

**EFFECT OF ROOTSTOCK ON GROWTH
AND PRODUCTIVITY OF SOME
GRAPE CULTIVARS**

By

EMAN SAMY MOHAMED EL-HADY

B.Sc. Agric. Sc (Horticulture), Cairo University, 2000

M.Sc. Agric. Sc (Horticulture), Ain Shams University, 2008

**A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of
the requirements for the degree of**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

**in
Agricultural Science
(Pomology)**

**Department of Horticulture
Faculty of Agriculture
Ain Shams University**

2015

Approval Sheet

**EFFECT OF ROOTSTOCK ON GROWTH
AND PRODUCTIVITY OF SOME
GRAPE CULTIVARS**

By

EMAN SAMY MOHAMED EL-HADE

B.Sc. Agric. Sc (Horticulture), Cairo University, 2000

M.Sc. Agric. Sc (Horticulture), Ain Shams University, 2008

This thesis for Ph. degree has been Approved by:

Dr. Ghobrial Farag Ghobrial
Head of Research Emeritus, Hort. Research Institute, Agric. Research
Center

Dr. Hussein Mahmoud El-Hennawy
Prof Emeritus of Pomology, Faculty of Agric, Ain Shams University

Dr. Assem Dosoukey Shaltout
Prof. Emeritus of Pomology, Faculty of Agric, Ain Shams University

Dr. Ibrahim Mohamed Dosoukey
Prof Emeritus of Pomology, Faculty of Agric, Ain Shams University

Date of Examination: 2/3/2015

EFFECT OF ROOTSTOCK ON GROWTH AND PRODUCTIVITY OF SOME GRAPE CULTIVARS

By

EMAN SAMY MOHAMED EL-HADE

B.Sc. Agric. Sc (Horticulture), Cairo University, 2000

M.Sc. Agric. Sc (Horticulture), Ain Shams University, 2008

Under the supervision of:

Dr. Ibrahim Mohamed Dosoukey

Prof. Emeritus of Pomology, Department of Horticulture, Faculty of
Agric, Ain Shams University (Principal Supervisor)

Dr. Assem Dosoukey Shaltout

Prof. Emeritus of Pomology, Department of Horticulture, Faculty of
Agric, Ain Shams University

Dr. Laila Foaud Haggag

Prof. Emeritus of Pomology, Department of Pomology, National
Research Centre

ABSTRACT

Eman Samy Mohamed El-Hady: Effect of Rootstock on Growth and Productivity of some Grape Cultivars. Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, Department of Horticulture, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University, 2015.

This work was divided into three separate experiments. The first experiment was designed to evaluate some grapevine cultivars grafted on different rootstocks comparing with the own rooted cultivars to resistance of root-knot nematode *Meloidogyne incognita* under green house condition at National Research Center, Giza, Doki. The obtained results revealed that Flame cultivar was highly susceptible to the infestation with *M. incognita* than other cultivars. On the other hand the rootstocks of Salt creek and Freedom were extremely highly resistance than the own rooted cultivars. *M. incognita* infestation caused a significant reduction in growth of the own rooted grapevine cultivars Flame, Early sweet, Red Glob and Superior comparing with grafted ones on the nematode resistant rootstocks, Salt creek and Freedom. The fiber fraction (ADL, Hemicellulose and Cellulose) recorded the highest percentage in cultivars grafted on Salt creek and Freedom rootstocks comparing with the own rooted ones. Proline and free amino acid were extremely higher in the own rooted cultivars than the rootstocks ones. Under field condition, grape vine varieties grafted on Salt creek and Freedom produced the highest average yield with nematode infestation, in the opposite own rooted ones produced the lowest average yield with nematode infestation. The second experiment was designed as a pot culture experiment to examine the tolerance of different cultivars under study to salinity as affect by different rootstocks. Different levels of salinity of irrigation water (1000, 2000 and 3000 ppm) were used. Results showed that vine growth properties (vine length, inter-node length and number of leaves per vine) were significantly decreased with the increase of salinity levels among all vines. At the highest salinity level (3000 ppm), the survival vine percentage was zero % for own rooted vines, except, the own rooted Flame seedless that recorded 50 percent of vine survival. Among the scion-rootstock vines, about 70-80% vine survival was observed with the vines grafted on Salt

creek and 60-65% in vines grafted on Freedom rootstock. Increasing salt concentration significantly reduced the N, P and K contents in the leaf petioles. On the contrary, leaf proline, Na and Ca content were increased with increasing the salinity level. Based on the gained results, all cultivars grafted on Salt creek rootstock were more tolerant to irrigation with the studied salinity treatments. The third experiment was carried out during three seasons (2011 - 2013) on Flame seedless, Superior seedless and Early sweet cultivars grafted onto Salt Creek, Freedom and Harmony rootstocks, while Thompson seedless cultivar grafted only onto Salt Creek and Harmony rootstocks. In addition, the same cultivars were grown on own roots and served as control. Results revealed that leaf chlorophyll a and b (mg/gm fresh wt), Leaf Nitrogen, Phosphorus and Potassium content (%) were significantly increased in grafted vines onto all the three rootstock compared with ungrafted vines. Yield (kg)/vine, cluster weight (gm), length and width of cluster (cm) of Flame seedless, Superior seedless and Early sweet cultivars were markedly increased in grafted vines compared with ungrafted ones. Superior seedless and Early sweet cultivars grafted onto Harmony rootstock resulted in a significant higher values in berry weight (gm), berry size (cm³), length/ diameter ratio of berry and Juice volume of 100 berry (cm³) compared with other rootstocks and grown on own rooted. On the other hand Flame seedless cultivar grafted onto Freedom rootstock gave the best results. Chemical berry characteristic including SSC percentage, low acidity and high SSC/acid ratio were generally noticed when Flame seedless cultivar grafted onto Harmony rootstock and Superior seedless grafted onto Salt Creek rootstock. Early sweet cultivar grafted onto Harmony followed the similar trend except for juice acidity which recorded high percentage values compared with other grafted rootstocks. Flame seedless and Early sweet cultivars recorded higher fruiting bud percentage when grafted onto Harmony rootstock compared with other rootstocks and own rooted ones. Meanwhile, highest bud burst percentage and fruiting bud percentage of Superior seedless cultivar was obtained when grafted onto Salt creek rootstock. The own rooted Thompson seedless vines resulted in a significant higher values of yield, cluster weight, some physical properties of berries. Chemical berry characteristic including SSC

percentage, low acidity and high SSC/acid ratio were generally noted with own rooted vines of Thompson seedless. Thompson seedless cultivar recorded higher fruiting bud percentage with ungrafted vines compared with the other rootstocks. Meanwhile, highest bud burst percentage was obtained when Thompson seedless cultivar grafted onto Salt creek rootstock. Generally, yield, cluster and berry characteristics of grafted vines i.e. Flame seedless, Superior seedless and Early sweet cultivars on Salt creek, Freedom and Harmony rootstocks were better when compared with own rooted vines. On the other hand, yield, cluster and berry characteristics of own rooted vines of Thompson seedless were best when compared with vines grafted onto rootstocks under this study.

Key word: Grapevine, *vitis vinifera*, Rootstock, Nematode resistance, *M. incognita*, Salinity tolerance, Growth properties, Yield, Fruit quality, Nutrient content,

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Words can not express my gratitude and I am honored to convey my deepest thanks to **Prof. Dr. Ibrahim Mohamed Dosoukey and Prof. Dr. Assem Dosoukey Shaltout** Professor Emeritus of Pomology, Department of Horticulture, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University, for helping and encouraging me during this work.

My deepest gratitude and sincere thanks to **Prof. Dr. Laila Foad Haggag** Professor Emeritus of Pomology, Department of Pomology Research, National Research Center, who guided and still guiding me since my first steps in the field of scientific research and for support and encouragement.

I would also like to thank **Dr. Ahmed Eied Mahgoob**, Assistant Professor of Agricultural Zoology, Department of Plant Protection, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University, for helping and encouragement me during this work.

I would like to thank also **Dr. Mohamed Fathy Aesa Shahan** Assistant Professor of Pomology, Department of Pomology Research, National Research Center, for helping and encouragement me during this work.

I would also like to thank **Dr. Fikria Khilil** Assistant Professor Emeritus of Pomology, Department of Pomology Research, National Research Center, for help me during this work.

I am particularly grateful to my family for their help and continuous encouragement during my study period.

CONTENT

	Page
LIST OF TABLE	III
1- Introduction	1
2- Review of Literature	4
3- Materials and Methods	30
4- Results and Discussion	38
4-1- First Experiment:-	38
4-1-1- Tracing of population density	38
4-1-2- Growth measurements	41
4-1-3- The chemical constituents	42
4-1-4- Natural infestation with root-knot nematode	46
4-2- Second Experiment:-	48
4-2-1- Growth measurements:	48
4- 2-1-1- Average vine height	48
4-2-1-2- Average enter-node length	49
4-2-1-3- Average leaf number/vine	52
4-2-1-4- Survival plants percentage	54
4-2-2- Chemical determinations:	54
4-2-2-1- Leaves minerals content:	54
4-2-2-1-1- Nitrogen percentage	54
4-2-2-1-2- Phosphorus percentage	55
4-2-2-1-3- Potassium percentage	59
4-2-2-1-4- Calcium percentage	59
4-2-2-1-5- Sodium percentage	60
4-2-2-2- Proline content	60

4-3- Third Experiment:-	66
4-3-1- Flame, Superior and Early sweet:	66
4-3-1-1- Yield and physical characteristics of clusters	66
4-3-1-2- Physical characteristics of berries	71
4-3-1-3- Chemical characteristics of berries	75
4-3-1-4- Bud burst and fruiting buds percentage	79
4-3-1-5- Chemical characteristics of leaves	82
4-3-2- Thompson:	87
4-3-2-1- Yield and physical characteristics of clusters	87
4-3-2-2- Physical characteristics of berries	87
4-3-2-3- Chemical characteristics of berries:	89
4-3-2-4- Bud burst and flowering buds percentage:	90
4-3-2-5- Chemical characteristics of leaves	90
5-Summary and Conclusion	93
6-References	106
7-Arabic Summary	

List of Table

No	Page
1-(Table 1): Population density of the second juvenile stage (J2s) in soil and root galls of root-knot nematode <i>M. incognita</i> infesting the grapevine cultivars of Flame, Early sweet, Superior and Red Glob cultivars grafted on Salt creek, Freedom rootstocks and own rooted vines under green house conditions during the period from October 2012 – April 2013.	40
2-(Table 2): Effect of the infestation with root-knot nematode <i>M. incognita</i> on the growth of Flame, Early sweet, Superior and Red Glob cultivars grafted on Salt creek, Freedom rootstocks and own rooted vines under green house conditions during the period from October 2012 and April 2013.	44
3-(Table 3): Effect of the infestation with root-knot nematode <i>M. incognita</i> on some chemical constituents i.e fiber fraction (ADL, Hemicellulose and Cellulose), proline μ moles /g of fresh weight and free amino acid mg/g dry weight of Flame, Early sweet, Superior and Red Glob cultivars grafted on Salt creek, Freedom rootstocks and own rooted vines.	45
4-(Table 4): Effect of the natural infestation with root-knot nematode <i>Meloidogyne</i> sp. on the yield of grapevine cultivars grafted on nematode resistant rootstocks and own rooted ones under field conditions during season 2013.	47
5-Table (5): Effect of saline irrigation water on vines height (cm) of Flame, Early sweet, Superior and Red Glob cultivars grafted on Salt creek, Freedom rootstocks and own rooted vines in 2010-2011 seasons.	50

IV

No	Page
6-Table (6): Effect of saline irrigation water on enter-node length (cm) of Flame, Early sweet, Superior and Red Glob cultivars grafted on Salt creek, Freedom rootstocks and own rooted vines in 2010-2011 seasons.	51
7-Table (7): Effect of saline irrigation water on leaf number/ vines of Flame, Early sweet, Superior and Red Glob cultivars grafted on Salt creek, Freedom rootstocks and own rooted plants in 2010-2011 seasons.	53
8-Table (8): Effect of saline irrigation water on survival vines percentage of Flame, Early sweet, Superior and Red Glob cultivars grafted on Salt creek, Freedom rootstocks and own rooted vines in 2010-2011 seasons.	56
9-Table (9): Effect of saline irrigation water on Nitrogen percentage of Flame, Early sweet, Superior and Red Glob cultivars grafted on Salt creek, Freedom rootstocks and own rooted vines in 2010-2011 seasons.	57
10-Table (10): Effect of saline irrigation water on Phosphorus percentage of Flame, Early sweet, Superior and Red Glob cultivars grafted on Salt creek, Freedom rootstocks and own rooted vines in 2010-2011 seasons.	58
11-Table (11): Effect of saline irrigation water on Potassium percentage of Flame, Early sweet, Superior and Red Glob cultivars grafted on Salt creek, Freedom rootstocks and own rooted vines in 2010-2011 seasons.	62

No	Page
12-Table (12): Effect of saline irrigation water on Calcium percentage of Flame, Early sweet, Superior and Red Glob cultivars grafted on Salt creek, Freedom rootstocks and own rooted vines in 2010-2011 seasons.	63
13-Table (13): Effect of saline irrigation water on Sodium percentage of Flame, Early sweet, Superior and Red Glob cultivars grafted on Salt creek, Freedom rootstocks and own rooted vines in 2010-2011 seasons.	64
14-Table (14): Effect of saline irrigation water on proline content mg/gm fresh weight of Flame, Early sweet, Superior and Red Glob cultivars grafted on Salt creek, Freedom rootstocks and own rooted vines in 2010-2011 seasons.	65
15-(Table 15):Yield as kg/vine, cluster weight (gm), length of cluster (cm), width of cluster (cm) and number of shot berries/cluster of Flame, Superior and Early sweet as affected by different tested rootstocks in 2012 season.	68
16-(Table 16):Yield as kg/vine, cluster weight (gm), length of cluster (cm), width of cluster (cm) and number of shot berries/cluster of Flame, Superior and Early sweet as affected by different tested rootstocks in 2013 season.	69
17-(Table 17): Some physical characteristics of berry of Flame, Superior and Early sweet as affected by different tested rootstocks in 2012 season.	73
18-(Table 18): Some physical characteristics of berry of Flame, Superior and Early sweet as affected by different tested rootstocks in 2013 season.	74

VI

No	Page
19-(Table 19): berry color (Hue angle) and lightness (L) of Flame as affected by different tested rootstocks in 2012-2013 seasons.	75
20-(Table 20): Some chemical characteristics of berries of Flame, Superior and Early sweet as affected by different tested rootstocks in 2012 season..	77
21-(Table 21): Some chemical characteristics of berries of Flame, Superior and Early sweet as affected by different tested rootstocks in 2013 season.	78
22-(Table 22): Bud burst % and fruiting bud (%) of Flame, Superior and Early sweet as affected by different tested rootstocks in 2012 season.	80
23-(Table 23): Bud burst % and fruiting bud (%) of Flame, Superior and Early sweet as affected by different tested rootstocks in 2013 season.	81
24-Table (24): Some chemical characteristics of leaves of Flame, Superior and Early sweet as affected by different tested rootstocks in 2010 season.	84
25-Table (25): Some chemical characteristics of leaves of Flame, Superior and Early sweet as affected by different tested rootstocks in 2011 season.	85
26-Table (26): Some chemical characteristics of leaves of Flame, Superior and Early sweet as affected by different tested rootstocks in 2012 season.	86
27-Table (27): Yield as kg /vine, cluster weight (gm) and length / width of cluster of Thompson as affected by different tested rootstocks during 2012-2013 seasons.	88
28-Table (28): Physical characteristics of berries of Thompson as affected by different tested rootstocks during 2012-2013 seasons.	88

VII

No	Page
29-Table (29): chemical characteristics of berries of Thompson as affected by different tested rootstocks during 2012-2013 seasons.	89
30-Table (30): Bud burst % and Flowering bud % of Thompson as affected by different tested rootstocks during 2012 and 2013 seasons.	90
31-Table (31): Chemical characteristics of leaves of Thompson as affected by different tested rootstocks during 2012-2013 seasons.	92

INTRODUCTION

Grape (*Vitis vinifera* L.) is one of the most important and favorable fruit crops in Egypt, it is considered the second fruit crop after citrus. The planted area reached 188543 feddan producing 1378815 tons (**Ministry of Agriculture statistics, 2013**). The production of grapes increased as a result of introducing of new varieties and rootstocks and improving culture practices.

Rootstocks have been used in vineyards since the second half of 19th century as a consequence of the phylloxera (*Daktulosphaira vitifoliae*) invasion in Europe. Rootstocks, as a link between the soil and the scion, play an important role in vine adaptation with the environmental factors.

Choosing the rootstock is one of the most important decisions when establishing vineyards. Rootstocks are employed in grape cultivation to overcome several biotic stresses (phylloxera, nematodes, root diseases, etc.), a biotic stresses (soil and water salinity, water scarcity, frost effect, etc.), and controlling vegetative growth, precocity and fruit quality. **Reynolds and Wardle (2001)** outlined some major criteria for rootstocks choice in the order of their importance as phylloxera and nematode resistance, adaptability to high pH soils, saline soils, wet or poorly drained soils and drought. In this respect, Salt creek "Ramsey" rootstock imports great vigor to its scions. It is quite resistant to nematodes and moderately resistant to phylloxera, it is performed well in light sandy soils of low fertility, has good tolerance to salt, perform well in slightly acid and calcareous soils. Freedom (1613C x *V. Champini*) is highly resistant to phylloxera and nematodes, it renders scions more vigorous but less than Dog Ridge, it is highly resistant to drought, well adapted to acidic soils and moderate resistant to salinity. Harmony (1613C x *V. Champini*), it is moderate in vigor of moderate resistant to phylloxera and highly resistant to nematodes, well adapted to acidic soil, moderate resistant to salinity and highly resistant to drought (**Mc Carthy & Cirami, 1990; Mullins et al., 1992; Southey, 1992; Gao et al., 1993;**