to forest management to seed orchard development. Often we have traveled out of state to hold workshops to teach our techniques through demonstrations. In the current limited budget climate, online access to our protocol through JoVE will be an efficient, cost effective way for interested parties to learn how to perform all the steps involved in screening for beech scale resistant trees. The combination of the written manuscript with a video should give the same level of visual detail that we provide in our on-site workshops.

My technician and co-author, David Carey, has worked with me modifying and perfecting the methods we present in our manuscript for several years. We have worked side by side in the field and in the laboratory carrying out viability assays and resistance screens as part of our research identifying beech bark disease resistant American beech and developing a resistance breeding program. We have both contributed equally to the development of the described techniques and the attached manuscript.

We look forward to hearing your response to our submission. Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jennifer L Koch /S/





**TITLE:** A technique to screen American beech for resistance to the beech scale insect (*Cryptococcus fagisuga* Lind.)

**AUTHORS:**

Koch, Jennifer L  
Northern Research Station  
US Forest Service  
Delaware, OH USA  
jkoch@fs.fed.us

Carey, David W.  
Northern Research Station  
US Forest Service  
Delaware, OH USA  
dcarey@fs.fed.us

**CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:**

Jennifer L. Koch  
(740) 368-0188

**KEYWORDS:**

American beech, *Fagus grandifolia*, beech scale, *Cryptococcus fagisuga*, resistance, screen, bioassay

**SHORT ABSTRACT:**

Beech bark disease is initiated by feeding activities of the beech scale insect that create fungal entry points in the bark. Trees that are resistant to the scale insect are also disease resistant. Here we present the protocol we have developed to screen individual beech trees for beech scale resistance.

**LONG ABSTRACT:**

Beech bark disease (BBD) results in high levels of initial mortality, leaving behind survivor trees that are greatly weakened and deformed. The disease is initiated by feeding activities of the invasive beech scale insect, *Cryptococcus fagisuga*, that creates entry points for infection by one of the *Neonectria* species of fungus. Without scale infestation, there is little opportunity for fungal infection. Using scale eggs to artificially infest healthy trees in heavily BBD impacted stands demonstrated that these trees were resistant to the scale insect portion of the disease complex<sup>1</sup>. Here we present a protocol that we have developed, based on the artificial infestation technique by Houston<sup>2</sup>, which can be used to screen for scale-resistant trees in the field and in smaller potted seedlings and grafts. The identification of scale-resistant trees is an important component of management of BBD through tree improvement programs and silvicultural manipulation.

## INTRODUCTION:

Beech bark disease (BBD) has had a detrimental impact on American beech in North America since the introduction of the invasive beech scale insect, *Cryptococcus fagisuga*, in the Canadian province of Nova Scotia in the late 1890's<sup>3</sup>. This insect-disease complex is initiated when the beech scale insect inserts its feeding stylet into the bark creating small fissures that provide entryway for infection by one of the *Neonectria* species of fungus (*Neonectria ditissima* or *Neonectria faginata*). As the fungal mycelia grow, large areas of tissue may die, eventually completely girdling the tree. The damage from the disease weakens the tree, making it prone to snapping in high winds<sup>4</sup>. Mortality levels in the first wave of the disease have been reported to be as high as 50 %<sup>5</sup>. Surviving trees are often severely deformed as cankers form reducing value of the tree as a wood product. Such trees have a propensity for root-sprouting which leads to the formation of "beech thickets" that prevent other more desirable species from establishing and reduce the economic and ecological value of the stand<sup>6</sup>. Although beech bark disease is not likely to lead to extinction of the American beech, it alters stand composition and health leading to a decrease in food and habitat for wildlife<sup>7,8</sup>.

In stands affected by BBD for many years, trees that remain free of any symptoms of the disease have been reported. Artificial inoculation trials have shown that these trees are resistant to the scale insect<sup>2</sup>. Without scale infestation, there is little opportunity for *Neonectria* infection, minimizing the impact of the fungus. Large scale mortality in American beech due to *Neonectria* infection in the absence of prior scale infestation has never been reported, so resistance to the beech scale insect results in resistance to BBD.

Recent research on management of BBD has focused on the identification, propagation, breeding, and retention of American beech trees with resistance to the beech scale insect. Genetic studies have shown that resistance to the scale insect is heritable and careful selection and breeding of resistant trees can result in significant improvement in a single generation<sup>9</sup>. This finding has fueled efforts by state and national forest managers in the United States to establish regional seed orchards of resistant American beech to provide a source of genetically diverse BBD-resistant seed for restoration plantings<sup>10,11</sup>. Research has also indicated that silvicultural manipulation of stand genetics by the removal of susceptible trees and retention of resistant trees can result in stand improvement<sup>9,12</sup>.

Management of BBD through tree improvement activities or through carrying out silvicultural prescriptions requires the ability to select for and distinguish between beech scale-resistant and susceptible trees. The methods presented here have been adapted from a method first introduced by Dave Houston to artificially inoculate seedlings with beech scale eggs<sup>1</sup>. The method can be used as a screening tool to identify quantitative trait loci (QTL) associated with resistance or to distinguish between resistant and susceptible potted seedlings or grafted ramets in genetic studies. Alternatively, it can be used for screening mature trees in the field to identify resistant trees for seed orchard development, or retention in the field. Susceptible trees can be identified and removed to minimize disease impacts.

## **PROTOCOL:**

### **1. Plant material: mature field trees, potted seedlings or potted grafts**

- 1.1) For field testing, select mature healthy American beech trees that show no signs of scale infestation or disease for testing for possible resistance. Visibly susceptible trees will also need to be identified to be used as a control (Figure 1).
- 1.2) For testing potted seedlings or grafts, collect and germinate beechnuts as described in Koch & Carey, 2004 or graft scion as described in Carey et al., 2013.
- 1.3) Grow seedlings or grafts in potting soil mix amended with 47 g micronutrients, 477 g slow release fertilizer 15N-3.9P-9.9K, 700 g coarse perlite and 75 g aluminum sulfate per 2.8 cu. ft. bag. If needed later in the growing season, fertilize plants weekly with soluble 17N-1.3P-14.1K at 200 ppm nitrogen.
- 1.4) During the growing season, keep plants in shade house. Allow plants to go dormant outside in the fall prior to moving them to a controlled temperature storage facility (~4°C) from November through April.

### **2. Collection of beech scale eggs**

- 2.1) In a BBD-infested stand, inspect heavily infested trees (easily identified by their “whitewashed” appearance, Figure 1A) with a hand magnifying glass to confirm the presence of eggs, typically abundant from mid-July to mid-August.
- 2.2) Use a paintbrush to gently brush the white waxy clumps of adult scale insects, eggs and other debris, into a plastic sealable one gallon collection bag (Figure 1B). Collect from a minimum of three different trees at least 12 m apart.
- 2.3) If needed, store eggs in the sealed collection bag for up to two weeks at 4°C. Tape a small piece (2.5 cm square) of dampened polyethylene foam to the inside of the bag to prevent the eggs from drying out.
- 2.4) To separate the scale eggs (0.15 x 0.25 mm) from the adults (0.60 mm) and debris, construct a sieve using a short piece of 2' PVC pipe and a coupling to support a square piece of 250 micron nylon mesh (Figure 2).
- 2.5) Empty the mixture of adults, wax, eggs and debris from the collection bag onto the sieve and use a small paint brush to gently encourage the eggs to pass through the mesh into a glass petri dish below. Plastic should be avoided because they hold more static electricity, making it difficult to move the eggs. Eggs before and after sieving are shown in Figure 3.
- 2.6) Purified eggs can be stored in the petri dish at 4°C for at least a week. To prevent the eggs from drying out, tape a damp piece of foam to the lid and seal with parafilm.

### **3. Egg viability assays**

3.1) To assess egg viability, use a 10 cc syringe to apply a thin ring of petroleum jelly around the circumference of the bottom of a 60 mm glass Petri dish (Figure 4A).

3.2) Transfer about 100 eggs to the center of the ring, place the lid on the petri dish and seal with parafilm. Allow the sealed petri dish to remain undisturbed at room temperature for 2 weeks, or 3 weeks if eggs were stored at 4 °C prior to beginning the assay.

3.3) Hatched nymphs will become stuck in the petroleum jelly and can be easily counted, and empty eggs are easily distinguished from unhatched eggs by their color and sheen (Figure 4B). Calculate viability by dividing the number of nymphs by the sum of the empty eggs plus the remaining full eggs. Good viability should be in the 75 to 90 % hatched eggs range.

### **4. Scale resistance screening of large mature beech trees in the field**

4.1) For a quantitative test, count out 500 eggs using a dissecting microscope and using a small spatula gently sprinkle them across the center of a pre-dampened, open-cell 10 x 15 x 1.3 cm rectangle of polyethylene foam. To dampen foam, wet it then squeeze out as much water as possible. For a qualitative test, 500 eggs can be counted out and placed in a small glass vial and a “fill” line drawn that can be used to measure additional batches of approximately 500 eggs.

4.2) Place the foam pad onto the test tree with the egg side facing against the bark. Hold the pad in place with rope, string, twine or plastic coated hardware wire. Plastic or metal based material should be used rather than natural fiber materials which are more readily scavenged by wildlife.

4.3) Line the top and sides of a pre-cut 23 x 30 cm piece of vapor permeable waterproof house wrap with acetate based silicone adhesive and place it over the foam test pad. Press the edges of the house wrap to the tree to create a waterproof seal. Place nylon twine or plastic coated hardware wire around the tree and house wrap, to hold it in place while the adhesive sets (Figure 5).

4.4) Place a minimum of two test pads on each test tree, preferably on opposite sides of the bole. At each site, place test pads on at least two susceptible trees (with obvious natural scale infestation) as a control. Prior to placing the test pads on control trees, remove any naturally occurring scale insects or eggs using a firm bristled brush.

Note: Foam pads with eggs can also be placed on trees for the purpose of rearing scale eggs, which can be particularly helpful in areas where the infestation level is low.

### **5. Scale resistance screening of potted seedlings or grafts**

5.1) For testing, select potted trees with a minimum diameter of 1 cm (caliper 5 cm above soil line) that are tall enough to have at least two separate test pads placed on them. Prune small side branches when necessary to make room for the test pads.

5.2) Use a dissecting microscope to count out 150 eggs and scatter them over a pre-cut and dampened 2.5 x 7.6 x 1.3 cm open-cell polyethylene foam pad.

5.3) Affix the foam pad to seedling with the egg side against the bark, using plastic-coated wire. Wrap a small square of house wrap around the seedling just above the foam and seal it with acetate-based silicone (see Figure 6A).

5.4) Include known susceptible seedling families or grafts as controls.

## **6. Data collection**

Note: Approximately 52 to 57 weeks after placing the foam pads and eggs on the test trees, data can be collected. It is important that this is not done until after adults have begun to lay eggs so that their ability to reproduce can be determined. On some resistant trees it is not unusual to see a small number of adults establish but with no reproduction occurring.

6.1) Carefully remove the foam pad and count the number of adult scale insects established on the bark using a hand lens or magnifying glass (10X).

6.2) When the foam pad is removed, it is not uncommon for some adults and most egg clusters to be pulled off of the tree with the foam (see Figure 7). Using a dissecting microscope, count the egg clusters and adults that have remained attached to the foam pad.

## **REPRESENTATIVE RESULTS:**

Figure 6 shows a resistant seedling (C) and two susceptible seedlings (D, E) exhibiting different degrees of susceptibility. An example of what a susceptible mature tree looks like 57 weeks after the artificial infestation test was set up is shown in Figure 5B. When the foam is peeled away from the tree, it is not uncommon for scale insects and their egg clusters to remain stuck to the foam as shown in Figure 7, which is why it is essential to collect data from both the tree and the foam pad.

Figure 8 illustrates the average number of adult insects established per 100 eggs on artificially infested trees in two different stands, one in the Allegheny National Forest (ANF) in Pennsylvania and the other in Ludington State Park (LSP), Michigan. Both stands were infested with BBD and in each stand, a cluster of healthy trees was identified (LSP Resistant and ANF Resistant) and determined to be clonal based on DNA analysis (data not shown). A clonal cluster of BBD-susceptible trees was also identified at LSP (LSP Susceptible) but in the ANF five distinct susceptible trees were used (ANF Susceptible). Within and between clonal clusters, size varied with DBH ranging 2.1 to 12.8 inches. Figure 8 shows that although there is a lot of variation in the number of adults established on the susceptible trees, clear differences are detected between susceptible and resistant trees. There was less variation in the number of adults in both resistant clusters relative to the susceptible trees. In the ANF Resistant cluster, all 12 clones that were tested had no adults, while in the LSP Resistant cluster some clones had



a small number of adults. However, there was no overlap in the standard deviation from the mean of the resistant and susceptible trees at both sites.

The variation in the number of adults on clonally related trees in LSP (LSP Susceptible) is greater than observed in the ANF susceptible trees (ANF Susceptible) despite the fact that these trees are not clonal and are genetically different. Viability tests (data not shown) indicate this variation is not due to large differences in the viability of the eggs. The variation is likely due to both genetic and environmental differences and illustrates the importance of having susceptible controls for reference at every test site.

#### **Figure Legends:**

**Figure 1. Collection of scale eggs from scale-infested American beech tree.** A. Heavily scale-infested American beech tree. B. A paintbrush is used to brush adult scale insects and their eggs into a sealable storage bag below.

**Figure 2. Construction of sieve to separate scale eggs from adults and other contaminants.** A 4 x 4 inch pre-cut square of 250 micron nylon mesh is placed between a 4 inch piece of 2" diameter PVC pipe and a coupling to form the sieve.

**Figure 3. Scale eggs before (A) and after (B) sieving.** A. Mixture of adult scale insects, eggs and debris viewed under dissecting microscope after collection from tree. B. Purified eggs obtained after passing through sieve.

**Figure 4. Egg viability test.** A. Ring of petroleum in petri dish to trap nymphs after hatching. B. Form I nymph on the right of an un-hatched egg. C. Hatched eggs are lighter in color and translucent relative to opaque yellowish eggs prior to hatching.

**Figure 5. Artificial infestation of mature American beech in the field.** A. House wrap affixed with acetate-based silicone to prevent excess moisture build up on foam pad with eggs underneath. B. House wrap has been removed and foam pad peeled back 52 weeks after placement to reveal scale colonization beneath on this susceptible tree.

**Figure 6. Artificial infestation of potted American beech seedlings.** Foam with eggs attached to stem (A). House wrap covering foam (B). Foam removed after 56 weeks on a resistant seedling (C), a susceptible seedling (D) and a highly susceptible seedling (E).

**Figure 7. Adult scale and egg cluster on foam pad.** The adult scale insect is surrounded and partially covered by white, waxy frass. The smaller, smooth and shiny eggs are on top of the adult insect and inside the wax. This would be scored as one adult and one egg cluster.

**Figure 8. Comparison of the average number of adult insects established on artificially infested trees in two separate stands.** Resistant trees in the Allegheny National Forest, PA (ANF) and in Ludington State Park, MI (LSP) are compared to susceptible control trees. The

number of trees tested in each group is listed in parentheses below, and adult counts per 100 eggs applied were averaged across all trees within the group. The bar represents one standard deviation from the mean.

## **DISCUSSION:**

The critical steps required for success of this assay include performing a viability test on the eggs and the use of susceptible controls at each site tested, and with potted materials. It is also important to use more than one test pad per tree or seedling. We have found that both in the field and in more controlled tests on potted plants, a frequent source of error can be pad failure. For example, in the field, even with our modification of covering the test pad with house wrap to prevent excess moisture, water flowing down the stem can favor one side of a tree and result in loss of a test pad.

In order to obtain accurate results, it is important to score both the tree surface under the pad and the foam pad itself. In addition to adults and egg clusters, the only mobile phase in the scale life cycle called form I nymphs, may also be observed. These mobile nymphs eventually insert their feeding stylet into the bark of the tree, becoming a form II nymph. Both types of nymphs are very similar in size and appearance to the small, oval shaped eggs, while the larger adults have a more spherical shape. The form I nymph is distinguishable from eggs because it has red eyes and is moving, but this movement makes getting an accurate count very difficult. The form II nymph can easily be mistaken for an egg, especially when recording data in the field with a hand lens or magnifying glass and not a microscope. For these reasons, we recommend counting only the adults and the number of egg clusters, which we have found gives us reproducible data on the ability of a test tree to support self-sustaining scale infestation. Previous work has shown that the adult count is highly correlated with the egg cluster number<sup>9</sup>. In many cases it may be sufficient to just count adults; however, we have observed some instances where adults are capable of establishing on certain genotypes of trees, but do not produce eggs. Without the ability to reproduce, the scale infestation would not be sustainable on these trees.

An unexpected downfall of this assay when performed in the field is the attractiveness of the test pads to bears. Future modifications to the protocol should focus on using materials that may be less attractive to bears or placing the test pads at different heights. A limitation to this method of testing is that it should not be used in areas that do not already have at least a light beech scale infestation, to avoid the risk of spreading beech bark disease.

The utility of this technique is that it can be used to assess parent performance as part of a breeding program. For such progeny tests stringent criteria for scale-resistance are usually followed, allowing only one adult and zero egg clusters as criteria for resistance. Using these guidelines to select parents, the proportion of resistant progeny should be approximately 50 %, which is a considerable improvement over open-pollinated seed<sup>15</sup>. However, for land management purposes it may be desirable to use less stringent criteria for retaining trees since trees that support a low level of scale insects may remain relatively healthy.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

The authors gratefully acknowledge funding from the US Forest Service Forest Health Protection Evaluation Monitoring and Special Technology Development Programs that have supported the development, modification and application of the protocol described here to identify trees that are resistant and susceptible to the beech scale insect. We also are grateful to the Holden Arboretum, Kirtland, OH, for their continued partnership and support of our American beech resistance screening program.

## DISCLOSURES:

The authors declare that they have no competing financial interests.

## REFERENCES

1. Houston, D.R. A technique to artificially infest beech bark with the scale, *Cryptococcus fagisuga* (Lindinger). U.S. RP-NE-507. U.S. Forest Service, Northeastern Forest Experiment Station, Broomhall, PA, (1982).
2. Houston, D.R. American beech resistance to *Cryptococcus fagisuga*. In: *Proceeding, IUFRO beech bark disease working party conference*. GTR-WO-37. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Forest Experiment Station, Washington, D.C., 38-42, (1983).
3. Ehrlich, J. The beech bark disease: a necrotic disease of *Fagus*, following *Cryptococcus fagi* (Bair.). *Can. J. For. Res.* **10**, 593-692, (1934).
4. Papaik, M.J., Canham, C.D., Latty, E.F., Woods, K.D. Effects of an introduced pathogen on resistance to natural disturbance: beech bark disease and windthrow. *Can. J. For. Res.* **35**, 1832-1843, 10.1139/x05-116, (2005).
5. Miller-Weeks, M. Current status of beech bark disease in New England and New York. In: *Proceeding, IUFRO beech bark disease working party conference*. GTR WO-37. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Forest Experiment Station, Washington, D.C., 21-23, (1983).
6. Houston, D.R. Beech bark disease: The aftermath forests are structured for a new outbreak. *J. For.* **73**, 660-663, (1975).
7. Twery, M.J., Patterson, W.A. Variations in beech bark disease and its effects on species composition and structure of northern hardwood stands in central New England. *Can. J. For. Res.* **14**, 565-574, (1984).
8. Jakubus, W.J., McLaughlin, C.R., Jensen, P.G., McNulty, S.A. Alternate year beechnut production and its influence on bear and marten populations. In: *Beech Bark Disease: Proceedings of the Beech Bark Disease Symposium*. Evans, C.A., et al., eds. GTR-NE-311. U.S. Forest Service, Northern Research Station, Newtown Square, PA, 79-87, (2005).
9. Koch, J.L., Carey, D.W., Mason, M.E., Nelson, C.D. Assessment of beech scale resistance in full- and half-sib families. *Can. J. For. Res.* **40**, 265-272, (2010).
10. Koch J.L. Beech bark disease: The oldest “new” threat to American beech in the United States. *Outlooks Pest Manag.* **21**, 64-68, (2010).

11. Koch, J.L., Mason, M.E., Carey, D.W. Screening for resistance to beech bark disease: improvements and results from seedlings and grafted field selections. In: *Proceedings of the 4<sup>th</sup> International Workshop on Genetics of Host-Parasite Interactions in Forestry*. Palmieri, K., et al., eds. PSW-GTR-240. U.S. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, Albany, CA, 196-208, (2012).
12. Leak, W.B. Fifty year impacts of the beech bark disease in the Bartlett Experimental Forest, New Hampshire. *Northern J. Appl. For.* **23**, 141-143, (2006).
13. Koch, J.L., Carey, D.W. Controlled cross-pollinations with American beech trees that are resistant to beech bark disease. In: *Proceedings of the 14<sup>th</sup> Central Hardwood Forest Conference*. Yaussy, D.A., et al., eds. GTR-NE-316. U.S. Forest Service, Northeastern Research Station, 358-364, (2004).
14. Carey, D.W., Mason, M.E., Bloese, P., Koch, J.L. Hot callusing for propagation of American beech by grafting. *HortSci.* **48**, 620-624, (2013).
15. Koch, J.L., Carey, W.W. The genetics of resistance of American beech to beech bark disease: knowledge through 2004. In: *Beech Bark Disease: Proceedings of the Beech Bark Disease Symposium*. Evans, C.A., et al., eds. GTR-NE-311. U.S. Forest Service, Northern Research Station, Newtown Square, PA, 98-105, (2005).

\*Figure

[Click here to download Figure: koch fig 1 jove.pdf](#)





\*Figure

[Click here to download Figure: koch fig 2 jove.pdf](#)



\*Figure


[Click here to download Figure: koch fig 3 jove.pdf](#)





\*Figure

[Click here to download Figure: koch fig 4 jove.pdf](#)





\*Figure

[Click here to download Figure: koch fig 5 jove.pdf](#)



\*Figure


[Click here to download Figure: koch fig 6 jove.pdf](#)



\*Figure

[Click here to download Figure: koch fig 7 jove.pdf](#)





Name of Reagent/Equipment	Company	Catalog Number
Nylon Mesh Sheet, 250 micron	Small Parts	CMN-0250-D
Tyvek Home Wrap	DuPont	D1349991
Polyethylene foam, ½" thick	Columbus Foam Products	N/A
MetroMix 510	Sun Gro Horticulture	N/A
Osmocote Plus 15-9-12	Everris	E903206
Sight Savers 10 X	Bausch & Lomb	813434
Nikon Mini Field Stereoscope	Nikon	7314
Silicone II clear	GE	159538

## Comments/Description

Mesh opening size: 250 microns square, % of open area: 34, thread diameter: 180 micron, width: 24", Length: 12", Package quantity: 1

[http://www.amazonsupply.com/dp/B000FMWH1S/ref=sp\\_dp\\_g2c\\_asin](http://www.amazonsupply.com/dp/B000FMWH1S/ref=sp_dp_g2c_asin)

9 ft x 150 ft roll, can ask for it to be cut in half.

[http://www.lowes.com/pd\\_14582-2020-D13499991\\_0](http://www.lowes.com/pd_14582-2020-D13499991_0)

2 ft x 50 ft roll

<http://www.colsfoam.com/apcftp/products.htm>

2.8 cu. ft. bark, peat moss, vermiculite, bark ash, starter nutrient charge (with Gypsum), slow release nitrogen and dolomitic limestone.

[http://sungro.com/products\\_displayProduct.php?product\\_id=118&brand\\_id=17](http://sungro.com/products_displayProduct.php?product_id=118&brand_id=17)

Standard 3-4 month release.

<http://everris.us.com/product/15-9-12>

10 x magnification illuminated coddington

<http://www.amleo.com/Bausch---Lomb-Illuminating-Codington-Magnifier-10x/p/CM10/>

20 x magnification

<http://www.opticsplanet.com/nikon-fieldmicroscope.html>

2.9 oz clear window & door caulk

<http://www.midlandhardware.com/159538.html>



# ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

Title of Article:

*A technique to screen American beech for resistance to the beech scale insect (Cryptococcus fagisuga Lind.)*

Author(s):

*Jennifer L. Kolk David W. Carey*

Item 1 (check one box): The Author elects to have the Materials be made available (as described at <http://www.jove.com/publish>) via: ☒ Standard Access ☐ Open Access

Item 2 (check one box):

- ☐ The Author is NOT a United States government employee.
- ☒ The Author is a United States government employee and the Materials were prepared in the course of his or her duties as a United States government employee.
- ☐ The Author is a United States government employee but the Materials were NOT prepared in the course of his or her duties as a United States government employee.

## ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

1. **Defined Terms.** As used in this Article and Video License Agreement, the following terms shall have the following meanings: "**Agreement**" means this Article and Video License Agreement; "**Article**" means the article specified on the last page of this Agreement, including any associated materials such as texts, figures, tables, artwork, abstracts, or summaries contained therein; "**Author**" means the author who is a signatory to this Agreement; "**Collective Work**" means a work, such as a periodical issue, anthology or encyclopedia, in which the Materials in their entirety in unmodified form, along with a number of other contributions, constituting separate and independent works in themselves, are assembled into a collective whole; "**CRC License**" means the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivs 3.0 Unported Agreement, the terms and conditions of which can be found at: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/legalcode>; "**Derivative Work**" means a work based upon the Materials or upon the Materials and other pre-existing works, such as a translation, musical arrangement, dramatization, fictionalization, motion picture version, sound recording, art reproduction, abridgment, condensation, or any other form in which the Materials may be recast, transformed, or adapted; "**Institution**" means the institution, listed on the last page of this Agreement, by which the Author was employed at the time of the creation of the Materials; "**JoVE**" means MyJoVE Corporation, a Massachusetts corporation and the publisher of *The Journal of Visualized Experiments*; "**Materials**" means the Article and / or the Video; "**Parties**" means the Author and JoVE; "**Video**" means any video(s) made by the Author, alone or in conjunction with any other parties, or by JoVE or its affiliates or agents, individually or in collaboration with the Author or any other parties, incorporating all or any portion of the Article, and in which the Author may or may not appear.

2. **Background.** The Author, who is the author of the Article, in order to ensure the dissemination and protection of the Article, desires to have the JoVE publish the Article and create and transmit videos based on the Article. In furtherance of such goals, the Parties desire to memorialize in this Agreement the respective rights of each Party in and to the Article and the Video.

3. **Grant of Rights in Article.** In consideration of JoVE agreeing to publish the Article, the Author hereby grants to JoVE, subject to **Sections 4 and 7** below, the exclusive, royalty-free, perpetual (for the full term of copyright in the Article, including any extensions thereto) license (a) to publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Article in all forms, formats and media whether now known or hereafter developed (including without limitation in print, digital and electronic form) throughout the world, (b) to translate the Article into other languages, create adaptations, summaries or extracts of the Article or other Derivative Works (including, without limitation, the Video) or Collective Works based on all or any portion of the Article and exercise all of the rights set forth in (a) above in such translations, adaptations, summaries, extracts, Derivative Works or Collective Works and (c) to license others to do any or all of the above. The foregoing rights may be exercised in all media and formats, whether now known or hereafter devised, and include the right to make such modifications as are technically necessary to exercise the rights in other media and formats. If the "Open Access" box has been checked in **Item 1** above, JoVE and the Author hereby grant to the public all such rights in the Article as provided in, but subject to all limitations and requirements set forth in, the CRC License.

4. **Retention of Rights in Article.** Notwithstanding the exclusive license granted to JoVE in **Section 3** above, the



Author shall, with respect to the Article, retain the non-exclusive right to use all or part of the Article for the non-commercial purpose of giving lectures, presentations or teaching classes, and to post a copy of the Article on the Institution's website or the Author's personal website, in each case provided that a link to the Article on the JoVE website is provided and notice of JoVE's copyright in the Article is included. All non-copyright intellectual property rights in and to the Article, such as patent rights, shall remain with the Author.

**5. Grant of Rights in Video – Standard Access.** This Section 5 applies if the "Standard Access" box has been checked in Item 1 above or if no box has been checked in Item 1 above. In consideration of JoVE agreeing to produce, display or otherwise assist with the Video, the Author hereby acknowledges and agrees that, Subject to Section 7 below, JoVE is and shall be the sole and exclusive owner of all rights of any nature, including, without limitation, all copyrights, in and to the Video. To the extent that, by law, the Author is deemed, now or at any time in the future, to have any rights of any nature in or to the Video, the Author hereby disclaims all such rights and transfers all such rights to JoVE.

**6. Grant of Rights in Video – Open Access.** This Section 6 applies only if the "Open Access" box has been checked in Item 1 above. In consideration of JoVE agreeing to produce, display or otherwise assist with the Video, the Author hereby grants to JoVE, subject to Section 7 below, the exclusive, royalty-free, perpetual (for the full term of copyright in the Article, including any extensions thereto) license (a) to publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Video in all forms, formats and media whether now known or hereafter developed (including without limitation in print, digital and electronic form) throughout the world, (b) to translate the Video into other languages, create adaptations, summaries or extracts of the Video or other Derivative Works or Collective Works based on all or any portion of the Video and exercise all of the rights set forth in (a) above in such translations, adaptations, summaries, extracts, Derivative Works or Collective Works and (c) to license others to do any or all of the above. The foregoing rights may be exercised in all media and formats, whether now known or hereafter devised, and include the right to make such modifications as are technically necessary to exercise the rights in other media and formats. For any Video to which this Section 6 is applicable, JoVE and the Author hereby grant to the public all such rights in the Video as provided in, but subject to all limitations and requirements set forth in, the CRC License.

**7. Government Employees.** If the Author is a United States government employee and the Article was prepared in the course of his or her duties as a United States government employee, as indicated in Item 2 above, and any of the licenses or grants granted by the Author hereunder exceed the scope of the 17 U.S.C. 403, then the rights granted hereunder shall be limited to the maximum rights permitted under such statute. In such case, all provisions contained herein that are not in conflict with such statute shall remain in full force and effect, and all provisions contained herein that do so conflict

shall be deemed to be amended so as to provide to JoVE the maximum rights permissible within such statute.

**8. Likeness, Privacy, Personality.** The Author hereby grants JoVE the right to use the Author's name, voice, likeness, picture, photograph, image, biography and performance in any way, commercial or otherwise, in connection with the Materials and the sale, promotion and distribution thereof. The Author hereby waives any and all rights he or she may have, relating to his or her appearance in the Video or otherwise relating to the Materials, under all applicable privacy, likeness, personality or similar laws.

**9. Author Warranties.** The Author represents and warrants that the Article is original, that it has not been published, that the copyright interest is owned by the Author (or, if more than one author is listed at the beginning of this Agreement, by such authors collectively) and has not been assigned, licensed, or otherwise transferred to any other party. The Author represents and warrants that the author(s) listed at the top of this Agreement are the only authors of the Materials. If more than one author is listed at the top of this Agreement and if any such author has not entered into a separate Article and Video License Agreement with JoVE relating to the Materials, the Author represents and warrants that the Author has been authorized by each of the other such authors to execute this Agreement on his or her behalf and to bind him or her with respect to the terms of this Agreement as if each of them had been a party hereto as an Author. The Author warrants that the use, reproduction, distribution, public or private performance or display, and/or modification of all or any portion of the Materials does not and will not violate, infringe and/or misappropriate the patent, trademark, intellectual property or other rights of any third party. The Author represents and warrants that it has and will continue to comply with all government, institutional and other regulations, including, without limitation all institutional, laboratory, hospital, ethical, human and animal treatment, privacy, and all other rules, regulations, laws, procedures or guidelines, applicable to the Materials, and that all research involving human and animal subjects has been approved by the Author's relevant institutional review board.

**10. JoVE Discretion.** If the Author requests the assistance of JoVE in producing the Video in the Author's facility, the Author shall ensure that the presence of JoVE employees, agents or independent contractors is in accordance with the relevant regulations of the Author's institution. If more than one author is listed at the beginning of this Agreement, JoVE may, in its sole discretion, elect not take any action with respect to the Article until such time as it has received complete, executed Article and Video License Agreements from each such author. JoVE reserves the right, in its absolute and sole discretion and without giving any reason therefore, to accept or decline any work submitted to JoVE. JoVE and its employees, agents and independent contractors shall have full, unfettered access to the facilities of the Author or of the Author's institution as necessary to make the Video, whether actually published or not. JoVE has sole discretion as to the method of making and publishing the Materials, including,



## ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

without limitation, to all decisions regarding editing, lighting, filming, timing of publication, if any, length, quality, content and the like.

11. **Indemnification.** The Author agrees to indemnify JoVE and/or its successors and assigns from and against any and all claims, costs, and expenses, including attorney's fees, arising out of any breach of any warranty or other representations contained herein. The Author further agrees to indemnify and hold harmless JoVE from and against any and all claims, costs, and expenses, including attorney's fees, resulting from the breach by the Author of any representation or warranty contained herein or from allegations or instances of violation of intellectual property rights, damage to the Author's or the Author's institution's facilities, fraud, libel, defamation, research, equipment, experiments, property damage, personal injury, violations of institutional, laboratory, hospital, ethical, human and animal treatment, privacy or other rules, regulations, laws, procedures or guidelines, liabilities and other losses or damages related in any way to the submission of work to JoVE, making of videos by JoVE, or publication in JoVE or elsewhere by JoVE. The Author shall be responsible for, and shall hold JoVE harmless from, damages caused by lack of sterilization, lack of cleanliness or by contamination due to the making of a video by JoVE its employees, agents or independent contractors. All sterilization, cleanliness or decontamination procedures shall be solely the responsibility of the Author and shall be undertaken at the Author's expense. All indemnifications provided herein shall include JoVE's attorney's fees and costs related to said losses or

damages. Such indemnification and holding harmless shall include such losses or damages incurred by, or in connection with, acts or omissions of JoVE, its employees, agents or independent contractors.

12. **Fees.** To cover the cost incurred for publication, JoVE must receive payment before production and publication the Materials. Payment is due in 21 days of invoice. Should the Materials not be published due to an editorial or production decision, these funds will be returned to the Author. Withdrawal by the Author of any submitted Materials after final peer review approval will result in a US\$1,200 fee to cover pre-production expenses incurred by JoVE. If payment is not received by the completion of filming, production and publication of the Materials will be suspended until payment is received.

13. **Transfer, Governing Law.** This Agreement may be assigned by JoVE and shall inure to the benefits of any of JoVE's successors and assignees. This Agreement shall be governed and construed by the internal laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts without giving effect to any conflict of law provision thereunder. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which together shall be deemed to be one and the same agreement. A signed copy of this Agreement delivered by facsimile, e-mail or other means of electronic transmission shall be deemed to have the same legal effect as delivery of an original signed copy of this Agreement.

A signed copy of this document must be sent with all new submissions. Only one Agreement required per submission.

### AUTHOR:

Name:

Jennifer L. Koch

Department:

Northern Research Station

Institution:

US Forest Service

Article Title:

A technique to screen American beech for resistance to the beech scale insect (*Cryptococcus fagisuga* Lind.)

Signature:

Jennifer L. Koch

Date:

8/6/13

Please submit a signed and dated copy of this license by one of the following three methods:

- 1) Upload a scanned copy as a PDF to the JoVE submission site upon manuscript submission (preferred);
- 2) Fax the document to +1.866.381.2236; or
- 3) Mail the document to JoVE / Attn: JoVE Editorial / 17 Sellers St / Cambridge, MA 02139

For questions, please email [editorial@jove.com](mailto:editorial@jove.com) or call +1.617.945.9051.

MS # (internal use):



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest  
Service

[NRS-04]

[359 Main Road]  
[Delaware, OH 43015]  
[740-368-0188]

**File Code:**

**Date:** August 8, 2013

Dear Dr. Singh:

Please find attached the revised version of our submitted manuscript entitled “A technique to screen American beech for resistance to the beech scale insect (*Cryptococcus fagisuga* Lind.),” for your consideration for publication in the Journal of Visualized Experiments.

We have addressed all of the editorial comments by Dr. Zaman and made the appropriate changes as outlined below.

We look forward to hearing your decision.

Sincerely,

Jennifer L Koch /S/



## Editorial comments:

- 1) Editor modified the formatting of the manuscript to comply with JoVE instructions for authors, please maintain the current formatting throughout the manuscript. You can find the updated manuscript attached to this e-mail. *We used this version to make all suggested editorial changes.*
- 2) Please re-write steps 4.4, 6.2 and 6.3 of your protocol section in imperative tense, as if you are telling someone how to do the technique (i.e. "Do this", "Measure that" etc.). *These steps have been rewritten in the imperative tense.*
- 3) The JoVE protocol is reserved for actions and notes. Step 3.3 does not constitute an action by itself, therefore it should be added as a "Note:" directly below step 3.2. Alternatively, please re-write this step in imperative tense. Please also revise steps 4.5, 5.1 and 6.1 in a similar way. *Steps 3.3 and 5.1 were rewritten in the imperative tense. Steps 4.5 and 6.1 were removed as steps and instead appear as notes. Step 6.1 is not the former step 6.2.*
- 4) Please make sure that your references comply with JoVE instructions for authors. In-text formatting: corresponding reference numbers should appear as superscripts after the appropriate statement(s) in the text of the manuscript *We have changed the formatting and have used superscripts in the text to correspond to the references listed.*



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest  
Service

[NRS-04]

[359 Main Road]  
[Delaware, OH 43015]  
[740-368-0188]

**File Code:**

**Date:** January 9, 2014

Dear Dr. Singh:

Please find attached the revised version of our submitted manuscript entitled “A technique to screen American beech for resistance to the beech scale insect (*Cryptococcus fagisuga* Lind.),” for your consideration for publication in the Journal of Visualized Experiments.

We have addressed all of the reviewer’s comments and made changes when appropriate, as outlined below.

Please let me know if you have any additional comments or questions.

Sincerely,

Jennifer L Koch /S/



## **Reviewers' comments:**

### **Reviewer #1:**

#### *Manuscript Summary:*

No issues with summary or background information.

#### *Major Concerns:*

None, method appears to be fully capable of operating per intended use.

#### *Minor Concerns:*

1. Conceptual issue: The only concern I have is some American beech in areas with very high scale pressure have a very slight infestation of scale (you can find a few individual scales but no "patches" or fully mature scales). I would propose that since the paper indicates that resistance is heritable, there may be incomplete resistance possible so is there utility in briefly addressing "scale free" trees versus ones with a very tiny level of infestation for selection using this method?

*It is certainly true that there is variation in the amount of susceptibility ranging from high levels of infestation to trees that support only a very low level of infestation. To illustrate this variation in susceptibility we included examples in Fig. 6 of a result illustrating a highly susceptible tree (Fig. 6E) as well as a result that illustrates a tree that is less susceptible (Fig. 6D). In addition, the data shown in Fig. 8 and discussed in the representative results section also illustrates the range of levels of susceptibility that are observed. We feel that because the variation in susceptibility is illustrated in these two figures and because the focus of this paper is on the technique and not on how to define the differences between resistance, incomplete resistance, and various levels of susceptibility that it is not necessary to include additional discussion in the text regarding this issue. Depending on the goals of the researchers who use this technique, they may set their own guidelines on what cut-offs they use to define a resistant, incomplete resistant, or susceptible tree based on the data collected using our described technique or they may use the scale and egg counts directly in their analyses (such as in mapping applications). Our recommendation is that when considering the data, both adult counts and egg cluster counts, as a measure of reproduction (step 6) be evaluated as well as data collected from control trees that were tested simultaneously (step 4.4 and 5.4).*

2. Figure 7 arrows and labeling is confusing to me. Is the arrow pointing to "frass" actually scale wax and the small black circles the frass? *The scale wax is considered frass. The small black circles are debris, possibly small pieces of bark that have come off the tree when the pad was removed after a year, and are also visible in other areas throughout the pad that are not directly associated with the insect.*

#### *Additional Comments to Authors:*

1. Black bears may just destroy them because they are a "thing" but in funnel trapping of bark beetles, traps that have ethanol-based lures are bothered the most by bears so perhaps the acetate glue smells too good to resist and a different adhesive with less vapors could be found in areas with high bear populations. *Thank you for the helpful suggestion!*

### **Reviewer #2:**

*Manuscript Summary:*

This manuscript presents a detailed description of a technique for screening beech trees, both in the field and in greenhouse settings, for resistance to infestation by the beech scale, an essential component in the beech bark disease insect-disease complex. The authors combine a step-by-step description with a series of supporting photographic figures to guide the reader through the process. In addition, they add useful recommendations, based on their experience with the technique, which anticipate and address practical issues related to implementation of the technique.

*Major Concerns:*

No major concerns.

*Minor Concerns:*

line 47 - "impacting" is an ambiguous term which, without a modifier, could be interpreted as positive or negative. Perhaps a word such as "damaging" or "harming" would be more informative. *We have changed this line to read "Beech bark disease has had a detrimental impact on American beech...."*

line 48 - "Canada" is a very large country, and stating "to Canada" as a means of identifying the point of introduction is not useful. Perhaps you could substitute "through Nova Scotia" in place of "to Canada". *We have changed this line to specify "the Canadian province of Nova Scotia."*

line 51 - Although not critical to the intent of the paper, when identifying the pathogens causing the disease it would be more accurate to emphasize *N. faginata* as by far the most damaging agent. *N. ditissima* and another *Neonectria* species whose name escapes me at the moment are often cited as being involved with the insect-disease complex but have been insignificant in my studies and most others I have read. *Although we agree that N. faginata often outcompetes N. ditissima and results in more extensive damage, we feel that because the focus on our technique is on the scale insect and not the fungal agent that additional discussion of the various fungal species is not warranted. The way we have written line 51 is accurate, as both N.ditissima and N. faginata have been documented to be involved in beech bark disease. However, to be cognizant of the variation in infections by different species, we have changed the next sentence from the definitive statement "As the fungal mycelia grow, large areas of tissue die and eventually completely girdle the tree" to the more indeterminate "As the fungal mycelia grow, large areas of tissue may die, eventually completely girdling the tree."*

line 73 - BBD is a disease that is affecting beech internationally. Add "US" before "state and national forest managers" to identify which country you are referring to. *We have added "the United States" for clarification.*

on line 123 and in the "Table of Reagents and Equipment" the mesh opening size is stated as "250 micron", but line 238 says "200". Please correct this. *The correct opening size is 250 micron and we have corrected line 238 so that it is uniform throughout the manuscript.*

*Additional Comments to Authors:*

In my opinion, the technique is very well described and will be prove useful and essential to

anyone wanting to undertake such screening efforts. Thank you for this contribution.  
*Thank you for your helpful comments!*