

**Investigating behavior of the potato psyllid *Bactericera cockerelli* (Šulc) (Hemiptera: Triozidae) on three potato genotypes with putative resistance to “*Candidatus Liberibacter solanacearum*”**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Insect Science</i>
Manuscript ID	JIS-2019-0327
Manuscript Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	30-Oct-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Fife, Austin; University of Florida, Entomology and Nematology; Cruzado Gutierrez, Regina; University of Idaho, Aberdeen Research And Extension Center Rashed, Arash; University of Idaho, Aberdeen Research And Extension Center Novy, Richard; USDA-ARS Small Grains and Potato Germplasm Research Unit, Small Grains and Potato Germplasm Research Wenninger, Erik; University of Idaho, Entomology, Plant Pathology, and Nematology
Organism Keywords:	Triozidae, Hemiptera
Field Keywords:	Feeding Behavior, Host Plant Resistance, Agricultural Entomology

SCHOLARONE™  
 Manuscripts

1    **Investigating behavior of the potato psyllid *Bactericera cockerelli* (Šulc) (Hemiptera:**  
2    **Triozidae) on three potato genotypes with putative resistance to “*Candidatus Liberibacter***  
3    ***solanacearum*”**

4    Austin N. Fife<sup>1,2,6</sup>, Karin Cruzado<sup>3</sup>, Arash Rashed<sup>4</sup>, Richard G. Novy<sup>5</sup>, and Erik J. Wenninger<sup>1</sup>

5

6

---

<sup>1</sup> University of Idaho - Kimberly Research & Extension Center, 3806 N 3600 E, Kimberly, ID, 83341, USA

<sup>2</sup> Current address: University of Florida - North Florida Research and Education Center, 155 Research Road, Quincy, FL, 32351, USA

<sup>3</sup> University of Idaho - Aberdeen Research and Extension Center, 1693 S 2700 W, Aberdeen, ID 83210

<sup>4</sup> University of Idaho, 875 Perimeter Dr., Moscow, ID, 83844, USA

<sup>5</sup> United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, 1693 S 2700 W, Aberdeen, ID, 83210, USA

<sup>6</sup> Corresponding author email: [afife@ufl.edu](mailto:afife@ufl.edu)

## Abstract

The potato/tomato psyllid *Bactericera cockerelli* (Šulc) (Hemiptera: Triozidae) transmits “*Candidatus Liberibacter solanacearum*” (Lso) (also known as “*Candidatus Liberibacter psyllaeus*”), the bacterium associated with zebra chip disease (ZC) in potato. When disease incidence is high, ZC causes large economic losses through reductions in potato yield and tuber quality. No commercial potato variety has been found resistant to the pathogen. We evaluated host acceptance behaviors using no-choice assays on three breeding clones derived from *Solanum chacoense* Bitter with putative resistance to Lso and/or ZC as part of an effort to determine if the resistance observed in those breeding clones was related to effects on psyllid settling behavior. We also counted the number of eggs laid and nymphs hatched on the different genotypes to observe any differences in reproduction. The potato variety ‘Russet Burbank’ was used as a susceptible control. Probing frequency and female walking duration were greater on Russet Burbank than the other genotypes. Oviposition did not differ among genotypes. However, female psyllids on two of the putatively resistant genotypes displayed reduced fertility 18-24 days after confinement with a male, relative to females on Russet Burbank. These results suggest that although the germplasms display minor abiotic activity on psyllid fertility, putative resistance to Lso may be more strongly linked with resistance to the pathogen rather than effects on settling behaviors.

## 29    **Resumen**

30    El psílido de la papa y tomate *Bactericera cockerelli* (Šulc) (Hemiptera: Triozidae)  
31    transmite la bacteria "Candidatus Liberibacter solanacearum" (Lso) (conocida también  
32    como "Candidatus Liberibacter psyllaourous"), la cual ha sido asociada con la enfermedad  
33    'punta morada' (PM) de la papa. Cuando la incidencia de la enfermedad es alta, PM causa  
34    grandes pérdidas económicas ya que produce severas reducciones en el rendimiento y la  
35    calidad del tubérculo de la papa. Hasta el momento, no se ha encontrado ninguna variedad  
36    comercial de papa resistente al patógeno causante de PM. Nosotros evaluamos la  
37    aceptación del psílido de papa a su huésped mediante ensayos de no-elección en clones  
38    reproductores derivados de *Solanum chacoense* Bitter. Ya que dichos clones han sido  
39    reportados con resistencia putativa a Lso y / o PM, nosotros quisimos investigar si tal  
40    resistencia estaba relacionada con cambios en el comportamiento de aceptación del psílido  
41    a dichos clones. También registramos el número de huevos puestos y el número de ninfas  
42    producidas por la eclosión dichos huevos, esta evaluación se realizó con el fin de observar  
43    alguna diferencia en la reproducción del psílido debido genotipo del huésped. La variedad  
44    de papa 'Russet Burbank' se utilizó como control susceptible. Los resultados mostraron que  
45    la frecuencia de prueba del tejido huésped y la duración de la caminata de las hembras  
46    fueron mayores en Russet Burbank que en los otros genotipos. La oviposición fue similar  
47    en todos los genotipos; sin embargo, se observó una reducida fertilidad de los huevos 18-  
48    24 días después del apareamiento en los genotipos considerados como resistentes a PM,  
49    comparado a hembras puestas en papas de la variedad Russet Burbank. Estos resultados  
50    sugieren que, aunque los genotipos evaluados muestran una actividad abiótica menor en la  
51    fertilidad del psílido de papa, esta putativa resistencia al no se debe a la reducción de los

52 comportamientos de alimentación del psílido, sino que puede estar más fuertemente  
53 relacionada con la resistencia al patógeno.

54 **Key Words** *Solanum tuberosum*, *Solanum chacoense*, host plant resistance, tomato psyllid

55

## Introduction

The potato/tomato psyllid, *Bactericera cockerelli* (Šulc) (Hemiptera: Triozidae), is a small sternorrhynchan insect pest of solanaceous crops such as potato, tomato, cape gooseberry, tobacco, pepper, eggplant and tamarillo (Knowlton and Thomas 1934, Wallis 1955, Martin 2008, Aguilar et al. 2013). First discovered in Colorado (Šulc 1909), potato psyllids have a history closely tied to potato growing regions in North America to and to potato diseases (Richards and Blood 1973). The geographical distribution of *B. cockerelli* ranges from southern Canada to Central America, throughout the Western United States (Munyanze et al. 2007, Rehman et al. 2010, Butler and Trumble 2012) and a recent introduction to New Zealand (Martin 2008, Liefting et al. 2009, Teulon et al. 2009).

Interest in potato psyllids grew during the 1920s due to the apparent association of this insect with a condition affecting solanaceous plants known as ‘psyllid yellows’ (Richards 1928, Eyer and Crawford 1933, Richards and Blood 1973). More recently, potato psyllids have been identified as vectors of “*Candidatus Liberibacter solanacearum*” (Lso) (also known as “*Candidatus Liberibacter psyllaeus*”) (Rhizobiaceae: Alphaproteobacteria) (Goolsby et al. 2007b, Hansen et al. 2008, Munyanze et al. 2007, Liefting et al. 2009, Cicero et al. 2016). Lso is an uncultured gram-negative  $\alpha$ -proteobacterium (Liefting et al. 2009) that infects solanaceous plants. Lso is transmitted to the plant’s phloem by the psyllid’s saliva while feeding (Cooper and Bamberg 2014).

Symptoms of Lso infection in potato include stunting, swollen axillary buds, aerial tubers, leaf purpling, chlorosis and reduced yield (Munyanze et al. 2007, 2008). Infection also alters tuber sugars and phenolics, resulting in brown stripes that char and blacken when

fried (Navarre et al. 2009, Alvarado et al. 2012, Buchman et al. 2012). This condition is known as zebra chip disease (ZC) (Munyaneza et al. 2007). ZC-affected tubers are unmarketable, which results in large economic losses for growers (Rosson et al. 2006, Munyaneza et al. 2007). Yield reduction from Lso infection has ranged from 43% to 93% in some cases (Munyaneza et al. 2008, 2011).

Lso and ZC symptoms were first described in 1994 in Mexico and first detected in the United States in 2000 (Secor and Rivera-Varas 2004). Lso and ZC were first detected in the Pacific Northwest (PNW) states of Idaho, Washington and Oregon in 2011 (Crosslin et al. 2012). Since 2011, Lso and ZC continue to threaten potato production in the PNW, increasing production costs for growers (Guenthner et al. 2012, Greenway 2014, Wenninger et al. 2017, Greenway and Rondon 2018).

Management of ZC primarily targets the potato psyllid vector, usually relying on multiple applications of insecticides (Guenthner et al. 2012, Greenway 2014, Echegaray and Rondon 2017). In 2018, around half of Eastern Idaho growers' insecticide expenditures were related to ZC control (Greenway and Rondon 2018). Chemicals such as abamectin, imidacloprid, spiromesifen, thiamethoxam and dinotefuran (Goolsby et al. 2007a, Vega-Gutiérrez et al. 2008, Gharalari et al. 2009, Guenthner et al. 2012) are commonly used but, some psyllid populations are starting to develop resistance to common neonicotinoids and abamectin (Liu and Trumble 2004, Hernández-Bautista et al. 2013, Prager et al. 2013, Chávez et al. 2015). The difficulty and large expense of psyllid control emphasizes the need for alternative and improved pest management strategies such as host plant resistance to control ZC.

Host plant resistance to Lso or the potato psyllid would provide growers with a valuable tool for integrated pest management (Kogan 1988, Butler and Trumble 2012, Munyaneza 2012, Diaz-Montano et al. 2013). Even a small amount of resistance or tolerance of a plant to a vector or its pathogen can reduce damage below action thresholds and reduce pesticide applications (Kennedy et al. 1987). Host plant resistance also increases pesticide efficiency and helps to delay development of insecticide resistance (Gharalari et al. 2009). Currently no commercial potato varieties have been found with acceptable resistance to Lso (Munyaneza et al. 2011, Anderson et al. 2012).

Potatoes that have been bred with closely related plants such as *Solanum chacoense* Bitter (Rashidi et al. 2017) and *Solanum berthaultii* Hawkes (Butler et al. 2011) have shown less Lso infection and/or ZC symptoms than other genotypes tested. By determining how these genotypes resist or tolerate either Lso or the psyllid vector itself (Kennedy et al. 1987, Putten et al. 2001, Butler et al. 2011), we can decide which traits should be bred or cloned into commercial cultivars to develop resistant potato cultivars (Kaloshian 2004, Casteel et al. 2006, 2007).

We examined psyllid host acceptance behaviors as well as oviposition and egg fertility on three potato breeding clones derived from *Solanum chacoense*: 'A07781-10LB' ('10LB'), 'A07781-3LB', ('3LB') and 'A07781-4LB' ('4LB') (Rashidi et al. 2017). 'Russet Burbank' was used as a susceptible control (Munyaneza et al. 2011). The A07781 family of genotypes exhibits high tolerance and low susceptibility to Lso (Rashidi et al. 2017). This low susceptibility to Lso may be due to either resistance or tolerance to the psyllid vector or the bacteria itself. Focusing on psyllid host selection and settling behaviors such as probing,



walking and time spent on the leaf can help us understand if a plant-induced change in psyllid behavior is part of why we observed any reduction in Lso transmission and/or ZC symptoms. Our results will help to clarify potato-psyllid interactions on these genotypes, which will help plant breeders to develop Lso-resistant potatoes (Kennedy et al. 1987).

## **Materials and Methods**

### **Experimental insects**

A Lso-positive potato psyllid colony was reared in colonies with free access to both Russet Burbank potatoes and ‘Yellow Pear’ tomatoes (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.). Colonies were kept in a greenhouse maintained between 25-32°C, 32% RH, with a photoperiod of 16:8 (L:D). Colony plants were fertilized once weekly with approximately 4.5 g of 24:8:16 NPK fertilizer per liter of water (MiracleGro All Purpose Plant Food, Scotts Company, Marysville, OH). Plants were replaced as needed.

### **Experimental plants**

Potato clones were provided by the USDA-ARS, Small Grains and Potato Germplasm Research Unit Aberdeen, ID, USA. The selected potatoes were grown in cages in the same greenhouse as described above (25-32°C, 32% RH, 16:8 (L:D)). We used three sibling clones derived from *Solanum chacoense* Bitter with putative relative resistance and/or tolerance to Lso: A07781-3LB, A07781-4LB and A07781-10LB (Rashidi et al. 2017). Russet Burbank was used as control because it is susceptible to Lso (Munyaneza et al. 2011) and because of its prevalence in potato production in the Pacific Northwest (NASS Northwest Regional Field Office 2017). Plants were grown in pots of approximately 8.5 cm length ×

8.5 cm width  $\times$  9.5 cm height, with a soil mixed in ratios of 4:4:4:1 peat moss: compost: coconut coir: perlite. Fertilizer was not used on experimental plants to avoid nitrogen increases which may alter insect feeding behaviors (Pfeiffer and Burts 1983, 1984). We used plants in their vegetative growth stage (growth stage II) (Dwelle et al. 2003) for all experiments.

#### **Psyllid Haplotype and Lso Detection**

Idaho harbors four haplotypes of the potato psyllid: Northwestern, Western, Central and Southwestern as well as Lso haplotypes A and B (Dahan et al. 2017, Wenninger et al. 2017). Our lab colony was comprised of 'Central' psyllids infected with Lso 'B', verified via the methods described in Swisher and Crosslin (2014). The infection status of psyllids was verified in a sample of 40 psyllids collected from our Lso-positive colony. Each psyllid tested positive for Lso, suggesting a 100% rate of infection for the colony.

Lso incidence was determined by the analysis of Lso presence in individual potato psyllids at the Entomology Laboratory in the Aberdeen Research and Extension Center (Aberdeen, ID, USA). Forty adults' psyllids were collected from the positive colony and transferred to individual microcentrifuge tubes containing 70% ethanol. Ethanol was removed completely from psyllids before DNA extraction. DNA extraction was based on the methods described by Marzachi et al. (1998). Tissue was ground in 500  $\mu$ l of Cetyl Trimethylammonium Bromide 2% solution (Alpha Teknova, Inc., Hollister, CA, Cat. No. C2190) (Composition: 2% CTAB, 100 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0, 20 mM EDTA, pH 8.0, 1.4M Sodium Chloride (NaCl) by a homogenizer (Omni International Inc., Kennesaw, GA). Samples were then incubated at 60°C for 30 minutes and gently mixed by inversion every 10 minutes while incubating.

Tubes were centrifuged at 14000 rpm for 5min, then the supernatant was transferred to new tube of 2ml. One volume of chloroform:isoamyl alcohol (24:1 v:v) (Sigma-Aldrich, Inc., Atlanta, GA: Catalog number C0549) was added and then tubes mixed by vortex for 20 seconds and centrifuged at 14,000 rpm for 10 minutes at 4 °C. The supernatant was collected into a new 2 ml tube, then cold isopropanol (Sigma-Aldrich, Inc., Atlanta, GA: Catalog number I9516) was added at a rate of 2/3 of the volume of the supernatant. The mixture was then stored at -20°C for 30 minutes. DNA was precipitated by centrifuging the mixture for 20 minutes at 14,000 rpm at 4°C, then isopropanol was gently removed. Finally, 300 µL of 70% ethanol was added to the pellet and centrifuged for 5 minutes at 10,000 rpm. After ethanol was completely removed, the pellet was resuspended in 30 µL of nuclease-free water (Sigma-Aldrich, Inc., Atlanta, GA: Catalog number W4502) and stored at -20°C. DNA was used to detect the presence of Lso in psyllid tissue using qPCR SYBR Green analysis using a CFX Real-Time PCR System (Biorad, Hercules, CA). The qPCR reaction contained primers 150 nM of HLBr (5'-GCG TTA TCC CGT AGA AAA AGG TAG-3') and LsoF (5'-GTC GAG CGC TTA TTT TTA ATA GGA-3') primers (Li et al. 2006, 2009); 1X SsoAdvanced Universal SYBR Green Supermix (Biorad, Hercules, CA), and 1 ul of DNA template. The program cycle was as follows: one cycle at 98°C for 2 minutes followed by 40 cycles of 95°C for 10 sec and 62°C for 20 sec. The melt curve was 65 to 95 °C, with increments of 0.5 sec<sup>-1</sup>. DNA of a healthy tuber was used as a negative control. DNA of a healthy psyllids was used as a negative control and water was used as a no-template control in all tests.

## 186    **No-Choice Arena Design**

187    No-choice assays were conducted in a climate-controlled lab closet maintained at 26°C.  
188    Assays were conducted on a wire shelving unit which allowed the testing arena to be lit  
189    both from above and below. Three Smith-Victor Digilight fixtures (Smith-Victor  
190    Corporation, Bartlett, IL) were used with three Azlo (Akces Media LLC dba ALZO Digital,  
191    Bethel, CT) full-spectrum CFL bulbs per light fixture (100-240 volts, 60 Hz, color temp  
192    5500K CRI 91, 750 lumens, 15 watts). Two lights were placed with their light sources 35  
193    cm above the testing arena and the light was softened with a diffusion material. The  
194    remaining light fixture was placed so that its light source was 45 cm below the testing  
195    arena and was softened with diffusion material as well. Illuminance was 3600 lx at the  
196    surface of the arena (Sekonic L-308DC-U Light Meter, Sekonic Corporation, Tokyo, Japan).

197    The observation arena (Fig. 1) was modeled after the design described by Liu et al. (2004),  
198    but modified to use leaflets of intact, potted plants as in Butler et al. (2011). This permitted  
199    us to observe the psyllids with minimal interference to plant physiology and avoided  
200    altering plant volatiles or chemical defenses that might be activated by damaging plant  
201    tissues (Klingler et al. 2005). A recording arena was formed by sandwiching a panel of  
202    glass, a wetted filter paper, a leaf and a piece of Plastazote polyethylene foam (Zotefoams  
203    Inc., Croydon, UK) with a circular opening cut in the center (28 mm diameter). The arena  
204    was held together with two clips. This arena was then suspended by a suction cup held by  
205    an adjustable burette clamp, allowing the psyllid access to the lower (abaxial) surface of  
206    the leaf. We used leaves from the upper canopy of the plants for trials. The filter paper was  
207    discarded between observations to avoid cross contamination. The glass pane and foam

were replaced with each new plant and washed and dried at 90°C before reuse to prevent potential volatile accumulation. Recordings were done with a L3CMOS C-mount USB camera and ToupView recording software (L3CMOS14000KPA, Hangzhou ToupTek Photonics Co., Ltd, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China).

### **No-Choice Behavior Assays**

We collected psyllids from the colony using an aspirator and transferred them to 8 × 35 mm glass shell vials. All psyllids were tested within 90 minutes from the time of collection from the colony. For each experimental replicate, a single psyllid was introduced to the arena, and its behaviors recorded for five minutes. Psyllid sex was identified, and psyllids were preserved in 95% ethanol for later testing for Lso by qPCR. (see Psyllid Haplotype and Lso Detection, above). We recorded behaviors similar to Butler et al. (2011): probing, walking, cleaning and whether the psyllid was on or off the leaf. These behaviors have putative significance with disease transmission and host selection (Prager et al. 2014a,b). These behaviors were scored using CowLog3 (Hänninen and Pastell 2009), which records behavioral incidences with timestamps from prerecorded video.

### **Oviposition Assays**

Oviposition assays were conducted with the same greenhouse conditions, plants and insects as previously described. A female + male pair of recently emerged (teneral) psyllids, identified by their green body color, was introduced to a plant covered with an insect rearing sleeve (MegaView Science Co., Ltd., Taiwan). These rearing sleeves were supported over the plant using two lengths of galvanized steel wire with a diameter of 1.63 mm. Each wire was curved into a parabolic shape and each end of the wire was inserted into the soil

on opposite corners of the plant pot (Fig. 2). Plants were arranged in a randomized complete block in rows of four and placed inside mesh-covered PVC-framed cages (60 cm length × 60 cm width × 60 cm height). Plants were watered on alternating days by soaking pots in plastic trays (56 cm length × 28 cm width × 6 cm height) until the soil became saturated (approximately 45 mins).

The oviposition experiment used two different mating access periods (Period 1): six days and eight days. Period 1 involved maintaining a male and female psyllid in the same cage on a plant, after which the male was removed, and the female transferred to a new plant of the same genotype. After the mating access period, the females were transferred to a new plant of the same genotype every four days (Periods 2-4, 18 - 20 days total)

Eggs were counted on each plant after the female was removed using 10× headband magnifiers. Nymphs were counted four days, eight days and twelve days later to allow time for hatching (Knowlton and Janes 1931). Each nymph was removed as it was counted. Egg fertility percentages were calculated as the ratio of nymphs divided by egg counts for each sample × 100.

### **Statistical Analysis**

Statistical analysis was performed using R Version 3.5.1 (R Core Team 2013). Assumptions of normality were examined with qqplots and Cullen and Frey graphs from the R package fitdistrplus (Delignette-Muller and Dutang 2015). No-choice experiments and egg count data were analyzed using generalized linear mixed model (GLMM) (Stroup 2015) from the glmer function (Bates et al. 2015). A Poisson distribution and log link were used to model count data. Egg fertility was modeled with a binomial distribution and log link to account

for ratios. Behavioral models had fixed factors of plant genotype, psyllid sex and the interaction of plant genotype  $\times$  psyllid sex. Psyllid replicate (n=181) was treated as random factor. Model formula: Behavior  $\sim$  Genotype + Sex + Sex \* Genotype + (1 | Psyllid). There were not enough psyllids that left the leaf (n = 20 out of 181 psyllids) to analyze an interaction between genotype  $\times$  sex, so this interaction was excluded in the off-leaf model. Oviposition models had fixed factors of genotype, time period and genotype  $\times$  time period. Psyllid replicate was considered the random factor. Model formula: Eggs  $\sim$  Genotype \* Period + (1 | Psyllid). Egg fertility was modeled with genotype and time period (days between plant rotations) as fixed factors and individual psyllids as the random factor. Model formula: Hatch Rate  $\sim$  Genotype \* Period + (1 | Psyllid). All data were tested with Wald's  $\chi^2$  tests, followed by least-squares means with Tukey's HSD adjustments to test for multiple comparisons. Statistical significance was considered at  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

## Results

### No-Choice Assays

Overall, psyllids spent more time engaged in probing behavior than in the other activities recorded (Tables 1-5). The number of probing events observed was significantly different among genotypes (Table 1). Psyllids probed more frequently on Russet Burbank than on A07781-10LB and A07781-3LB, which did not differ from each other (Table 2). Probing frequency on A07781-4LB did not differ among the other genotypes. This effect appeared to reflect the trend of more probing by females on Russet Burbank (Table 2); however, the genotype  $\times$  sex interaction was not significant (Table 1). Probing frequency was not

affected by sex (Table 1). Probing duration did not differ among genotypes, between sexes or by their interaction (Table 1).

The number of walking events differed significantly among genotypes as well as by the interaction of genotype  $\times$  sex (Table 1). Psyllids walked more on Russet Burbank than on 10LB (Table 3). Female psyllids on Russet Burbank walked significantly more often than males and females on 10LB and females on 3LB (Table 3). Walking duration did not differ among genotypes or between sexes, but the interaction term was significant (Table 1). Female psyllids walked significantly longer on Russet Burbank than for all other genotype  $\times$  sex combinations (Table 3).

Cleaning behaviors generally were uncommon and of short duration. The frequencies and durations of cleaning behaviors were not significantly different among genotypes, between sexes, or by their interaction (Table 1, Table 4).

Off-leaf behaviors also occurred infrequently. Frequency of off-leaf behaviors did not differ among genotypes, between sexes or by their interaction (Table 1). However, the duration of off-leaf behaviors differed significantly among genotypes (Table 1). Psyllids spent more time off-leaf in the 3LB treatment relative to the 4LB and Russet Burbank treatments. Time spent off-leaf in the 10LB treatment did not differ among the other genotypes (Table 5).

Off-leaf duration did not differ by sex (Table 1). The interaction between genotype and sex could not be analyzed due to the low number psyllids observed leaving the leaf ( $n = 20$  out of 181).



## Oviposition Assays

Neither the number of eggs nor percent viable eggs differed significantly among genotypes (Table 6). However, both the number of eggs and egg fertility were significantly different by time period and the interaction of genotype  $\times$  time period (Table 6). For oviposition, this interaction effect was an artifact of calculating multiple comparisons of different genotypes across observation periods. There were no significant differences among genotypes within a given period (Table 7). For egg fertility during the last period, there were significantly more fertile eggs on Russet Burbank than 10LB or 3LB and there were significantly more eggs on 4LB than 10LB (Table 7). There were no significant differences among genotypes within periods 1-3 (Table 7). Overall oviposition (with genotype pooled) was significantly lower during period 4 than for the first period (Table 7). Similarly, egg fertility (with genotype pooled) tended to decline during the last observation period for all genotypes except for Russet Burbank (Table 7).

## Discussion

It is difficult to separate the mechanisms of host plant resistance or tolerance and how these correlate with psyllid host acceptance (Diaz-Montano et al. 2006, Butler et al. 2011). Our visual observations of settling behavior lack the precision of electrical penetration recordings used in similar studies (Butler et al. 2012, Sandanayaka et al. 2014, Mustafa et al. 2015), but require less expensive equipment. Our results are similar to those of other investigations of putatively resistant potato genotypes. Our analysis of the video recordings showed more probing and walking on Russet Burbank than on the putatively resistant

genotypes, which is consistent with results reported by Butler et al. (2011) and Prager et al. (2014b). However, in contrast to Butler et al. (2011), we found cleaning and leaf-leaving behaviors to be rare. Russet Burbank received more probes than two other genotypes, but the psyllids still probed the other genotypes, often for long periods. Sandanayaka et al. (2014) and Mustafa et al (2015) both suggest that it takes *B. cockerelli* approximately two hours to access the phloem and acquire Lso. This suggests that very long observations may be necessary to determine when probing becomes true feeding. Limited observations of overnight recordings revealed little activity besides apparent feeding on the genotype where they were placed (ANF, unpublished data). In addition, psyllids rarely abandoned the plants where they began to probe. A single psyllid is enough to transmit Lso (Buchman et al. 2011; Rashed et al. 2012) and the disease progresses independently of bacterial titer (Rashed et al. 2012). Therefore, it is unlikely that we were observing phloem feeding which would result in pathogen transmission within the span of our short observation periods. These factors underscore that psyllid probing and feeding behavior would have to be nearly eliminated to truly reduce the risk of Lso transmission. We found no evidence for such reductions in probing behavior on these genotypes.

Studies on the Asian citrus psyllid, *Diaphorina citri* Kuwayama (Hemiptera: Liviidae), a vector of a similar liberibacter pathogen (Teixeira et al. 2005) have examined how host plant volatiles can alter psyllid behaviors (Wenninger et al. 2009, Davidson et al. 2014). Plant volatiles can induce probing in combination with visual and chemical cues from host plants (Patt et al. 2011). It is possible that Lso infection alters *B. cockerelli*'s attraction to leaf volatiles (Mayer et al. 2008) and their settling behavior as well (Mas et al. 2014). Lso infection can increase psyllid preferences for undamaged, uninfected hosts for oviposition

and settling (Davis et al. 2012) – a behavior which has been seen in other insect-plant-vector relationships (Cao et al. 2016, Eigenbrode et al. 2018). In the present study it may be that this phenomenon encouraged greater acceptance of genotypes that would be rejected by an uninfected psyllid. A high percentage of the psyllids in our colony were infected and our plants were all uninfected, so psyllid infection may not entirely explain the patterns we observed. Infection status also would not explain the minor trend we saw between male and female probing on Russet Burbank.

Another possible explanation for differences between genotypes is that the female psyllids are more influenced by familiar cues while selecting host plants for oviposition or feeding (Prager et al. 2014). Russet Burbank was one of the plants used to rear our colonies, so it is possible that the volatiles from this genotype were more stimulating for female psyllids. Further studies into potato psyllid's attraction to plant volatiles while Lso positive and Lso negative can help clarify if these possible explanations correlate with host plant acceptance.

Although leaf-leaving duration differed significantly among genotypes, the incidence and duration of leaf-leaving behaviors was very small and probably not biologically significant. It is also important to note that leaf-leaving was defined in the context of leaving the leaf in our small observation arena. On a plant in the field there is a much larger surface area for a psyllid to explore, so the leaf-leaving events might represent questing behavior rather than host rejection. It also is possible that the duration between a psyllid's initial encounter and settling behaviors or eventual plant rejection is longer than the time we allotted for recording.

Contrary to previously published studies (Butler et al. 2011, Diaz-Montano et al. 2013, Cooper and Bamberg 2014, Rubio-Covarrubias et al. 2017) our study showed similar oviposition rates among genotypes, consistent with results reported by (Prager et al. 2017). Other studies have found psyllids will oviposit on a variety of hosts (Diaz-Montano et al. 2013, Thinakaran et al. 2015), even when it is not beneficial for their survival (Prager et al. 2014b). Psyllids oviposited on every type of potato offered, showing little evidence of antixenosis.

We selected the number of days for our observations to correlate with the periods of maximum oviposition reported in the life history tables of Abdullah (Knowlton and Janes 1931,) and Yang et al. (2010, 2013). Therefore, it was surprising to see the large reduction of egg fertility for some psyllids in period four (18-24 days). Fertility declined on the resistant genotypes as opposed to the Russet Burbank variety, which suggests that these genotypes may have antibiotic effects over time. Over the course of a growing season, these reductions in fertility may have a cumulative effect on psyllid populations, which could contribute to integrated pest management. Longer observation periods could help to better quantify these effects.

It is possible that Lso infection status played a role in the egg fertility observed; Lso has been reported to negatively impact female fertility (Frias et al. 2018, Nachappa et al. 2012a, 2012b, 2014, Yao et al. 2016). The evidence of antibiotic effects we observed on egg fertility of psyllids housed on putatively resistant genotypes might manifest differently for uninfected psyllids.

We saw a large degree of variability in fertility for psyllids on all genotypes. We only permitted male access to the female psyllids during the initial period to increase female longevity by preventing possible harassment (Abdullah 2008, Wenninger and Hall 2008, Arnqvist and Rowe 2013). Abdullah (2008), Yang and Liu (2009) and Yang et al. (2013) all kept female and male psyllids together to freely mate for the duration their observations, which may explain why they observed greater fertility than we did. It is possible that potato psyllids may require multiple mates and/or multiple mating over time to maintain egg fertility (Wenninger and Hall 2008, Arnqvist and Rowe 2013). Knowlton and Janes (1931) reported (with a limited number of observations) reductions in egg fertility over time after a single mating. There also may be some variability in female reproductive output created by the physiological interactions of male spermatophores, female spermathecae and/or spermatodose (Marchini et al. 2011), which all influence how long females are able to remain fertile (Qazi and Hogdal 2010, Schnakenberg et al. 2011, Wolfner 2011, Abe and Kamimura 2015).

In conclusion, we found little evidence of antixenosis or antibiosis with respect to settling behavior, but we saw a reduction in egg fertility on the putatively resistant genotypes 18-24 days after mating. Taken together, these results suggest that the modality of resistance to Lso for the A07781 genotypes (Rashidi et al. 2017) is not likely related to psyllid settling behaviors, but rather that reduced ZC symptoms may be due to resistance to Lso development itself or presence of mechanisms that limit symptom expression. Further work will be required to clarify the modality of resistance to Lso in the A07781 genotypes.

## Acknowledgments

For helpful comments during the development of this project and drafting of the manuscript, we thank N.A. Bosque-Pérez. We thank A.V. Karasev and J. Dahan for their assistance with haplotyping. We thank A. Carlson and B. Price for their statistical advice. We are especially grateful to J. Lojewski for his diligent work with the oviposition assays. We gratefully acknowledge additional technical support from L. Standley and A. Stanzak. Financial support was generously provided by the Gary Lee Memorial Scholarship, the Gary and Darlene Steiner Scholarship, the John L. and Lois K. Toevs fund and the University of Idaho as well as the USDA - National Institute of Food and Agriculture project 2014-67014-22408.

## Statement of Author Contributions

Austin N. Fife: Collected data, performed statistical analyses, helped write the manuscript

Arash Rashed: Helped write the manuscript, provided psyllid haplotypes, assisted with molecular analysis, provided funding

Karin Cruzado: Tested psyllid haplotypes, assisted with molecular analysis

Richard G. Novy: Helped write the manuscript, developed A07781 breeding clones and provided plant materials, helped write the manuscript

Erik J. Wenninger: Conceived and designed the experiments, helped write the manuscript, provided funding

422

423 **References Cited**424 **Abdullah, N. M. H. 2008.** Life history of the potato psyllid *Bactericera cockerelli*

425 (Homoptera: Psyllidae) in controlled environments agriculture in Arizona. Afr. J.

426 Agric. Res. 3: 60–67.

427 **Abe, J., and Y. Kamimura. 2015.** Sperm economy between female mating frequency and

428 male ejaculate allocation. Am. Nat. 185: 406–416.

429 **Aguilar, E., V. G. Sengoda, B. Bextine, K. F. McCue, and J. E. Munyaneza. 2013.** First430 report of "*Candidatus Liberibacter solanacearum*" on tobacco in Honduras. Plant Dis.

431 97: 1376–1376.

432 **Alvarado, V. Y., D. Odokonyero, O. Duncan, T. E. Mirkov, and H. B. Scholthof. 2012.**

433 Molecular and physiological properties associated with zebra complex disease in

434 potatoes and its relation with *Candidatus Liberibacter* contents in psyllid vectors.

435 PLoS ONE. 7: e37345.

436 **Anderson, J. A. D., G. P. Walker, P. A. Alspach, M. Jeram, and P. J. Wright. 2012.**437 Assessment of susceptibility to zebra chip and *Bactericera cockerelli* of selected

438 potato cultivars under different insecticide regimes in New Zealand. Am. J. Potato

439 Res. 90: 58–65.

440 **Arnqvist, G., and L. Rowe. 2005.** Sexual conflict (Monographs in Behavior and Ecology).

441 Princeton University Press (New Jersey).

- 442 **Bates, D., M. Mächler, B. Bolker, and S. Walker. 2015.** Fitting linear mixed-effects models  
443 using lme4. J. Stat. Softw. 67.
- 444 **Buchman, J. L., T. W. Fisher, V. G. Sengoda, and J. E. Munyaneza. 2012.** Zebra chip  
445 progression: From inoculation of potato plants with *Liberibacter* to development of  
446 disease symptoms in tubers. Am. J. Potato Res. 89: 159–168.
- 447 **Buchman, J. L., V. G. Sengoda, and J. E. Munyaneza. 2011.** Vector transmission efficiency  
448 of *Liberibacter* by *Bactericera cockerelli* (Hemiptera: Triozidae) in zebra chip potato  
449 disease: Effects of psyllid life stage and inoculation access period. J. Econ. Entomol.  
450 104: 1486–1495.
- 451 **Butler, C. D., B. Gonzalez, K. L. Manjunath, R. F. Lee, R. G. Novy, J. C. Miller, and J. T.**  
452 **Trumble. 2011.** Behavioral responses of adult potato psyllid, *Bactericera cockerelli*  
453 (Hemiptera: Triozidae), to potato germplasm and transmission of *Candidatus*  
454 *Liberibacter psyllae*. Crop Prot. 30: 1233–1238.
- 455 **Butler, C. D., and J. T. Trumble. 2012.** The potato psyllid, *Bactericera cockerelli* (Šulc)  
456 (Hemiptera: Triozidae): Life history, relationship to plant diseases, and management  
457 strategies. Terrestrial arthropod reviews. 5: 87–111.
- 458 **Butler, C. D., G. P. Walker, and J. T. Trumble. 2012.** Feeding disruption of potato psyllid,  
459 *Bactericera cockerelli*, by imidacloprid as measured by electrical penetration graphs.  
460 Entomol. Exp. Appl. 142: 247–257.



- 461 **Cao, H., H. Liu, Z. Zhang, and T. Liu. 2016.** The green peach aphid *Myzus persicae* perform  
462 better on pre-infested chinese cabbage *Brassica pekinensis* by enhancing host plant  
463 nutritional quality. *Sci. Rep.* 6.
- 464 **Casteel, C. L., L. L. Walling, and T. D. Paine. 2006.** Behavior and biology of the tomato  
465 psyllid, *Bactericera cockerelli*, in response to the mi-1.2 gene. *Entomol. Exp. Appl.*  
466 121: 67–72.
- 467 **Casteel, C. L., L. L. Walling, and T. D. Paine. 2007.** Effect of mi-1.2 gene in natal host  
468 plants on behavior and biology of the tomato psyllid *Bactericera cockerelli* (Sulc)  
469 (Hemiptera: Psyllidae). *J. Entomol. Sci.* 42: 155–162.
- 470 **Chávez, E. C., O. H. Bautista, J. L. Flores, L. A. Uribe, and Y. M. O. Fuentes. 2015.**  
471 Insecticide-resistance ratios of three populations of *Bactericera cockerelli*  
472 (Hemiptera: Psylloidea: Triozidae) in regions of northern Mexico. *Fla. Entomol.* 98:  
473 950–953.
- 474 **Cicero, J. M., T. W. Fisher, and J. K. Brown. 2016.** Localization of “*Candidatus Liberibacter*  
475 *solanacearum*” and evidence for surface appendages in the potato psyllid vector.  
476 *Phytopathology.* 106: 142–154.
- 477 **Cooper, W. R., and J. B. Bamberg. 2014.** Variation in *Bactericera cockerelli* (Hemiptera:  
478 Triozidae) oviposition, survival, and development on *Solanum bulbocastanum*  
479 germplasm. *Am. J. Potato Res.* 91: 532–537.

- 480 **Crosslin, J. M., H. Lin, and J. E. Munyaneza. 2011.** Detection of “*Candidatus* Liberibacter  
481 solanacearum” in the potato psyllid, *Bactericera cockerelli* (Sulc), by conventional  
482 and real-time PCR. Southwest. Entomol. 36: 125–135.
- 483 **Crosslin, J. M., N. Olsen, and P. Nolte. 2012.** First report of zebra chip disease and  
484 *Candidatus* Liberibacter solanacearum on potatoes in Idaho. Plant Dis. 96: 453–453.
- 485 **Dahan, J., E. J. Wenninger, B. Thompson, S. Eid, N. Olsen, and A. V. Karasev. 2017.**  
486 Relative abundance of potato psyllid haplotypes in southern Idaho potato fields  
487 during 2012 to 2015, and incidence of “*Candidatus* Liberibacter solanacearum”  
488 causing zebra chip disease. Plant Dis. 101: 822–829.
- 489 **Davidson, M. M., R. C. Butler, N. M. Taylor, M. C. Nielsen, C. E. Sansom, and N. B. Perry.**  
490 **2014.** A volatile compound, 2-undecanone, increases walking, but not flying, tomato  
491 potato psyllid movement toward an odour source. New Zealand plant protection.  
492 67: 184–190.
- 493 **Davis, T. S., D. R. Horton, J. E. Munyaneza, and P. J. Landolt. 2012.** Experimental  
494 infection of plants with an herbivore-associated bacterial endosymbiont influences  
495 herbivore host selection behavior. PLoS ONE. 7: e49330.
- 496 **Delignette-Muller, M. L., and C. Dutang. 2015.** fitdistrplus: An R package for fitting  
497 distributions. J. Stat. Softw. 64.
- 498 **Diaz-Montano, J., J. C. Reese, W. T. Schapaugh, and L. R. Campbell. 2006.**  
499 Characterization of antibiosis and antixenosis to the soybean aphid (Hemiptera:  
500 Aphididae) in several soybean genotypes. J. Econ. Entomol. 99: 1884–1889.

- 501 **Diaz-Montano, J., B. G. Vindiola, N. Drew, R. G. Novy, J. C. Miller, and J. T. Trumble.**  
502 **2013.** Resistance of selected potato genotypes to the potato psyllid (Hemiptera:  
503 Triozidae). *Am. J. Potato Res.* 91: 363–367.
- 504 **Dwelle, R. B., J. M. Alvarez, P. Bain, C. R. Baird, E. J. Bechinski, W. H. Bohl, D. L. Corsini,**  
505 **C. V. Eberlein, L. L. Ewing, B. F. Finnigan, B. D. Geary, J. F. Guenthner, S. L. Hafez,**  
506 **P. J. S. Hutchinson, W. B. Jones, B. A. King, G. E. Kleinkopf, J. S. Miller, P. Nolte, R.**  
507 **Novy, N. Olsen, S. Palanisamy, P. E. Patterson, L. E. Sandvol, R. L. Stoltz, D. T.**  
508 **Westermann, and J. C. Whitmore. 2003.** Potato production systems, pp. 12–14. *In.*  
509 *The University of Idaho agricultural communications.*
- 510 **Echegaray, E. R., and S. I. Rondon. 2017.** Incidence of *Bactericera cockerelli* (Hemiptera:  
511 Triozidae) under different pesticide regimes in the lower Columbia Basin. *J. Econ.*  
512 *Entomol.* 110: 1639–1647.
- 513 **Eigenbrode, S. D., N. A. Bosque-Pérez, and T. S. Davis. 2018.** Insect-borne plant  
514 pathogens and their vectors: Ecology, evolution, and complex interactions. *Annu.*  
515 *Rev. Entomol.* 63: 169–191.
- 516 **Eyer, J. R., and R. F. Crawford. 1933.** Observations on the feeding habits of the potato  
517 psyllid (*Paratrioza cockerelli* Sulc.) and the pathological history of the "psyllid  
518 yellows" which it produces. *J. Econ. Entomol.* 26: 846–850.
- 519 **Frias, A. A. T., F. Ibanez, A. Mendoza, W. M. de Carvalho Nunes, and C. Tamborindeguy.**  
520 **2018.** Effects of "*Candidatus Liberibacter solanacearum*" (haplotype b) on  
521 *Bactericera cockerelli* fitness and vitellogenesis. *Insect Sci.*

- 522 **Gharalari, A. H., C. Nansen, D. S. Lawson, J. Gilley, J. E. Munyaneza, and K. Vaughn.**  
523 **2009.** Knockdown mortality, repellency, and residual effects of insecticides for  
524 control of adult *Bactericera cockerelli* (Hemiptera: Psyllidae). J. Econ. Entomol. 102:  
525 1032–1038.
- 526 **Goolsby, J. A., J. Adamczyk, B. Bextine, D. Lin, J. E. Munyaneza, and G. Bester. 2007a.**  
527 Development of an IPM program for management of the potato psyllid to reduce  
528 incidence of zebra chip disorder in potatoes. Subtropical Plant Science. 59: 85–94.
- 529 **Goolsby, J. A., B. Bextine, J. E. Munyaneza, M. Setamou, J. Adamczyk, and G. Bester.**  
530 **2007b.** Seasonal abundance of sharpshooters, leafhoppers, and psyllids associated  
531 with potatoes affected by zebra chip disorder. Subtropical Plant Science. 59: 15–23.
- 532 **Greenway, G. 2014.** Economic impact of zebra chip control costs on grower returns in  
533 seven US states. Am. J. Potato Res. 91: 714–719.
- 534 **Greenway, G. A., and S. Rondon. 2018.** Economic impacts of zebra chip in Idaho, Oregon,  
535 and Washington. Am. J. Potato Res.
- 536 **Guenthner, J., J. Goolsby, and G. Greenway. 2012.** Use and cost of insecticides to control  
537 potato psyllids and zebra chip on potatoes. Southwest. Entomol. 37: 263–270.
- 538 **Hansen, A. K., J. T. Trumble, R. Stouthamer, and T. D. Paine. 2008.** A new  
539 huanglongbing species, "*Candidatus Liberibacter psyllaeus*," found to infect  
540 tomato and potato, is vectored by the psyllid (*Bactericera cockerelli*) (Sulc). Appl.  
541 Environ. Microbiol. 74: 5862–5865.

- 542 **Hänninen, L., and M. Pastell. 2009.** CowLog: Open-source software for coding behaviors  
543 from digital video. *Behav. Res. Methods.* 41: 472–476.
- 544 **Hernández-Bautista, O., E. Cerna-Chávez, J. Landeros-Flores, Y. Ochoa-Fuentes, J.**  
545 **Chacón-Hernández, and S. Castillo-Arriaga. 2013.** Resistance proportion of  
546 *Bactericera cockerelli* (Sulc) in regions from Villa de Arista, San Luis Potosí and  
547 Saltillo, Coahuila. *Entomología mexicana.*
- 548 **Kaloshian, I. 2004.** Gene-for-gene disease resistance: Bridging insect pest and pathogen  
549 defense. *J. Chem. Ecol.* 30: 2419–2438.
- 550 **Kennedy, G. G., F. Gould, O. M. B. Deponti, and R. E. Stinner. 1987.** Ecological,  
551 agricultural, genetic, and commercial considerations in the deployment of insect-  
552 resistant germplasm. *Environ. Entomol.* 16: 327–338.
- 553 **Klingler, J., R. Creasy, L. Gao, R. M. Nair, A. S. Calix, H. S. Jacob, O. R. Edwards, and K. B.**  
554 **Singh. 2005.** Aphid resistance in *Medicago truncatula* involves antixenosis and  
555 phloem-specific, inducible antibiosis, and maps to a single locus flanked by NBS-LRR  
556 resistance gene analogs. *Plant Physiol.* 137: 1445–1455.
- 557 **Knowlton, G. F., and M. J. Janes. 1931.** Studies on the biology of *Paratrioza cockerelli*  
558 (Sulc). *Ann. Entomol. Soc. Am.* 24: 283–292.
- 559 **Knowlton, G. F., and W. L. Thomas. 1934.** Host plants of the potato psyllid. *J. Econ.*  
560 *Entomol.* 27: 547–549.
- 561 **Kogan, M. 1988.** Integrated pest management theory and practice. *Entomol. Exp. Appl.* 49:  
562 59–70.

- 563 **Levy, J., A. Ravindran, D. Gross, C. Tamborindeguy, and E. Pierson. 2011.** Translocation  
564 of "*Candidatus Liberibacter solanacearum*", the zebra chip pathogen, in potato and  
565 tomato. *Phytopathology*. 101: 1285–1291.
- 566 **Li, W., J. A. Abad, R. D. French-Monar, R. J., A. Wen, N. C. Gudmestad, G. A. Secor, I. M.**  
567 **Lee, Y. Duan, and L. Levy. 2009.** Multiplex real-time PCR for detection,  
568 identification and quantification of "*Candidatus Liberibacter solanacearum*" in  
569 potato plants with zebra chip. *J. Microbiol. Methods*. 78: 59–65.
- 570 **Li, W., J. S. Hartung, and L. Levy. 2006.** Quantitative real-time PCR for detection and  
571 identification of *Candidatus Liberibacter* species associated with citrus  
572 huanglongbing. *J. Microbiol. Methods*. 66: 104–115.
- 573 **Liefting, L. W., B. S. Weir, S. R. Pennycook, and G. R. G. Clover. 2009.** '*Candidatus*  
574 *Liberibacter solanacearum*', associated with plants in the family Solanaceae. *Int. J.*  
575 *Syst. Evol. Microbiol.* 59: 2274–2276.
- 576 **Lin, H., H. Doddapaneni, J. E. Munyaneza, E. L. Civerolo, V. G. Sengoda, J. L. Buchman,**  
577 **and D. C. Stenger. 2009.** Molecular characterization and phylogenetic analysis of  
578 16S rRNA from a new "*Candidatus Liberibacter*" strain associated with zebra chip  
579 disease of potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.) and the potato psyllid (*Bactericera*  
580 *cockerelli* Sulc). *J. Plant Pathol.* 91: 215–219.
- 581 **Liu, D., and J. T. Trumble. 2004.** Tomato psyllid behavioral responses to tomato plant  
582 lines and interactions of plant lines with insecticides. *J. Econ. Entomol.* 97: 1078–  
583 1085.

- 584 **Marchini, D., G. D. Bene, R. Viscuso, and R. Dallai. 2011.** Sperm storage by  
585 spermatodoses in the spermatheca of *Trioza alacris* (Flor, 1861) Hemiptera,  
586 Psylloidea, Triozidae: A structural and ultrastructural study. J. Morphol. 273: 195–  
587 210.
- 588 **Martin, N. A. 2008.** Host plants of the potato/tomato psyllid: A cautionary tale. The Weta.  
589 35: 12–16.
- 590 **Marzachi, C., F. Beratti, and D. Bosco. 1998.** Direct PCR detection of phytoplasmas in  
591 experimentally infected insects. Ann. Appl. Biol. 133: 45–54.
- 592 **Mas, F., J. Vereijssen, and D. M. Suckling. 2014.** Influence of the pathogen *Candidatus*  
593 *Liberibacter solanacearum* on tomato host plant volatiles and psyllid vector  
594 settlement. J. Chem. Ecol. 40: 1197–1202.
- 595 **Mayer, C. J., A. Vilcinskis, and J. Gross. 2008.** Phytopathogen lures its insect vector by  
596 altering host plant odor. J. Chem. Ecol. 34: 1045–1049.
- 597 **Munyaneza, J. E. 2012.** Zebra chip disease of potato: Biology, epidemiology, and  
598 management. Am. J. Potato Res. 89: 329–350.
- 599 **Munyaneza, J. E., J. L. Buchman, V. G. Sengoda, T. W. Fisher, and C. C. Pearson. 2011.**  
600 Susceptibility of selected potato varieties to zebra chip potato disease. Am. J. Potato  
601 Res. 88: 435–440.
- 602 **Munyaneza, J. E., J. L. Buchman, J. E. Upton, J. A. Goolsby, J. M. Crosslin, G. Bester, G. P.**  
603 **Miles, and V. G. Sengoda. 2008.** Main content area impact of different potato

- 604           psyllid populations on zebra chip disease incidence, severity, and potato yield.  
605           Subtropical plant science. 60: 27–37.
- 606   **Munyaneza, J. E., J. M. Crosslin, and J. E. Upton. 2007.** Association of *Bactericera*  
607           *cockerelli* (Homoptera: Psyllidae) with 'zebra chip,' a new potato disease in  
608           southwestern United States and Mexico. J. Econ. Entomol. 100: 656–663.
- 609   **Murphy, A. F., S. I. Rondon, and A. S. Jensen. 2012.** First report of potato psyllids,  
610           *Bactericera cockerelli*, overwintering in the Pacific Northwest. Am. J. Potato Res. 90:  
611           294–296.
- 612   **Mustafa, T., D. R. Horton, W. R. Cooper, K. D. Swisher, R. S. Zack, H. R. Pappu, and J. E.**  
613           **Munyaneza. 2015.** Use of electrical penetration graph technology to examine  
614           transmission of "*Candidatus Liberibacter solanacearum*" to potato by three  
615           haplotypes of potato psyllid (*Bactericera cockerelli*; (Hemiptera: Triozidae). PLoS  
616           ONE. 10: e0138946.
- 617   **Nachappa, P., J. Levy, and C. Tamborindeguy. 2012a.** Transcriptome analyses of  
618           *Bactericera cockerelli* adults in response to "*Candidatus Liberibacter solanacearum*"  
619           infection. Mol. Genet. Genomics. 287: 803–817.
- 620   **Nachappa, P., A. A. Shapiro, and C. Tamborindeguy. 2012b.** Effect of "*Candidatus*  
621           *Liberibacter solanacearum*" on fitness of its insect vector, *Bactericera cockerelli*  
622           (Hemiptera: Triozidae), on tomato. Phytopathology. 102: 41–46.



- 623 **Nachappa, P. J. Levy, E. Pierson, and C. Tamborindeguy. 2014.** Correlation between  
624 "*Candidatus Liberibacter solanacearum*" infection levels and fecundity in its psyllid  
625 vector. *J. Invertebr. Pathol.* 115: 55–61.
- 626 **NASS Northwest Regional Field Office, U. S. D. A. 2017.** Potato size and grade summary –  
627 2017 crop. United States Department of Agriculture - National Agricultural Statistics  
628 Service.
- 629 **Navarre, D. A., R. Shakya, J. Holden, and J. M. Crosslin. 2009.** LC-MS analysis of phenolic  
630 compounds in tubers showing zebra chip symptoms. *Am. J. Potato Res.* 86: 88–95.
- 631 **Patt, J. M., W. G. Meikle, A. Mafra-Neto, M. Sétamou, R. Mangan, C. Yang, N. Malik, and J.**  
632 **J. Adamczyk. 2011.** Multimodal cues drive host-plant assessment in asian citrus  
633 psyllid (*Diaphorina citri*). *Environ. Entomol.* 40: 1494–1502.
- 634 **Pfeiffer, D. G., and E. C. Burts. 1983.** Effect of tree fertilization on numbers and  
635 development of pear psylla (Homoptera: Psyllidae) and on fruit damage. *Environ.*  
636 *Entomol.* 12: 895–901.
- 637 **Pfeiffer, D. G., and E. C. Burts. 1984.** Effect of tree fertilization on protein and free amino  
638 acid content and feeding rate of pear psylla (Homoptera: Psyllidae). *Environ.*  
639 *Entomol.* 13: 1487–1490.
- 640 **Prager, S. M., I. Esquivel, and J. T. Trumble. 2014a.** Factors influencing host plant choice  
641 and larval performance in *Bactericera cockerelli*. *PLoS ONE.* 9: e94047.

- 642 **Prager, S. M., O. M. Lewis, J. Michels, and C. Nansen. 2014b.** The influence of maturity  
643 and variety of potato plants on oviposition and probing of *Bactericera cockerelli*  
644 (Hemiptera: Triozidae). *Environ. Entomol.* 43: 402–409.
- 645 **Prager, S. M., B. Vindiola, G. S. Kund, F. J. Byrne, and J. T. Trumble. 2013.**  
646 Considerations for the use of neonicotinoid pesticides in management of *Bactericera*  
647 *cockerelli* (Šulk) (Hemiptera: Triozidae). *Crop Prot.* 54: 84–91.
- 648 **Prager, S. M., C. M. Wallis, M. Jones, R. Novy, and J. T. Trumble. 2017.** Examining the  
649 potential role of foliar chemistry in imparting potato germplasm tolerance to potato  
650 psyllid, green peach aphid, and zebra chip disease. *J. Econ. Entomol.* 111: 327–336.
- 651 **Putten, W. H. V. der, L. E. M. Vet, J. A. Harvey, and F. L. Wäckers. 2001.** Linking above -  
652 and belowground multitrophic interactions of plants, herbivores, pathogens, and  
653 their antagonists. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution.* 16: 547–554.
- 654 **Qazi, M. C. B., and L. Hogdal. 2010.** Hold on: Females modulate sperm depletion from  
655 storage sites in the fly *drosophila melanogaster*. *J. Insect Physiol.* 56: 1332–1340.
- 656 **Rashed, A., T. D. Nash, L. Paetzold, F. Workneh, and C. M. Rush. 2012.** Transmission  
657 efficiency of “*Candidatus Liberibacter solanacearum*” and potato zebra chip disease  
658 progress in relation to pathogen titer, vector numbers, and feeding sites.  
659 *Phytopathology.* 102: 1079–1085.
- 660 **Rashidi, M., R. G. Novy, C. M. Wallis, and A. Rashed. 2017.** Characterization of host plant  
661 resistance to zebra chip disease from species-derived potato genotypes and the  
662 identification of new sources of zebra chip resistance. *PLoS ONE.* 12: e0183283.

- 663 **R Core Team. 2013.** R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R foundation  
664 for statistical computing, Vienna, Austria.
- 665 **Rehman, M., J. C. Melgar, C. J. M. Rivera, A. M. Idris, and J. K. Brown. 2010.** First report  
666 of "*Candidatus* Liberibacter psyllae" or "*ca.* Liberibacter solanacearum"  
667 associated with severe foliar chlorosis, curling, and necrosis and tuber discoloration  
668 of potato plants in Honduras. Plant Dis. 94: 376–376.
- 669 **Richards, B. L. 1928.** A new and destructive disease of the potato in Utah and its relation  
670 to the potato psylla. Phytopathology. 18.
- 671 **Richards, H. L., and H. L. Blood. 1973.** Psyllid yellows of the potato. Readings in insect-  
672 plant disease relationships. 46: 139.
- 673 **Rosson, P., M. Niemeyer, M. Palma, and L. Ribera. 2006.** Economic impacts of zebra  
674 chips on the Texas potato industry. Center for North American studies, department  
675 of agricultural economics, Texas A&M university, College Station, TX.
- 676 **Rubio-Covarrubias, O. A., M. A. Cadena-Hinojosa, S. M. Prager, C. M. Wallis, and J. T.**  
677 **Trumble. 2017.** Characterization of the tolerance against zebra chip disease in  
678 tubers of advanced potato lines from Mexico. Am. J. Potato Res. 94: 342–356.
- 679 **Sandanayaka, W. R. M., A. Moreno, L. K. Tooman, N. E. M. Page-Weir, and A. Fereres.**  
680 **2014.** Stylet penetration activities linked to the acquisition and inoculation of  
681 *Candidatus* Liberibacter solanacearum by its vector tomato potato psyllid. Entomol.  
682 Exp. Appl. 151: 170–181.

- 683 **Schnakenberg, S. L., W. R. Matias, and M. L. Siegal. 2011.** Sperm-storage defects and live  
684 birth in *drosophila* females lacking spermathecal secretory cells. PLoS Biology. 9.
- 685 **Secor, G. A., and V. V. Rivera-Varas. 2004.** Emerging diseases of cultivated potato and  
686 their impact on latin america. Revista Latinoamericana de la Papa (Suplemento). 1:  
687 1–8.
- 688 **Stroup, W. W. 2015.** Rethinking the analysis of non-normal data in plant and soil science.  
689 Agron. J. 107: 811.
- 690 **Swisher, K. D., and J. M. Crosslin. 2014.** Restriction digestion method for haplotyping the  
691 potato psyllid, *Bactericera cockerelli*. Southwest. Entomol. 39: 49–56.
- 692 **Šulc, K. 1909.** *Trioza cockerelli* n. Sp., a novelty from North America, being also of economic  
693 importance. Acta Societatis Entomologicae Bohemiae. 6: 102–108.
- 694 **Teixeira, D. do C., C. Saillard, S. Eveillard, J. L. Danet, P. I. da Costa, A. J. Ayres, and J.**  
695 **Brové. 2005.** '*Candidatus Liberibacter americanus*', associated with citrus  
696 huanglongbing (greening disease) in Sao Paulo State, Brazil. Int. J. Syst. Evol.  
697 Microbiol. 55: 1857–1862.
- 698 **Teulon, D. A. J., P. J. Workman, K. L. Thomas, and M. C. Nielsen. 2009.** *Bactericera*  
699 *cockerelli*: Incursion, dispersal and current distribution on vegetable crops in New  
700 Zealand. New Zealand Plant Protection. 62: 136–144.
- 701 **Thinakaran, J., E. A. Pierson, M. Longnecker, C. Tamborindéguy, J. E. Munyaneza, C. M.**  
702 **Rush, and D. C. Henne. 2015.** Settling and ovipositional behavior of *Bactericera*

*cockerelli* (Hemiptera: Triozidae) on solanaceous hosts under field and laboratory conditions. J. Econ. Entomol. 108: 904–916.

**Vega-Gutiérrez, M. T., J. C. Rodríguez-Maciel, O. Díaz-Gómez, R. Bujanos-Muñiz, D. Mota-Sánchez, J. L. Martínez-Carrillo, A. Lagunes-Tejeda, and J. A. Garzón-Tiznado. 2008.** Susceptibility to insecticides in two Mexican population of tomato-potato psyllid, *Bactericera cockerelli* (Sulc.) (Hemiptera: Triozidae). Agrociencia. 42: 463–471.

**Wallis, R. L. 1955.** Ecological studies on the potato psyllid as a pest of potatoes. U.S. Department of Agriculture; US Department of Agriculture.

**Wenninger, E. J., A. Carroll, J. Dahan, A. V. Karasev, M. Thornton, J. Miller, P. Nolte, N. Olsen, and W. Price. 2017.** Phenology of the potato psyllid, *Bactericera cockerelli* (Hemiptera: Triozidae), and “*Candidatus Liberibacter solanacearum*” in commercial potato fields in Idaho. Environ. Entomol. 46: 1179–1188.

**Wenninger, E. J., and D. G. Hall. 2008.** Importance of multiple mating to female reproductive output in *Diaphorina citri*. Physiol. Entomol. 33: 316–321.

**Wenninger, E. J., L. L. Stelinski, and D. G. Hall. 2009.** Roles of olfactory cues, visual cues, and mating status in orientation of *Diaphorina citri* Kuwayama (Hemiptera: Psyllidae) to four different host plants. Environ. Entomol. 38: 225–234.

**Wolfner, M. F. 2011.** Precious essences: Female secretions promote sperm storage in *Drosophila*. PLoS Biology. 9.

- 723 **Yang, X. B., and T. X. Liu. 2009.** Life history and life tables of *Bactericera cockerelli*  
724 (Homoptera: Psyllidae) on eggplant and bell pepper. Environ. Entomol. 38: 1661–  
725 1667.
- 726 **Yang, X. B., Y. M. Zhang, D. C. Henne, and T. X. Liu. 2013.** Life tables of *Bactericera*  
727 *cockerelli* (Hemiptera: Triozidae) on tomato under laboratory and field conditions in  
728 southern Texas. Fla. Entomol. 96: 904–913.
- 729 **Yang, X. B., Y. M. Zhang, L. Hua, and T. X. Liu. 2010.** Life history and life tables of  
730 *Bactericera cockerelli* (Hemiptera: Psyllidae) on potato under laboratory and field  
731 conditions in the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas. J. Econ. Entomol. 103: 1729–  
732 1734.
- 733 **Yao, J., P. Saenkham, J. Levy, F. Ibanez, C. Noroy, A. Mendoza, O. Huot, D. F. Meyer, and**  
734 **C. Tamborindéguy. 2016.** Interactions of "*Candidatus Liberibacter*" solanacearum -  
735 *Bactericera cockerelli*: Haplotype effect on vector fitness and gene expression  
736 analyses. Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol. 6.
- 737

**Table 1.** Wald's  $\chi^2$  tests comparing psyllid behaviors between sexes and among four genotypes: A07781-10LB, A07781-3LB, A07781-4LB and Russet Burbank.

Behavior	Factors	Incidence			Duration	
		df	$\chi^2$	Pr > $\chi^2$	$\chi^2$	Pr > $\chi^2$
Probing	Genotype	3	27.46	0.000*	2.51	0.473
	Sex	1	3.24	0.072	0.00	0.959
	Genotype $\times$ Sex	3	6.49	0.090	4.74	0.192
Walking	Genotype	3	16.17	0.001*	4.66	0.199
	Sex	1	1.65	0.200	0.036	0.850
	Genotype $\times$ Sex	3	11.13	0.011*	10.73	0.013*
Cleaning	Genotype	3	5.98	0.113	2.23	0.525
	Sex	1	0.45	0.503	0.48	0.490
	Genotype $\times$ Sex	3	0.33	0.955	0.09	0.993
Off-Leaf <sup>a</sup>	Genotype	3	1.15	0.765	2.23	0.023*
	Sex	1	0.71	0.401	0.48	0.832
	Genotype $\times$ Sex	3	—	—	—	—

<sup>a</sup>The interaction genotype  $\times$  sex was unable to be analyzed due to the low number of psyllids that left the leaf (n = 20 out of 181)

**Table 2.** Least-square mean  $\pm$  SEM incidence and duration of potato psyllid probing behaviors recorded during 300-s no-choice tests on four different genotypes: A07781-10LB, A07781-3LB, A07781-4LB and Russet Burbank.

Genotype	Sex	N	Incidence		Duration (s)
A07781-10LB	Female	21	1.4 $\pm$ 0.26	A	182 $\pm$ 28.2
	Male	25	1.3 $\pm$ 0.23		242 $\pm$ 34.0
A07781-3LB	Female	27	1.5 $\pm$ 0.24	A	248 $\pm$ 33.6
	Male	21	1.4 $\pm$ 0.26		183 $\pm$ 28.2
A07781-4LB	Female	25	1.7 $\pm$ 0.27	AB	244 $\pm$ 34.1
	Male	18	1.9 $\pm$ 0.34		215 $\pm$ 35.6
Russet Burbank	Female	26	3.4 $\pm$ 0.38	B	250 $\pm$ 34.4
	Male	18	1.8 $\pm$ 0.32		285 $\pm$ 47.0

Means in the same column that share a letter are not significantly different ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ). Capital letters indicate differences among genotypes with sex pooled.



**Table 3.** Least-square mean  $\pm$  SEM incidence and duration of potato psyllid walking behaviors recorded during 300-s no-choice tests on four different genotypes: A07781-10LB, A07781-3LB, A07781-4LB and Russet Burbank.

Genotype	Sex	N	Incidence	Duration (s)
A07781-10LB	Female	21	0.7 $\pm$ 0.19 a	0.9 $\pm$ 0.8 a
	Male	25	0.3 $\pm$ 0.12 a	0.6 $\pm$ 0.5 a
A07781-3LB	Female	27	0.5 $\pm$ 0.15 a	0.4 $\pm$ 0.4 a
	Male	21	0.8 $\pm$ 0.21 ab	4.0 $\pm$ 3.3 a
A07781-4LB	Female	25	0.9 $\pm$ 0.21 ab	1.6 $\pm$ 1.3 a
	Male	18	1.1 $\pm$ 0.28 ab	5.7 $\pm$ 5.0 a
Russet Burbank	Female	26	1.8 $\pm$ 0.33 b	10.5 $\pm$ 7.5 b
	Male	18	0.6 $\pm$ 0.20 ab	0.6 $\pm$ 0.6 a

Means in the same column that share a letter are not significantly different ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ). Differences among sex  $\times$  genotype are indicated by lowercase letters; capital letters indicate differences among genotypes with sex pooled.

**Table 4.** Least-square mean  $\pm$  SEM incidence and duration of potato psyllid cleaning behaviors recorded during 300-s no-choice tests on four different genotypes: A07781-10LB, A07781-3LB, A07781-4LB and Russet Burbank.

Genotype	Sex	N	Incidence	Duration (s)
A07781-10LB	Female	21	0.34 $\pm$ 0.15	0.008 $\pm$ 0.017
	Male	25	0.33 $\pm$ 0.13	0.023 $\pm$ 0.048
A07781-3LB	Female	27	0.13 $\pm$ 0.07	0.002 $\pm$ 0.003
	Male	21	0.20 $\pm$ 0.10	0.003 $\pm$ 0.005
A07781-4LB	Female	25	0.20 $\pm$ 0.10	0.002 $\pm$ 0.003
	Male	18	0.26 $\pm$ 0.13	0.008 $\pm$ 0.018
Russet Burbank	Female	26	0.09 $\pm$ 0.05	0.001 $\pm$ 0.001
	Male	18	0.13 $\pm$ 0.08	0.001 $\pm$ 0.002

**Table 5.** Least-square mean  $\pm$  SEM incidence and duration of potato psyllids leaving the leaf surface during 300-s no-choice tests on four different genotypes: A07781-10LB, A07781-3LB, A07781-4LB and Russet Burbank.

Genotype <sup>a</sup>	Sex	N	Incidence	Duration (s)	
A07781-10LB	Female	21	0.03 $\pm$ 0.02	1449.9 $\pm$ 2934.1 $\times 10^{-7}$	AB
	Male	25	0.05 $\pm$ 0.03	1873.6 $\pm$ 3716.9 $\times 10^{-7}$	
A07781-3LB	Female	27	0.06 $\pm$ 0.03	2229.5 $\pm$ 4272.9 $\times 10^{-7}$	B
	Male	21	0.09 $\pm$ 0.05	2881.0 $\pm$ 5700.0 $\times 10^{-7}$	
A07781-4LB	Female	25	0.05 $\pm$ 0.04	10.6 $\pm$ 31.6 $\times 10^{-7}$	A
	Male	18	0.08 $\pm$ 0.06	13.7 $\pm$ 41.6 $\times 10^{-7}$	
Russet Burbank	Female	26	0.03 $\pm$ 0.02	9.1 $\pm$ 27.1 $\times 10^{-7}$	A
	Male	18	0.05 $\pm$ 0.03	11.7 $\pm$ 35.7 $\times 10^{-7}$	

Means in the same column that share a letter are not significantly different ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ).

Differences among sex  $\times$  genotype are indicated by lowercase letters; capital letters indicate differences among genotypes with sex pooled.

<sup>a</sup>Off-leaf sex  $\times$  genotype interactions were unable to be analyzed statistically due to low numbers of replicates ( $n = 20$  out of 181).

**Table 6.** Wald’s  $\chi^2$  tests comparing psyllid oviposition and fertility among four genotypes: A07781-10LB, A07781-3LB, A07781-4LB and Russet Burbank.

Factors	Total Eggs			Egg Fertility		
	$\chi^2$	df	Pr > $\chi^2$	$\chi^2$	df	Pr > $\chi^2$
Genotype	0.84	3	0.840	0.21	3	0.976
Time Period	70.23	3	0.000	25.60	3	0.000
Genotype × Time Period	51.00	9	0.000	81.93	9	0.000

**Table 7.** Mean  $\pm$  SEM (A) total eggs laid and (B) egg fertility of psyllids on four different genotypes.

A. Total Eggs

Genotype	N	Period 1 <sup>a</sup>	Period 2	Period 3	Period 4
A07781-10LB	20	6.3 $\pm$ 1.5	7.0 $\pm$ 1.7	9.4 $\pm$ 2.3	3.8 $\pm$ 1.0
A07781-3LB	13	4.8 $\pm$ 1.4	9.5 $\pm$ 2.8	9.1 $\pm$ 2.7	4.3 $\pm$ 1.3
A07781-4LB	19	8.4 $\pm$ 2.0	10.5 $\pm$ 2.6	8.0 $\pm$ 2.0	6.9 $\pm$ 1.8
Russet Burbank	14	5.8 $\pm$ 1.7	7.6 $\pm$ 2.2	7.0 $\pm$ 2.0	6.6 $\pm$ 1.9
Overall	66	6.2 $\pm$ 0.8	8.5 $\pm$ 1.1	8.3 $\pm$ 1.1	5.2 $\pm$ 0.7

B. Percent

Fertility

Genotype	N	Period 1	Period 2	Period 3	Period 4
A07781-10LB	20	68.8 $\pm$ 9.2	59.5 $\pm$ 10.9	61.8 $\pm$ 10.7	3.2 $\pm$ 2.0 a
A07781-3LB	13	65.9 $\pm$ 12.8	61.0 $\pm$ 12.6	55.7 $\pm$ 13.3	11.9 $\pm$ 6.8 ab
A07781-4LB	19	62.3 $\pm$ 10.5	64.1 $\pm$ 10.1	49.6 $\pm$ 12.2	29.2 $\pm$ 10.4 bc
Russet Burbank	14	47.0 $\pm$ 13.0	50.9 $\pm$ 12.7	63.9 $\pm$ 11.9	70.1 $\pm$ 10.9 c
Overall	66	61.3 $\pm$ 5.9 A	58.9 $\pm$ 5.9 AB	57.8 $\pm$ 6.1 AB	20.3 $\pm$ 4.7 B

Means for individual genotypes within a time period that share a letter or overall means within a row that share a letter are not significantly different ( $P > 0.05$ ).

775   <sup>a</sup>Period 1 (the mating access period) comprised of six or eight days, during which a female  
776   + male pair of psyllids was held on a caged plant. At the end of Period 1, the male was  
777   removed and the remaining female was transferred to a new plant of the same genotype  
778   over three successive four-day time periods (Periods 2-4, 18-20 days total).

779

780

781 Figure captions

782

783 **Fig. 1.** No-choice arena used for behavioral recordings.

784 **Fig. 2.** Sleeve cage with potato used in oviposition assays.

785

786 Fig. 1



787

788



789 Fig. 2



790



Fig. 2. Sleeve cage with potato used in oviposition assays.




Fig. 1. No-choice arena used for behavioral recordings.