

**GENETIC AND MOLECULAR ANALYSES OF RESISTANCE
TO RUST DISEASES IN BARLEY**

by

PRASHANT G. GOLEGAONKAR

M.Sc. (Agriculture), M.Sc. (Horticulture)

A thesis submitted in fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY



**THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY
PLANT BREEDING INSTITUTE COBBITTY**

NOVEMBER 2007

STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university, and to the best of my knowledge, it contains no material previously published by any other person, except where due references are made in the text.

Prashant G. Golegaonkar

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I take this opportunity to express my indebtedness to my supervisor Prof. Park, R.F., Director of Cereal Rust Research, Plant Breeding Institute of University of Sydney, Camden for his keen interest, most valuable and inspiring guidance, constant criticism throughout the research work and preparation of this manuscript.

I owe my profound thanks to my assistant supervisors, Assoc Prof. Wellings, C. R. and Dr. Singh, D. for their unfailing help and making enlightening suggestions during the course of the research. I am thankful to Dr. Karaoglu, H. for helping me to conduct molecular research. I am also thankful to Mr. Williams, M., Mr. Kavanagh, P., Mr. Kandel, K. and Ms. Wildner, B. for valuable technical assistance and Mr. Bell, J. A. for providing research facilities and necessary support for the research.

The financial support provided through industrial research scholarship by Grains Research and Development Corporation (GRDC) to conduct the research is gratefully acknowledged.

My special thanks to Emeritus Prof. McIntosh, R. A. for giving valuable time to discuss results and suggesting valuable information during the study.

I express my cordial thanks to my college mates Aderajew, Ali, Baljit, Omid, Natalia, Brett, Adrian, Jianping and a special friend, Tracy (Hiu Tong) Wong for their help during my studies.

I cannot eschew to express my wholehearted sense of reverence to my beloved wife and family members who were instrumental in providing this opportunity for building up my educational carrier, encouragement and inspiration throughout the study. At the last but not the least, I would like to be in awe of my daughter, Sanika for refreshing me from my tiresome research work with her sweet smile and affectionate cuddle.

“The reason of my liking to keep the marks for cleanness on plants, which have afterwards become rusty, is that I look upon lateness in becoming affected by it, as a measure of resistance to the parasite; and because I consider that individual plants may transmit to their progeny the valuable quality of resisting the parasite until a late stage of their lives, when it has less time for injuring the grain.”

Farrer, W. J. (1898). The making and improvement of wheats for Australian conditions. *Agr. Gas. N.S. W.* **9**: 131-168.

Dedicated to

**All scientists who contributed to the current understanding of rust resistance in
cereals**

Summary

The responses of 92 barley genotypes to selected *P. hordei* pathotypes was assessed in greenhouse tests at seedling growth stages and in the field at adult plant growth stages to determine known or unknown resistances. On the basis of multipathotype tests, 35 genotypes were postulated to carry *Rph2*, *Rph4*, *Rph5*, *Rph12*, *RphCantala* alone or combinations of *Rph2* + *Rph4* and *Rph1* + *Rph2*, whereas 52 genotypes lacked detectable seedling resistance to *P. hordei*. Five genotypes carried seedling resistance that was effective to all pathotypes tested, of which four were believed to carry uncharacterised resistance based on pedigree information. Field tests at adult plant growth stages indicated that while 28 genotypes were susceptible, 57 carried uncharacterised APR to *P. hordei*. Pedigree analysis indicated that APR in the test genotypes could have been derived from three different sources. The resistant responses of seven cultivars at adult plant growth stages were believed to be due to the presence of seedling resistance effective against the field pathotypes.

Genetic studies conducted on 10 barley genotypes suggested that ‘Vada’, ‘Nagrad’, ‘Gilbert’, ‘Ulandra (NT)’ and ‘WI3407’ each carry one gene providing adult plant resistance to *P. hordei*. Genotypes ‘Patty’, ‘Pompadour’, ‘Athos’, ‘Dash’ and ‘RAH1995’ showed digenic inheritance of APR at one field site and monogenic inheritance at a second. One of the genes identified in each of these cultivars provided high levels of APR and was effective at both field sites. The second APR gene was effective only at one field site, and it conferred low levels of APR. Tests of allelism between resistant genotypes confirmed a common APR gene in all genotypes with the exception of ‘WI3407’, which based on pedigree information was genetically distinct from the gene common in ‘Vada’, ‘Nagrad’, ‘Patty’, ‘RAH1995’ and ‘Pompadour’.

An incompletely dominant gene, *Rph14*, identified previously in an accession of *Hordeum vulgare* confers resistance to all known pathotypes of *P. hordei* in Australia. The inheritance of *Rph14* was confirmed using 146 and 106 F₃ lines derived from the crosses ‘Baudin’/ ‘PI 584760’ (*Rph14*) and ‘Ricardo’/ ‘PI 584760’ (*Rph14*), respectively. Bulk segregant analysis on DNA from the parental genotypes and resistant and susceptible DNA bulks from F₃ lines using diversity array technology (DArT) markers located *Rph14* to the short arm of chromosome 2H.

Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) based marker analysis identified a single simple sequence repeat (SSR) marker, Bmag692, linked closely to *Rph14* at a map distance of 2.1 and 3.8 cM in the populations 'Baudin'/'PI 584760' and 'Ricardo'/'PI 584760', respectively.

Seedlings of 62 Australian and two exotic barley cultivars were assessed for resistance to a variant of *Puccinia striiformis*, referred to as *BGYR*, which causes stripe rust on several wild *Hordeum* species and some genotypes of cultivated barley. With the exception of six Australian barley cultivars and an exotic cultivar, all displayed resistance to the pathogen. Genetic analyses of six Australian barley cultivars and the Algerian barley 'Sahara 3771', suggested that they carried either one or two major seedling resistance genes to the pathogen. A single recessive seedling resistance gene, *Bgyr1*, identified in 'Sahara 3771' was located on the long arm of chromosome 7H and flanked by restriction fragment length polymorphism (RFLP) markers wg420 and cdo347 at genetic distances of 12.8 and 21.9 cM, respectively. Mapping resistance to *BGYR* at adult plant growth stages using a doubled haploid population derived from the cross 'Clipper'/'Sahara 3771' identified two major QTLs on the long arms of chromosomes 3H and 7H that explained 26 and 18% of total phenotypic variation, respectively. The QTL located on chromosome 7HL corresponded to the seedling resistance gene *Bgyr1*. The second QTL was concluded to correspond to a single adult plant resistance gene designated *Bgyr2*, originating from cultivar 'Clipper'.

Contents

Chapter I Introduction	
1.1 Taxonomy and origin	01
1.2 Cultivation and use of barley	01
1.3 Barley breeding	02
1.3.1 Disease resistance	02
1.4 Research aims	03
Chapter II Review of literature	
2.1 General introduction	04
2.2 Rust diseases in barley	05
2.2.1 Leaf rust of barley	06
2.2.1.1 Life cycle of <i>P. hordei</i>	06
2.2.2 Economic importance	09
2.3 Pathotypes of <i>P. hordei</i>	09
2.3.1 Pathotype nomenclature	11
2.4 Stripe rust of barley	13
2.5 Breeding for rust resistance	14
2.5.1 Gene for gene theory of host pathogen interaction	15
2.5.2 Molecular basis of gene for gene hypothesis	16
2.5.3 Breeding methods	18
2.5.3.1 Selection	18
2.5.3.2 Mutation	18
2.5.3.3 Hybridisation	19
2.5.3.3.1 Pedigree method	19
2.5.3.3.2 Backcrossing method	19
2.5.3.3.3 Bulk selection method	20
2.5.3.3.4 Doubled haploid method	20
2.6 Disease assessment	20
2.6.1 Leaf rust assessment with respect to yield losses in barley	23
2.7 Resistance	23
2.7.1 Classification of resistance on the basis of growth stage	23
2.7.2 Classification of resistance on genetic basis	24
2.7.2.1 Major gene/qualitative resistance	24
2.7.2.1.1 Multilines	25
2.7.2.1.2 Pyramiding or combining resistance genes	25

2.7.2.2 Minor genes/quantitative resistance	26
2.7.2.2.1 Partial resistance	26
2.7.3 Classification of resistance on the basis of durability	27
2.8 Major gene resistance to leaf rust in barley	28
2.9 Classical and molecular mapping of disease resistance	34
2.9.1 Marker Assisted Selection	35
2.9.2 Tagging or mapping major genes	35
2.9.3 Mapping quantitative resistance	40
Chapter III Seedling and adult plant resistance to <i>Puccinia hordei</i> in barley	
3.1 Introduction	43
3.2 Materials and methods	44
3.2.1 Plant material	44
3.2.2 Pathogen material	46
3.2.3 Inoculation methods and disease assessment	47
3.2.4 Scoring disease responses	47
3.3 Results	48
3.3.1 Seedling resistance	48
3.3.2 Adult plant resistance	57
3.4 Discussion	62
3.4.1 Seedling resistance	62
3.4.2 Adult plant resistance	66
Chapter IV Genetic analysis of adult plant resistance to <i>Puccinia hordei</i> in barley	
4.1 Introduction	72
4.2 Materials and methods	73
4.2.1 Plant materials and field design	73
4.2.2 Pathogen	73
4.2.3 Disease assessment	74
4.2.4 Statistical analysis	74
4.3 Results	75
4.3.1 Inheritance of APR	77
4.3.2 Allelism tests	82
4.4 Discussion	84
4.5 Conclusion	86
Chapter V Molecular mapping of leaf rust resistance gene <i>Rph14</i> in barley	
5.1 Introduction	88
5.2 Materials and methods	89

5.2.1 Plant material	89
5.2.2 Seedling inoculations and disease assessment	89
5.2.3 DNA extraction and bulk preparation	90
5.2.4 SSR and STS analyses	90
5.2.5 Chi-squared and linkage analyses	91
5.3 Results	93
5.3.1 Genetic analysis	93
5.3.2 Molecular mapping	95
5.4 Discussion	97
5.5 Conclusion	99
Chapter VI Genetic & molecular analyses of resistance to a new form of <i>P. striiformis</i> in barley	
6.1 Introduction	100
6.2 Materials and methods	101
6.2.1 Genetic material	101
6.2.2 Inoculation procedures	103
6.2.3 Disease assessment	103
6.2.4 Statistical and molecular analyses	104
6.3 Results	104
6.3.1 Genetic analysis	105
6.3.2 Tests of allelism	109
6.3.3 Mapping seedling resistance in Sahara 3771	110
6.3.4 Mapping adult plant resistance in Clipper/Sahara 3771 DH population	112
6.4 Discussion	113
6.5 Conclusion	116
Chapter VII General discussion	118
References	121
Appendices	143

List of Tables

Table 2.1. <i>P. hordei</i> pathotypes in Australia and their virulence/avirulence pattern.	12
Table 2.2. Binary triplets and their corresponding octal numbers used in designating pathotypes of <i>P. hordei</i> .	13
Table 2.3. Major infection types used to assess stem rust and leaf rust response at seedling growth stages.	22
Table 2.4. Major infection types used to assess stripe rust response.	22
Table 2.5. Recommended locus and allele symbols for genes conferring resistance to <i>Puccinia hordei</i> in barley.	31
Table 2.6. Chromosomal location of <i>Rph</i> genes in barley.	37
Table 2.7. Chromosomal locations of QTLs conferring resistance to <i>P. hordei</i> in barley	41
Table 3.1. Pedigrees of barley genotypes assessed for response to <i>Puccinia hordei</i> at seedling and adult plant growth stages.	44
Table 3.2. Infection types of differential genotypes to selected pathotypes of <i>Puccinia hordei</i> .	49
Table 3.3. Infection types of barley cultivars included in group 1 when inoculated with 10 <i>pts. Puccinia hordei</i> .	50
Table 3.4. Infection types of 12 barley genotypes included in group 2, postulated to carry <i>Rph12</i> , and the control differential genotype ‘Triumph’ when inoculated with 10 <i>pts. of Puccinia hordei</i> .	53
Table 3.5. Infection types of barley genotypes included in group 3, postulated to carry <i>Rph4</i> , and the control differential genotype ‘Gold’ when inoculated with 10 <i>pts. Puccinia hordei</i> .	53
Table 3.6. Infection types of eight barley cultivars included in group 4, postulated to carry <i>Rph2</i> , and the control differential genotype ‘Peruvian’ when inoculated with 10 <i>pts. of Puccinia hordei</i> .	55
Table 3.7. Infection types two of barley cultivars included in group 5, postulated to carry <i>Rph5</i> , and the differential genotype ‘Magnif 104’ when inoculated with 10 <i>pts. of Puccinia hordei</i> .	55
Table 3.8. Infection types of two barley cultivars included in group 6, postulated to carry <i>Rph Cantala</i> , and the differential genotype ‘Cantala’ when inoculated with 10 <i>pts. of Puccinia hordei</i> .	55

Table 3.9. Infection types of barley cultivar Rainbow included in group 7, postulated to carry <i>Rph2</i> , and <i>Rph4</i> , and the control differential genotypes ‘Peruvian’, and ‘Gold’ when inoculated with 10 <i>pts.</i> of <i>Puccinia hordei</i> .	56
Table 3.10. Infection types of two barley cultivars included in group 8, postulated to carry <i>Rph1</i> , and <i>Rph2</i> , and control differential genotypes ‘Sudan’, and ‘Peruvian’ when inoculated with 10 <i>pts.</i> of <i>Puccinia hordei</i> .	56
Table 3.11. Infection types of four barley cultivars included in group 9 when inoculated with 10 <i>pts.</i> of <i>Puccinia hordei</i> .	56
Table 3.12. Adult plant responses of barley genotypes included in group A1 to <i>Puccinia hordei</i> at two field sites in 2006.	59
Table 3.13. Adult plant responses of barley genotypes included in group A2 to <i>Puccinia hordei</i> at two field sites in 2006.	61
Table 3.14. Adult plant responses of barley genotypes included in group A3 to <i>Puccinia hordei</i> at two field sites in 2006.	63
Table 3.15. Adult plant responses of barley genotypes included in group A4 to <i>Puccinia hordei</i> at two field sites in 2006.	63
Table 3.16. Adult plant responses of barley genotypes included in group A5 to <i>Puccinia hordei</i> at two field sites in 2006.	63
Table 4.1. Pedigrees and countries of origin of resistant parental barley genotypes	74
Table 4.2. Parental reactions to <i>Puccinia hordei</i> at seedling (greenhouse) and adult plant (field) growth stages	75
Table 4.3. Frequency distribution and Chi-squared analysis of adult plant resistance to <i>Puccinia hordei</i> in BC ₁ F ₂ rows derived from crosses of 10 barley genotypes with the susceptible cultivar Gus.	78
Table 4.4. Frequency distribution and Chi-squared analysis of segregation of head character in BC ₁ F ₂ populations derived from crosses of 10 two row barley genotypes with the six row cultivar Gus	80
Table 4.5. Distribution of BC ₁ F ₂ rows based on combined adult plant response to <i>Puccinia hordei</i> at two field sites	82
Table 4.6. Leaf rust responses of F ₂ populations derived from intercrossing barley cultivars displaying adult plant resistance to <i>Puccinia hordei</i>	83
Table 5.1. Description of 20 DNA markers located on barley chromosome 2HS assessed for potential mapping of <i>Rph14</i> in two barley populations.	92
Table 5.2. Observed frequencies of phenotypic classes in F ₂ and F ₃ populations derived from the crosses ‘Baudin’/‘PI 584760’ and ‘Ricardo’/‘PI 584760’.	94

Table 6.1. Pedigrees and years of release of 60 Australian and two exotic barley cultivars assessed for response to Barley Grass Stripe Rust.	101
Table 6.2. Infection types of 60 Australian and two exotic barley cultivars when inoculated with Barley Grass Stripe Rust isolate 981549.	105
Table 6.3. Frequencies of resistant and susceptible lines of three DH populations of barley when inoculated with Barley Grass Stripe Rust isolate 981549.	107
Table 6.4. Frequencies of resistant and susceptible F ₂ seedlings derived from crosses involving four Australian and an Algerian barley cultivars against Barley Grass Stripe Rust isolate 981549 in seedling tests.	107
Table 6.5. Frequencies of resistant and susceptible F ₃ seedlings derived from crosses involving four Australian and an Algerian barley cultivars against Barley Grass Stripe Rust isolate 981549 in seedling tests.	109
Table 6.6. Distribution of seedlings resistant and susceptible to <i>BGYR</i> in F ₂ populations derived from the crosses ‘Skiff’/‘Tantangara’, ‘Sahara 3771’/‘Skiff’ and ‘Sahara 3771’/‘Tantangara’.	110
Table 6.7. Frequencies of resistant and susceptible lines of ‘Clipper’/‘Sahara 3771’ DH population when screened in the field at adult plant growth stages against Barley Grass Stripe Rust isolate 981549.	112
Table 6.8. Details of two QTL located on chromosome 3HL and 7HL providing resistance at adult plant growth stages to Barley Grass Stripe Rust isolate 981549.	113

List of Figures

Figure 2.1. Life cycle of <i>P. hordei</i> ..	8
Figure 2.2. Interaction between a host resistance gene and a pathogenicity gene and the resulting disease phenotypes.	15
Figure 2.3. Interaction between an elicitor produced by a pathogen and a receptor encoded by a resistance gene of a host plant cell and its effect on disease resistance reaction of the host.	17
Figure 2.4. Chromosomal location of seedling resistance genes against <i>P. hordei</i> in barley.	39
Figure 3.1. Diagrammatic representation of genetic relationship between 10 cultivars and the source of resistance in them determined on the basis of pedigree information.	52
Figure 3.2. Diagrammatic representation of genetic relationships between barley genotypes based on pedigree information, and the presumed origin of APR based on their responses to <i>Puccinia hordei</i> at adult plant growth stages.	68
Figure 4.1. A genetic model explaining the phenotypic responses of BC ₁ F ₂ populations grown at two sites to <i>Puccinia hordei</i> , assuming locus A is effective at two locations (L1 and L2) while locus B is effective only at location L2.	81
Figure 5.1. Partial consensus map of barley chromosome 2HS developed by linking DArT markers to SSR, RFLP and STS loci (Wenzel <i>et al.</i> , 2006) and showing the genomic location.	96
Figure 5.2. Linkage analysis of <i>Rph14</i> with marker Bmag692 using F ₃ lines from the population ‘Baudin’/‘PI 584760’ (a) and ‘Ricardo’/‘PI 584760’ (b); M - pUC19 / MspI DNA marker, P1 – resistant parent (‘PI 584760’), P2 – susceptible parent (‘Baudin’), P3 – susceptible parent (‘Ricardo’), S – non-segregating susceptible progeny, H – segregating progeny, R – non-segregating resistant progeny of <i>Rph14</i> .	96
Figure 6.1. Partial map of barley chromosome 1 (7H) showing the genomic location of seedling gene <i>Bgyr1</i> providing resistance to Barley Grass Stripe Rust isolate 981549.	111
Figure 6.2. Major QTL on chromosome 1 (7H) and chromosome 3 (3H) associated resistance to Barley Grass Stripe Rust at adult plant growth stages in ‘Clipper’/‘Sahara 3771’ doubled haploid population, including thresholds for significant associations (LRS).	114

List of Plates

- Plate 3.1.** Infection types observed on seedlings (left to right) of ‘Abacus (A)’, and ‘Abacus (B)’ when inoculated with *P. hordei* pt. 5653P+. **57**
- Plate 3.2.** Adult plant (flag leaf) responses (left to right) of ‘Vada’, ‘Minerva’, ‘Gull’, and ‘Gus’ when assessed under field conditions against *P. hordei* pt. 5653P+. **67**
- Plate 3.3.** Adult plant (flag leaf) responses of ‘Emir’, ‘Agio’, ‘Delta’, and ‘Kenia’ when assessed under field conditions against *P. hordei* pt. 5653P+. **69**
- Plate 3.4.** Adult plant (flag leaf) responses (left to right) of ‘Ricardo’, ‘WI3407’, ‘RAH1995’, ‘Ulandra (NT)’, and ‘Gus’ infected with *P. hordei* pt. 5653P+. **69**
- Plate 4.1.** Adult plant flag leaf rust responses of (from left) ‘Gus’ (susceptible, male parent), ‘Pompadour’, ‘Patty’, ‘Nagrad’, ‘Vada’, ‘RAH1995’ and ‘WI3407’ when tested in the field against *Puccinia hordei* pathotype 5653P+. **76**
- Plate 4.2.** Adult plant flag leaf rust responses of (from left) ‘Gus’ (susceptible male parent), ‘Dash’, ‘Gilbert’, ‘Athos’ and ‘Ulandra (NT)’ when tested in the field against *Puccinia hordei* pathotype 5653P+. **77**
- Plate 5.1.** Infection types of parents (from left) ‘PI 584760 (;1+CN)’, ‘Baudin’ and ‘Ricardo’ (3+) when tested in the greenhouse at seedling growth stages against *P. hordei* pt. 5453P-. **94**
- Plate 6.1.** Infection types of parental cultivars of DH populations (from left) ‘Skiff’, ‘Franklin’, ‘Tantangara’, ‘Tilga’, ‘Clipper’ and ‘Sahara 3771’ when tested at seedling growth stages against Barley Grass Stripe Rust isolate 981549 in the greenhouse. **106**
- Plate 6.2.** Infection types of parental cultivars (from left) ‘Sudan’, ‘Skiff’, ‘Tantangara’, ‘Baudin’ and ‘Stirling’ when tested in greenhouse at seedling growth stages against Barley Grass Stripe Rust isolate 981549. **108**
- Plate 6.3.** Infection types of (from left) ‘Ketch’ and ‘Sahara 3771’ when tested in the greenhouse at seedling growth stages against Barley Grass Stripe Rust isolate 981549. **108**
- Plate 6.4.** Adult plant (flag leaf) responses of parental genotypes (left to right) ‘Clipper’, ‘Sahara 3771’ and a susceptible line from ‘Clipper’/‘Sahara 3771’ DH population when assessed under field conditions against Barley Grass Stripe Rust isolate 981549. **111**