

GENETIC STUDIES ON BREAD WHEAT RESISTANCE TO STEM RUST

BY

AHMED MOHAMED MOSTAFA RAMADAN

B. Sc. Agric. Sc. (Biotechnology), Cairo University, 2003

M. Sc. Agric. Sc. (Genetics), Ain Shams University, 2009

**A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of
The Requirement for the Degree of**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in
Agricultural Science
(Genetics)**

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

2016

Approval Sheet

**GENETIC STUDIES ON BREAD WHEAT
RESISTANCE TO STEM RUST**

BY

AHMED MOHAMED MOSTAFA RAMADAN

B. Sc. Agric. Sc. (Biotechnology), Cairo University, 2003

M. Sc. Agric. Sc. (Genetics), Ain Shams University, 2009

This thesis for Ph. D. degree has been approved by:

Dr. Abdel Hamid Abdel Hamid Ali.....
Prof. Emeritus of Genetics, Faculty of Agriculture, Kafr El-sheikh
University

Dr. Ahmed Houssien Abo Doma.....
Prof. of Genetics, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University

Dr. Aiman Hanafy Abdel-Azeem Atta.....
Prof. of Genetics, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University

Dr. Mohamed Abdel-Salam Rashed.....
Prof. Emeritus of Genetics, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams
University

Date of Examination: 11 / 4 / 2016

GENETIC STUDIES ON BREAD WHEAT RESISTANCE TO STEM RUST

BY

AHMED MOHAMED MOSTAFA RAMADAN

B. Sc. Agric. Sc. (Biotechnology), Cairo University, 2003

M. Sc. Agric. Sc. (Genetics), Ain Shams University, 2009

Under the supervision of:

Dr. Mohamed Abdel-Salam Rashed

Prof. Emeritus of Genetics, Department of Genetics, Faculty of
Agriculture, Ain Shams University (Principal Supervisor)

Dr. Aiman Hanafy Abdel-Azeem Atta

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

Dr. Tag Eldin Mohamed Shehab Eldin

Head of Research Emeritus of Wheat Breeding, Department of
Wheat Research, Field Crops Research Institute, Agricultural
Research Center

ABSTRACT

Ahmed Mohamed Mostafa Ramadan: Genetic Studies on Bread Wheat Resistance to Stem Rust. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Genetics, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University, 2016.

Screening experiment was performed on twelve varieties and lines of bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) to select the most contrasting genotypes in stem rust susceptibility. The results of the experiment revealed that the resistant variety is (Misr1) and the two most stem rust susceptible lines are (Line37 and Line92) according to stem rust reaction. Crosses were carried out between the resistant parent (Misr1) with each of the two susceptible parents as well as between the two susceptible parents (Line37 and Line92) to obtain the F₁ kernels. Some of the F₁ kernels were sown in the field and self-pollinated to obtain the F₂ plants for each cross. These three selected parents, their F₁ and the most resistant and susceptible F₂ plant groups for the three crosses were evaluated for their response to stem rust resistance by recording some stem rust-related traits. However, the infection reduced the values of all yield related traits except spike length and number of spikelet's/spike traits. The three parents, their F₁ plants and some individual plants of the two contrasting F₂ plant groups as the offspring of the crosses between the most resistant and the two most susceptible. The three crosses were used to develop some molecular genetic markers associated with stem rust resistance using SSR and STS protocols. The results indicated that the presence of two positive markers out of the three SSR and three STS primers which used in this study. Sr2 (SSR) and Sr25 (STS) primers produced positive markers at fragment sizes of 120 and 130 bp, respectively, for stem rust resistance that could be considered as reliable markers for stem rust resistance in bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum*).

Key words: Wheat, Stem rust, Stem rust and yield related traits,
Molecular markers for stem rust, SSR & STS markers.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I wish to thank **Allah** who supported me with the strength and patience to complete this work.

The author wishes to express his deep gratitude and sincere appreciation to **Prof. Dr. M. A. Rashed**, Professor of Genetics, Determent of Genetics, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University, for continuous supervision, kind encouragement, sincere help criticism and precious advices during the progress of thesis work and the preparation and writing of the manuscript.

Sincere appreciation to **Prof. Dr. Aiman Hanafy Atta**, Prof. of Genetics, Faculty of Agric., Ain Shams University, for his supervision and useful suggestions, continuous guidance throughout the courses of this investigation and his efforts in writing and reviewing the manuscript.

Deep gratitude is also due to all staff members of Genetics, Faculty of Agric., Ain Shams University. Especially Prof. Dr. **Ahmed H. Abo Doma**.

Deep thanks to Prof. Dr. **Tag Eldin Mohamed Shehab Eldin** , Prof. of Breeding & Genetics, Wheat Research Dept., Field Crops Res. Inst.; Agric. Res. Center for his continuous supervision, for providing me to select the materials of this study, kind encouragement, sincere help criticism and precious advices during the progress of thesis work and the preparation and writing of the manuscript.

I would like to thank all staff members of the wheat Research department, Agriculture Research Center (ARC). especially Prof. Dr. **Assad Ahmed Hamada**, Prof. Dr. **Sami Reda Saber**, Prof. Dr. **Mostafa A. Mostafa**, Prof. Dr. **Mosaad M. Abdel-Aleem**, Prof. Dr. **Eman Sadek**, Prof. Dr. **Nabil S. Hanna**, Prof. Dr. **Abu-Bakr M. Ali**, Prof. Dr. **Ezz Eldin Abd- Alrahman**, Prof. Dr. **Sabah Hamaza**, Prof. Dr. **Ahmed Kamal Mostafa**, Prof. Dr. **Mohamed Khalaf**, **Dr. Khalid Ibrahim Gad**,

Dr. Ahmed Ali Zein and Dr. Mohamed Abd Alkader (Wheat Disease Dep.) for their kind help and advices during the work of this study.

Also, my sincere appreciation to all staff members of Biotechnology laboratory, Wheat Research Department, Agricultural Research Center, Giza (**especially Dr. Hoda Mostafa Mostafa El-Gharbawy**) for all their help, encouraging and providing the facilities to finish this work. Deep thanks for all staff members of the Gemmeiza Research Station, Wheat Research Dep.

Finally, I am indebted as gift to **my wife and my son Eyad** for their great help and patience during this work and to **my mother, father, Brothers and all my family** for their continuous encouragement and praying for me.

CONTENTS

Title	Page
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Review of Literature.....	3
1- Stem rust pathogen and disease cycles.....	3
2- Damage of stem rust disease.....	4
3- Wheat stem rust and historical Impact.....	5
4- Pathogen races and Sr resistance genes.....	9
5- Wheat resistance to stem rust disease in bread wheat.....	12
6- Yield-related traits in relation to stem rust.....	15
7- Deployment of stem rust resistance genes in common wheat....	18
8- DNA markers for stem rust resistance.....	21
III. Materials and Methods.....	24
1. Materials	24
2. Methods.....	24
2.1. Preliminary experiment to stem rust.....	24
2.2. Assessment of stem rust.....	25
2.3. Molecular markers and identification of wheat.....	26
2.3.1. Extraction of DNA.....	26
2.3.1.1. DNA extraction protocol.....	26
2.3.1.2. Stock solutions.....	26
2.3.2. Estimation of DNA quantity and quality.....	27
2.3.2.1. Spectrophotometric method.....	27
2.3.2.2. Visual method.....	27
2.3.3. SSR & STS markers – PCR.....	27
2.3.3.1. SSR & STS primers names.....	28
2.3.3.2. PCR reaction mixture	29

Title	Page
2.3.3.3. PCR programs	30
2.3.4. Agarose & acrylamide gel electrophoresis	31
2.3.4.1. Stock solutions.....	31
2.3.4.2. Gel preparation.....	32
2.3.4.2.1. Agarose gel preparation.....	32
2.3.4.2.2. Acrylamide gel preparation.....	32
2.3.4.3. Separation on agarose.....	32
2.3.5. Analysis of gel images	33
IV. Results and Discussions	34
1. Yield - Related Traits in Relation to Stem rust.....	34
1.1. Screening for Stem rust resistance.....	34
1.2. Assessment of stem rust resistance	34
1.2.1. Response of the parents and F ₁ plants.....	35
1.2.2. Response of F ₂ plants.....	40
2. Molecular genetic markers for stem rust resistance.....	43
2.1. SSR & STS molecular markers for stem rust resistance.....	43
V. Summary	51
VI. References	53

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
Table 1 Name, pedigree and origin of the three selected parental varieties	25
Table 2 List of Microsatellites (SSR) and Sequence Tagged Sites (STS) Markers, chromosomal localization and their loading gels	29
Table 3 Screening the responses of the twelve studied bread wheat genotypes under infected condition at season 2010 – 2011	34
Table 4 Means of some stem rust-related traits of the three parents and their F ₁ plants after harvest.....	37
Table 5 The performances of the most resistant & most susceptible F ₂ (Individual Plants) for cross 1 (Misr1 x Line37) under infected condition (late planting date)	42
Table 6 The performances of the most resistant & most susceptible F ₂ (Individual Plants) for cross 2 (Misr1 x Line92) under infected condition (late planting date)	42
Table 7 The performances of the most resistant & most susceptible F ₂ (Individual Plants) for cross 3 (Line37 x Line92) under infected condition (late planting date)	43
Table 8 Survey of the tested primer fragments with the three parents, their F ₁ plants, the most resistant and the most susceptible F ₂ plants for cross 1 (Misr1 x Line37)	48
Table 9 Survey of the tested primer fragments with the three parents, their F ₁ plants, the most resistant, and the most susceptible F ₂ plants for cross 2 (Misr1 x Line92)	48
Table 10 Survey of the tested primer fragments with the three parents, their F ₁ plants, the most resistant, and the most susceptible F ₂ plants for cross 3 (Line37 x Line92)	48

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
Fig. 1 Life cycle of stem rust pathogen	4
Fig. 2 The main experiment under normal condition (optimum planting date)	35
Fig. 3 The main experiment under infected condition (late planting date)	36
Fig. 4 Symptoms of stem rust disease on bread wheat...	36
Fig. 5 SSR & STS fragments of six primers (Sr2, Sr24, Sr25, Sr36, Sr38 and Sr39) for the most resistant F ₂ plants (R1-R8), the resistant parent (RP1), F ₁ plants, the susceptible parent (SP1) and the most susceptible F ₂ plants (S1-S8) for cross 1 (Misr1 x Line37)	45
Fig. 6 SSR & STS fragments of six primers (Sr2, Sr24, Sr25, Sr36, Sr38 and Sr39) for the most resistant F ₂ plants (R ₁ -R ₇), the resistant parent (RP ₁), F ₁ plants, the susceptible parent (SP ₂) and the most susceptible F ₂ plants (S ₁ -S ₅) for cross 2 (Misr1 x Line 92)	46
Fig. 7 SSR & STS fragments of six primers (Sr2, Sr24, Sr25, Sr36, Sr38 and Sr39) for the most resistant F ₂ plants (R1-R7), the susceptible parent (SP1), F ₁ plants, the susceptible parent (SP2) and the most susceptible F ₂ plants (S1-S8) for cross 3 (Line37 x Line92)	47

LIST OF ABBREVIATION

AFLP	Amplified Fragment Length Polymorphism
ARC	Agricultural Research Center
CIMMYT	International Center for Maize and Wheat Improvement
DGGE	Denaturing Gradient Gel Electrophoresis
ICARDA	International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas
MAS	Marker Assisted Selection
PCR	Polymerase Chain Reaction
QTL	Quantitative Trait Loci
RAPD	Randomly Amplified Polymorphism DNA
RFLP	Restriction Fragment Length Polymorphism
STS	Sequence Tagged Sites
SSR	Simple Sequence Repeats

INTRODUCTION

Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) is the most important strategic cereal crop for the majority of the world populations. Wheat is one of the oldest and most important of the cereal crops in Egypt. The annual consumption of wheat grains in Egypt is about 12.4 million tons, while the annual local production is about 9.38 million tons/3.4 million faddan, while consumption is about 12.4 m.tons in 2014/2015 (gap: 3.02 m.tons). **(Agric. Economics and Statistics Department, Ministry of Agriculture, Egypt 2015).**

Therefore, the efforts of wheat breeders and geneticists must continue to increase the productivity of area unit to face the gap between production and consumption in Egypt, though grown under a wide range of climates and soils. The required yield increase may be achieved by developing high-yielding cultivars simultaneously, implementing improved cultural practices. The new improved cultivars must be resistant to serious diseases such as wheat rusts, tolerant to abiotic stresses namely; drought, salinity and heat, and should be stable in a broad spectrum of environments (having wide adoptability).

Stripe, leaf and stem rusts caused by *Puccinia striiformis*, *Puccinia triticinea* and *Puccinia graminis*, respectively are globally important wheat fungal diseases that cause significant grain yield losses. Stem rust can cause severe yield losses in susceptible cultivars of wheat in environments favorable for disease development **(Leonard and Szabo, 2005)**. Stem rust resistance genes were successfully deployed in commercial cultivars worldwide from the middle 1950s, effectively controlling the disease. However, in 1999, a new race of stem rust, Ug99, also called TTKS, emerged in Uganda **(Pretorius et al., 2000)**. Later, it was also found in Kenya, Ethiopia and Yemen **(Singh et al., 2006)**. More recently, Ug99 has spread to major wheat production areas of the Middle East, such as Iran, Afghanistan, India, Pakistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan. The possible route of stem rust spread is

INTRODUCTION

proposed as East Africa – Middle East – West Asia – South Asia (**Singh et al., 2006**). Use of resistance wheat cultivars is the most economic and environmentally safe way to reduce crop losses from rust diseases. However, understanding the genetic behavior of wheat resistance to these diseases is essential for deciding the breeding method that maximizes the genetic improvement of these characters (**Shehab El-Din et al., 1991**).

Wheat resistance to rusts has been documented to be a simple inherited character governed by one, two or a few number of major gene pairs (**Dyck, 1991**) and (**Bai et al., 1997**). Meanwhile, several investigators indicated that resistance is a quantitative character controlled by many genes as well as the prevailing environmental conditions, (**Shehab El-Din et al., 1991**), (**Yadav et al., 1998**) and (**Nawar et al., 2010**).

Molecular markers are useful tools to study the genetic variations (**Röder et al., 2002**). It offers the simplest and fastest method for detecting a great number of genomic markers in less period of time (**Edwards et al., 1992**). **Michelmore et al. (1991)** developed the F₂ plants population to the highest and the lowest extremes for the development of markers needed for marker-assisted selection. Marker-assisted selection program was progressed markers in several crop plants such as wheat (**Penner et al., 1996**), durum wheat (**Wang et al., 1995**).

Several of the Sr genes derived from wild relatives present on Robertsonian translocations or small chromosomal introgression segments have been relied upon in for breeding programs and have been deployed commercially including Sr24, 25, 31, 36, 38, 5 and Sr1RAMigo (**Singh, 2008**). Sr2 has provided durable resistance since its introduction to hexaploid wheat in the 1920s (**McFadden, 1930**).

The objectives of this study are to screen the response of three contrasting parents and their F₁ and F₂ plants to stem rust by recording the rust reaction and some related traits to stem rust. Detect some

INTRODUCTION

molecular genetic markers associated with stem rust using SSR & STS markers.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1. Stem rust pathogen and disease cycle.

On barberry, *P. graminis* starts its life cycle by producing black thick walled, diploid teliospores that keep *P. graminis* dormant overwinter (Roelfs, 1985). After karyogamy, which forms a diploid nucleus from the fusion of two haploid nuclei, meiosis begins and results in four haploid basidiospores. In spring, each teliospore germinates to produce two identical thin walled haploid basidiospores (Roelfs, 1985; Leonard and Szabo, 2005). Mature basidiospores are carried by air currents to reinfect barberry. Basidiospores germinate and form a haploid mycelium growing on the leaf surface. From the mycelium, pycnia are produced on the upper leaf surface of barberry. Pycnia produce receptive hyphae that serve as female gametes and pycniospores served as male gametes (Roelfs, 1988). Pycniospores are produced in honeydew that is attractive to insects, and rain splashing helps disperse pycniospores. When pycniospores are paired with receptive hyphae, cross-fertilization occurs successfully and dikaryotic mycelium forms. Then a cup-shaped dikaryotic aecium forms to release aeciospores. Normally aeciospores stalked in chains produced on barberry are transported by wind to start a new disease cycle in susceptible wheat cultivars (Roelfs, 1985; Leonard and Szabo, 2005).

In wheat, rust infection mainly occurs on stems and leaf sheaths. Within two weeks after inoculation, a brick-red structure, called a rust pustule also known as a uredium containing urediospores, appears at the point of inoculation. In heteroecious rusts, urediospores can reproduce themselves and re-infect wheat multiple times (Leonard and Szabo, 2005), which can lead to severe damage on wheat production. In a later developmental stage, another type of spore called teliospore, which is a black overwintering spore, is produced in telia (Cummins and Hiratsuka, 2003) to conclude the disease cycle of stem rust in wheat and to start a new life cycle in barberry (Figure 1).