



**MOLECULAR BIOLOGICAL STUDIES  
ON THE EFFECT OF GAMMA RAYS  
AND MUTAGENIC CHEMICALS ON  
DROUGHT RESISTANCE  
IN PLANTS**

**THESIS  
SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN SCIENCE  
(BOTANY)**

**BY  
NAHLA HAMID ELDIN MOHAMED ELSAID  
B.Sc. & M.Sc.**

**AIN SHAMS UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY OF SCIENCE  
DEPARTMENT OF BOTANY**

**2005**

**MOLECULAR BIOLOGICAL STUDIES ON THE  
EFFECT OF GAMMA RAYS AND MUTAGENIC  
CHEMICALS ON DROUGHT RESISTANCE  
IN PLANTS**

**BY**

**NAHLA HAMID ELDIN MOHAMED ELSAID**

**M.Sc. FACULTY OF SCIENCE  
AIN SHAMS UNIVERSITY  
Advisory Committee**

**Prof. Dr. Seham Mohamed Aly Moustafa**

*Prof. of Plant Physiology. Department of Botany  
Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University*

**Prof. Dr. Ahmed Bahieldin Mohamed**

*Prof. of Molecular Genetics. Department of Genetics  
Faculty of Agriculture. Ain Shams University.*

**Dr. Asmahan Ahmed Mahmoud**

*Assistant Prof. of Genetics, Department of  
National Product Research Radiation  
Technology, Center, Atomic Energy Authority.*

**Dr. Hala Fattouh Sayed Ahmed**

*Lecturer of Plant Physiology. Department of  
Botany Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University.*

**2004**

**Name of Student:** Nahla Hamid Eldin Mohamed Elsaid

**Title of thesis:** Molecular Biological Studies on the Effect  
of Gamma Rays and Mutagenic Chemicals  
on Drought Resistance in Plants.

**Degree:** Ph.D in Science

This thesis for the Ph.D. Degree in Science has been  
approved by:

**Dr. Elhusseiny Abdel Rahman Youssef**

*Prof. of Plant Physiology, Department of  
Botany, Faculty of Science, Cairo University.*

**Dr. Safia Mohamed Ghazi**

*Prof. of Plant Physiology and Assistant Dean of  
Student Affairs, Faculty of Science, Helwan  
University.*

**Dr. Seham Mohamed Aly Moustafa**

*Prof. of Plant Physiology, Department of  
Botany, Faculty of Science, Ain Shams  
University.*

**Dr. Ahmed Bahieldin Mohamed**

*Prof. of Molecular Genetics, Department of  
Genetics, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams  
University.*

**This thesis has not been submitted  
for any degree at this or any other  
university.**

***Nahla Hamid Eldin***

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The author wishes to express her deepest appreciation and gratitude to Dr. Seham Mohamed A. Moustafa, Prof. of Plant Physiology, Department of Botany, Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University, Dr Ahmed Bahieldin Mohamed, Prof. of Molecular Genetics, Department of Genetics, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University, Dr. Asmahan A. Mahmoud, Assistant Prof. of Genetics, Department of Natural Product Research, Radiation Technology Center, Atomic Energy Authority, and Dr. Hala Fattouh S. Ahmed, Lecturer of Plant Physiology, Department of Botany, Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University, for suggesting the point and supervision, continuous help, and fruitful discussion throughout this work.

Grateful acknowledgement is also expressed to head and staff members of the Department of Natural Product Research, Radiation Technology Center, Atomic Energy Authority, for continuous encouragement.

## **ABSTRACT**

Nahla Hamid Eldin Mohamed Elsaid. [Molecular Biological Studies On The Effect Of Gamma Rays And Mutagenic Chemicals On Drought Resistance In Plants] Doctor Philosophy Degree in Science, Botany Department, Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University (2004).

Different doses of gamma rays and chemical mutagen have been applied as seed treatment of four plant strains. Seed treatment with 60 Gy gamma irradiation and 0.001 M Na-azide were selected to be used with the two maize strains G4 and Rg11 for further experimentation. Growth parameters and endogenous hormone levels indicated that strain Rg11 is more suitable than G4 under normal irrigation, whereby G4 did better performance under drought stress. The changes at the molecular levels showed variations in the protein banding patterns and the nucleic acid DNA, in response to the applied mutagenic treatments. It has been recommended to cultivate the maize strain G4, in consequence to seed irradiation with 60 Gy gamma rays, for drought resistance.

## CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>1. Preface .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Introduction.....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1. Growth Criteria .....	3
2.1.1. Vegetative characters .....	3
2.1.1.1. Effect of environmental drought stress .....	3
2.1.1.2. Effect of mutagenic agents .....	4
2.1.2. Photosynthetic pigments .....	7
2.1.2.1. Effect of environmental drought stress .....	7
2.1.2.2. Effect of mutagenic agents .....	7
2.2. Physiological studies.....	9
2.2.1. Growth Regulating substances .....	9
2.2.1.1. Effect of environmental stress .....	9
2.2.1.2. Effect of mutagenic agents .....	10
2.3. Molecular Biological Studies .....	11
2.3.1. Protein patterns .....	11
2.3.1.1. Effect of environmental stress .....	11
2.3.1.2. Effect of mutagenic agents .....	12
2.3.2. DNA .....	13
2.3.2.1. Effect of environmental stress .....	14
2.3.2.2. Effect of mutagenic agents .....	15
2.4. Aim of the present work .....	17
<b>3. Materials and Methods .....</b>	<b>20</b>
3.1. Mutagenic treatments .....	20
3.2. Statistical analysis .....	20
3.3. Measurement of photosynthetic pigments .....	21
3.4. Extraction and HPLC estimation of growth hormones.....	21
3.5. Molecular genetic studies.....	23
3.5.1. SDS protein electrophoresis .....	23
3.5.2. Detection of DNA.....	26

## B

	Page
3.5.2.1. RAPD-PCR condition.....	27
3.5.2.2.DNA Gel electrophoresis.....	28
<b>4. Results</b> .....	29
4.1.Experiment I (Evaluation of Different Doses of Gamma Rays or Sodium Azide with Four Strains of Maize).....	29
4.2. Experiment II (Effect of Gamma Irradiation and Sodium Azide in the Maize Strains G4 and Rg11 Under Normal Irrigation and Drought Stress .....	35
4.2.1. Growth Criteria .....	35
4.2.1.1.Vegetative characters.....	35
4.2.1.2.Photosynthetic pigments .....	45
4.2.2. Physiological Results .....	58
4.2.3. 3. Molecular Results .....	64
4.2.3.1.Protein patterns .....	64
4.2.3.2. RAPD. PCR .....	74
<b>5. Discussion</b> .....	78
<b>6. English Summary</b> .....	100
<b>7. References</b> .....	103
<b>8. Arabic Summary</b> .....	1



## LIST OF TABLES

No.	Title	Page
<b>Table (1)</b>	Germination percentages	31
<b>Table (2)</b>	Growth criteria of experiment I	31
	A- Length of shoot (cm)	31
	B-Stem Diameter (cm)	32
	C-Number of leaves / plant	32
	D-Leaf area (cm <sup>2</sup> )	32
	E-Fresh weight (g)	34
	F-Dry weight (g)	34
<b>Table (3)</b>	Growth criteria of experiment II	36
	A- Length of shoot (cm)	36
	B- Stem diameter (cm)	40
	C- Number of leaves / plant	42
	D- Leaf area (cm <sup>2</sup> )	44
	E- Total biomass (g)	46
	F- Chlorophyll a (mg/g dry.wt.)	47
	G- Chlorophyll b (mg/g dry. wt.)	49
	H-Chlorophyll a/b ratio (mg/g dry. wt.)	50
	I. Carotenoids (mg/g dry. wt.)	51
	J- Total pigments (mg/g dry. wt.)	53
<b>Table (4)</b>	The concentrations of IAA, GA <sub>3</sub> and ABA	57
<b>Table (5)</b>	The concentration of cytokinins (benzyladinine, zeatin and zeatin riboside)	60
<b>Table (6)</b>	Protein patterns.	65
<b>Table (7)</b>	List of polymorphic and monomorphic bands	68
<b>Table (8)</b>	DNA polymorphism using randomly amplifying DNA (RAPD)	69

**LIST OF FIGURES**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>Figure (1)</b>	Vegetative characters of 50-day-old plants	37
<b>Figure (2)</b>	Vegetative characters of 70-day-old plants	38
<b>Figure (3)</b>	Photosynthetic pigment contents old leaves of 50-day-old plants	54
<b>Figure (4)</b>	Photosynthetic pigment contents of leaves of 70-day-old plants	55
<b>Figure (5)</b>	The concentrations of IAA, GA <sub>3</sub> and ABA	58
<b>Figure (6)</b>	The concentrations of cytokinins (benzyl adenine, zeatin, zeatin riboside and total cytokinins)	63
<b>Figure (7)</b>	Protein-banding patterns (upper) and band scanning (lower)	66
<b>Figure (8)</b>	DNA Polymorphism using randomly amplified polymorphic DNA RAPD	70

## PREFACE

Crop yields increased dramatically in the 20<sup>th</sup> century as recorded in the world averages. In the next century, there is a number of challenges to be faced in order to maintain the necessary food production. These include an estimated increase in the world's population to around 8 billions by 2020 and global warming causing more frequent and severe fluctuations in climate, thus increasing the chance of crop failures. Strictly limited availability of land, and shortage of the water necessary to support crop growth with irrigation are also predicted (FAO / IAEA Division, 1999).

Crop plants are the direct or indirect source of virtually all our food. Crop plants, unlike animals, stay in one place and are therefore, controlled by the environment in which they find themselves. As a consequence, they have evolved a complex genetic system, which enables them to adapt the change in environment in order to complete their life cycle. The productivity of plants is greatly affected by environmental stresses such as drought, salinity, low and high temperature (Miflin, 2000). The genetic improvement of stress tolerance is an urgent need for the future of agriculture.

Maize (*Zea mays* L.) has long been utilized as an important human and animal food source. In Egypt, there is a wide gap between cereal crop production and consumption. To decrease this gap, we must increase the land cultivated with cereal crops, but this new land has many conditions of environmental stresses. Rapid methods are needed to identify germplasm potential for yield under different environmental stresses and soil conditions.

Mutations are the source of all hereditary variation and provide the basis of evolution. Physical and chemical mutants were used in several crop species to induce variation in quantitative and qualitative traits. Ionizing radiation induces various alterations to morphological and physiological processes in plants (Casarett, 1968) and can produce modifications on the DNA bases as those induced by  $\text{Fe}^{3+}$  and  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  *in vitro* (Aruoma *et al.*, 1989 a & b).

The growth habits and physiological properties of plants may differ markedly under different regimes of light, gravity, temperature, humidity and salinity. In this respect, hormones have long been known as important internal mediating signals in plants and the components of the underlying cellular machinery were identified and characterized (Grill and Hummelbach, 1998; Solano and Ecker, 1998; D'Agostino and Kiebar, 1999; Trewavas, 2000). Certain mutations can simultaneously influence the response to more than one hormone or to an altered physical parameter, including drought (Wilson *et al.*, 1999a; Benudoin *et al.*, 2000; Ghassemian *et al.*, 2000).

Molecular markers such as random amplified polymorphic DNAs (RAPDs) (Welsh and McClelland, 1990; Williams *et al.*, 1990) and restriction fragment length polymorphisms (RFLPs) (Grodzicker *et al.*, 1974) have been used in studying phenomena (such as heterosis) and showed an excellent potentiality to assist selection of quantitative traits (Stuber, 1992), besides their use in the construction of genetic maps in maize (Helentjaris *et al.*, 1986; Hoisington and Coe, 1990).

## INTRODUCTION

### 1. Growth Criteria

#### 1.1. Vegetative characters

### 1.1.1. Effect of environmental drought stress

Growth criteria are known to be affected by environmental stresses and there are obvious relationships between vegetative characters and the plant yield. Fischer *et al.* (1989) used three levels of soil moisture to detect the most suitable for improvement of the yield of maize under drought. The experiment was carried out under the same conditions for three successive cycles. They studied the traits connected with drought like leaf and stem extension growth, and rate of male and female flowering and yield. They found that there were significant changes in the drought adaptive traits, but there was no significant change in days to-flowering. Grzesiak (1990) also studied the response of different maize genotypes to drought and its relation with the leaf area, dry matter accumulation and grain yield. The results showed a drop in growth parameters and consequently yield with the reduction of soil water content. Sobrado (1990a) and Zemanek (1992) studied the relation between drought and the leaf area and grain yield in maize and barley. They concluded that in maize, drought caused a decrease of the leaf area, grain size and number. In barley, there was a positive correlation between the area of the three top leaves and both grain number and grain yield under all regimes. Sinclair *et al.* (1990) also found a linear correlation between biomass gain and grain yield of maize under water stress. Sobrado (1990b), Machiaria (1990) and Cramer and Daniel (1991) showed that water stress affected leaf elongation by action on leaf osmotic potential and turgor pressure. Frederick *et al.* (1990) and Sobrado (1990c) studied the action of drought stress in maize on carbon and nitrogen assimilation and their reflection on the total biomass and dry weight of vegetative parts. These parameters were markedly decreased as a result of drought stress. A similar conclusion was also attained by Nesmith (1991) who studied the whole plant responses to drought and the action of water deficits at various growth stages. He revealed that the yield losses are greatest when the water deficit is prevailed during grain filling. Reduction in the extension of internodes, leaves and size of ears, during the deficit period, was primarily attributable to decreased growth

rate rather than shortened growth duration. Also, he concluded that above ground biomass accumulation was less under deficit water condition at all growth stages and was largely attributable to reduced production of leaf area or increased loss of green leaf area due to early senescence and leaves rolling. Bolanos and Edmeades (1993) suggested that drought stress coincided with flowering and affected harvest index, yield stability, and grain yield. Calavache *et al.* (1995) identified the specific growth stages of maize crop at which the plant is less sensitive to water stress so that irrigation can be omitted without a significant decrease in yield, specified flowering and yield formation stages. Abdel-Tawab *et al.* (2002) studied the relationship between morphological performance, yield components, and drought-stress tolerance of eight Egyptian bread wheat. There were significant differences in the area of flag leaf, spike criteria, total biomass and grain yield / plant between the control plants and those under drought. In general, higher values were recorded in the control plants, as compared with those under drought.

#### **1.1.2. Effect of mutagenic agents**

Chemical and physical mutagenic agents usually cause changes in the vegetative characters by induction of mutations. In this connection, gamma rays represent one of the important physical mutagenic agents. Jaywardena (1988) used gamma rays for induced mutation to improve the characters and productivity of many plants (rice, maize, bean, cowpea and potato). Balan *et al.* (1989) treated some pollen and grains of maize by gamma rays. The resulted mutant showed changes in height, ear size, number of grain rows and yield. In addition, it was also resistant to cold, drought and lodging. Diaconu (1993) used gamma radiation to induce mutation in the endosperm structure of sugar corn. Gautam (1998) found that 10Krad gamma rays gave the highest mutation frequency in wheat. Four mutants were evaluated in M<sub>3</sub> and M<sub>4</sub> generations for grain yield / plant, plant height, number of tillers / plant, spike length, productivity of spikelets / spike and number of grains / spike, as well as the weight of 1000 grains.

Despite the induction of mutations, many workers studied the effects of radiation on growth criteria and yield of many plants. For example, Narimanove and Korytov (1996) and Narimanove *et al.* (1997) studied the action of gamma rays on the growth of some crop plants (wheat, barley, peas, maize, and *Cucumis melo*). The germination potential, root development and subsequent seedling growth were increased as a result of irradiation of dry seeds by a relatively low dose (10-20 Gy) gamma rays. Rabie *et al.* (1996) also irradiated seeds of faba bean with gamma rays, using 1, 2, 4 and 10 K rad doses, and studied their effects on growth and pod shedding. The results revealed significant increases in germination percentage, seedling length and relative growth rate at low radiation doses (1, 2, 4 Krads). The same treatments also induced high yield and low percentage of pod shedding. The dose 4 Krad was the most effective, whereby higher doses (8 and 10 Krad) led to a significant reduction in the growth characters concomitant with high shedding percentage. Wang *et al.* (1998), subjected the seeds of multiple-row ear of a maize hybrid to gamma ray irradiation. It could be concluded that gamma rays induced not only variation in characters and physiological damage, but also resulted in the production of two maize germplasm materials with good performance such as multiple-row cobs with compact conformation and disease resistance, Abdel-Tawab *et al.* (1998a and 2002) also studied the effect of gamma rays, alone and combined with drought stress, in maize and wheat. They concluded that irradiation positively affected the yield traits, whereas irradiation combined with drought stress displayed a good performance more than the non-irradiated plants under the same conditions. On the other hand, Abdel-Tawab *et al.* (2001), showed that gamma irradiation and salt stress caused a reduction of some growth traits (plant height, number of leaves, leaf area, stem diameter, fresh and dry weights) and yield of maize. Lal *et al.* (2000a) also reached a similar conclusion in Java citronella (*Cymbopogon winterianus*) and further indicated that a decrease in all plant traits was observed with increase of the radiation dose. On the other side, Chaudhuri (2001) concluded that root and shoot extension of lentil