

Potential of doubled-haploid lines and localization of quantitative trait loci (QTL) for partial resistance to bacterial leaf streak (Xanthomonas campestris pv. hordei) in barley

Hania El Attari, P. M. Hayes, Ahmed-Riadh Rebai, Gérard Barrault, Grégory Dechamp-Guillaume, Ahmad Sarrafi

▶ To cite this version:

Hania El Attari, P. M. Hayes, Ahmed-Riadh Rebai, Gérard Barrault, Grégory Dechamp-Guillaume, et al.. Potential of doubled-haploid lines and localization of quantitative trait loci (QTL) for partial resistance to bacterial leaf streak (Xanthomonas campestris pv. hordei) in barley. TAG Theoretical and Applied Genetics, 1998, 96 (1), pp.95-100. 10.1007/s001220050714 . hal-02875277

HAL Id: hal-02875277 https://hal.science/hal-02875277

Submitted on 19 Jun2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Open Archive Toulouse Archive Ouverte

OATAO is an open access repository that collects the work of Toulouse researchers and makes it freely available over the web where possible

This is an author's version published in: https://oatao.univ-toulouse.fr/26444

Official URL : https://doi.org/10.1007/s001220050714

To cite this version:

El Attari, Hania and Hayes, P. M. and Rebai, Ahmed and Barrault, Gérard and Dechamp-Guillaume, Grégory and Sarrafi, Ahmad *Potential of doubled-haploid lines and localization of quantitative trait loci (QTL) for partial resistance to bacterial leaf streak (Xanthomonas campestris pv. hordei) in barley.* (1998) Theoretical and Applied Genetics, 96 (1). 95-100. ISSN 0040-5752

Potential of doubled-haploid lines and localization of quantitative trait loci (QTL) for partial resistance to bacterial leaf streak (*Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *hordei*) in barley

Abstract Genetic variability for partial resistance to bacterial leaf streak in barley, caused by Xanthomonas campestris pv. hordei, was investigated in 119 doubledhaploid lines (DH) developed by the Hordeum bulbosum method from the F_1 progeny of the cross between two cultivars, 'Morex' (resistant) and 'Steptoe' (susceptible). Two experiments were undertaken in a randomized complete block design with three replicates, in a controlled growth chamber. Twenty seeds per replicate were planted in plastic containers $(60 \times 40 \times 8 \text{ cm})$ containing moistened vermiculite. At the two-leaf stage seedlings were inoculated with an Iranian strain of the pathogen. Genetic variability was observed among the 119 DH lines for partial resistance to the disease. Some DH lines were significantly more resistant than 'Morex' (resistant parent) to bacterial leaf streak. Genetic gain in percentage of resistant parent for 5% of the selected DH lines was significant (47.70% and 33.72% in the first and the second experiment, respectively). A QTL analysis of bacterial leaf streak resistance showed that three QTLs were detected on chromosomes 3 and 7. Multilocus allelic effects of the three QTLs account for almost 54% of the mean difference between the parents and nearly 30% of the phenotypic variation of the trait in the mean experiment. The resistance locus on chromosome 3, near ABG377, apprears to be a major gene.

H. El Attari · A. Rebai · G. Barrault
G. Dechamp-Guillaume · A. Sarrafi (⊠)
Ecole Nationale Supérieure Agronomique de Toulouse, Institut National Polytechnique (ENSAT-INP),
145, Avenue de Muret, F-31076 Toulouse-Cédex, France
Fax: + 33(0)562136564
E-Mail: sarrafi@ensat.fr.

P. M. Hayes

Key words Quantitative trait loci • Barley • Doubled haploid • Partial resistance • *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *hordei*

Introduction

Pathovars of *Xanthomonas campestris* are the causal agents of bacterial leaf streak of cereals. The disease is found over a range of very different conditions such as irrigated fields in temperate climates, high-rainfall subtropical highlands and warm environments (Duveiller, 1994). The foliar expression of the disease is characterized by longitudinal stripes that extend between the leaf veins and by the production of milky exudates under humid conditions (Duveiller et al. 1993).

Bacterial leaf streak is present in many countries all over the world (Akhtar and Aslam, 1985). Under favourable conditions losses attributable to this disease can reach 40% in susceptible triticale (Schaad and Forster 1985) and wheat (Cunfer 1988) cultivars. The disease also reduces grain weight and protein content of the grain (Shane et al. 1987). Transmission of the disease on a large scale is due to the seed-borne nature of the pathogen (Sands et al. 1986; Duveiller 1989).

There are differences between wheat genotypes in their susceptibility to bacterial leaf streak, and resistance is incomplete (Duveiller 1990). The inheritance of resistance to *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *translucens* from three resistant triticale lines showed that it was conferred by a single dominant gene (Johnson et al. 1987). A study of parental genotypes, F_1 plants and F_3 families showed that five genes were involved in resistance to *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *undulosa* in bread wheat (Duveiller et al. 1993). Additive genetic effects, which are important in predicting the progeny performance of crosses, were reported in barley by Arabi et al. (1990) for partial resistance to net bloch and by Alizadeh et al. (1994) for resistance to bacterial leaf streak in barley. The susceptibility of wheat to bacterial

Communicated by G. Wenzel

Department of Crop and Soil Science, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331, USA

leaf streak is similar under field and greenhouse conditions (Akhtar and Aslam 1986).

Doubled-haploid (DH) plant production provides a fast way for obtaining completly homozygous progenies from selected crosses. Additionally, since all the alleles of DH lines are fixed, selection for quantitative characters is often more reliable than in conventional populations (Choo et al. 1985). Bedo et al. (1992) have reported that some DH lines derived from F₁ hybrids have surpassed the better parent for protein and gluten contents and gluten extention. Simmonds et al. (1993) have shown that approximately one-half of the DH lines from a cross between two varieties resistant and susceptible to Fusarium head blight were resistant to the disease. Steffenson et al. (1995) have reported that a few high yielding DH lines obtained from a cross between two genotypes resistant or susceptible to leaf rust, stem rust and powdery mildew were resistant to all of these diseases.

The development of quantitative trait loci (QTL) mapping analyses has provided an alternative approach to locating and subsequently manipulating resistance genes related to powdery mildew and stripe rust in barley (Huen 1992; Chen et al. 1994, respective-ly), powdery mildew in mungbean (Young et al. 1993), downy mildew in sunflower (Mouzeyar et al. 1995) and important agronomic characters in barley (Backes et al. 1995).

The objective of the investigation presented here was to evaluate the variability and genetic gain for partial resistance to bacterial leaf streak due to *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *hordei* in doubled-haploid lines obtained from F_1 progeny of a cross between two barley varieties resistant and susceptible to the disease. We also carried out a QTL mapping analysis to characterize genomic regions involved in bacterial leaf streak. The locations of detected QTLs were compared to those of QTLs influencing agronomic, quality and disease resistance traits mapped in other studies.

Materials and methods

A population of 119 doubled-haploid lines developed by the Hordeum bulbosum method (Chen and Hayes 1989) from the F₁ progeny of the 'Steptoe' × 'Morex' cross were used in this experiment. 'Steptoe' is a high-yielding, broadly adapted six-row feed-type barley developed at the Washington State University (Seattle, Wash., USA). 'Morex' is a six-row spring malting barley released by the Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station in 1978. Our preliminary experiments showed that 'Steptoe' is susceptible to bacterial leaf streak caused by Xanthomonas campestris pv. hordei and 'Morex' is resistant to this disease. Two successive experiments, each in a randomized complete block design with three replicates, were performed in a growth chamber. Twenty seeds per replication per genotype were sterilized with sodium hypochlorite solution (6 chlorimetric degrees) for 5 min, washed several times in sterile distilled water and then planted in plastic containers $(60 \times 40 \times 8 \text{ cm})$ containing moistened vermiculite. At the two-leaf stage, seedlings were enclosed in a special transparent cover (plexiglass) for 24 h in order to create saturating moisture favourable for bacterial inoculation. The inoculation was then carried out by spraying bacterial suspension of an Iranian strain of the pathogen (IBLS8) standarized at about 10⁸ colony-forming units per milliliter. This strain was isolated from a barley variety grown in southeastern Iran and identified as *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *hordei* (Alizadeh and Rahimian, 1989). In order to maintain the high activity of the strain, we maintained the colonies on nutrient agar medium (Difco) with transfers being made every 4 days at $25^{\circ} \pm 1^{\circ}$ C and keeping cultures in the dark for 24 h. The cultures were used directly or stored under optimal conditions of virulence at $4^{\circ} \pm 1^{\circ}$ C.

Scoring was performed 12 days after inoculation. The first leaf of the seedling was stored to determine the proportion of diseased leaf area (water-soaking and translucent spots or stripes). The host reaction was rated from 1 (resistant) to 9 (susceptible) in proportion to the leaf area showing symptoms, as proposed by Alizadeh et al. (1994). Intensity values did not require any transformation to normalize the distribution. Statistical analyses were carried out in order to determine the effect of genotype on partial resistance in both experiments. The Newman – Keuls test was used for comparing the means of parents and DH lines. The mean of the 119 DH lines and that of the parents was also compared. The most resistant DH line as well as the 5% of DH lines showing the highest partial resistance to the pathogen (low values) were compared with the resistant parent. Genetic gain in percentage of the resistant parent was also determined for the above-mentioned selected lines.

For QTL analyses we used 223 marker loci which had (previously) been mapped in the 'Steptoe' \times 'Morex' populations by Mather (1995). The map, having an average marker density of 6 cM, is available under the Graingenes database. The reader is referred to this database and to Kleinhofs et al. (1993) for a comprehensive discussion and presentation of the map.

The MQTL software (Tinker and Mather 1995) was used for QTL mapping. We performed simple interval mapping (SIM) and simplified composite interval mapping (sCIM) on both experiments and on their means. SCIM uses background markers to account for other QTLs on the genome and thus gives a better resolution of multiple-linked QTLs. For sCIM, a single set of 48 (5–8 per chromosome) uniformly spaced background markers were chosen and used throughout the analysis, with a marker each 25 cM on average. Significance thresholds for SIM and sCIM tests were calculated by permutations using MQTL.

Results and discussion

Analyses of variance of the 119 DH lines and their parental varieties 'Morex' and 'Steptoe' showed a high significant genotype effect in both experiments (data not presented). The genetic variability of the parental genotypes and DH lines for partial resistance to Xanthomonas campestris pv. hordei in two experiments are presented in Table 1. In both experiments 'Morex' showed a high level of partial resistance when compared with 'Steptoe', the other parental genotype, which confirms a previous finding (Alizadeh et al. 1994). Some DH lines like DH-11 and DH-30 were highly resistant to bacterial leaf streak in both experiments and others like DH-112 and DH-126 were highly susceptible. These results indicate that genotype is thus a major determinant of resistance to bacterial leaf streak. Several reports have also shown the genetic variability of partial resistance to bacterial leaf streak in wheat (Milus and Kirkpartick 1990; Duveiller et al.
 Table 1
 Partial resistance^a of parental genotypes and DH lines to Xanthomonas campestris pv. hordei

$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Variety or DH	Experiment 1	Experiment 2	Variety or DH	Experiment 1	Experiment 2
Septoe6.46h6.38iDH-1166.87h6.47jDH-15.30f4.90gDH-1207.37i6.68kDH-26.36g6.25jDH-1242.44b2.30cDH-34.60e4.46fDH-1255.73g6.51iDH-55.75g5.87iDH-1267.31i7.07kDH-72.49b3.09bDH-1273.17f3.00bDH-1107.89i6.94kDH-1295.17f5.67gDH-125.90g5.70iDH-1323.48d2.7cDH-144.98f4.05fDH-1333.3cc4.40eDH-144.98f4.05fDH-1343.3cc3.19dDH-202.78c3.19eDH-1354.79e5.69iDH-214.33e3.98dDH-1354.76e5.28hDH-225.94g5.52hDH-1373.53d4.06fDH-237.5716.73jDH-1432.22b2.33cDH-242.68b2.63cDH 1415.00f5.28hDH-253.69d4.46eDH 1446.20g6.56jDH-315.00f5.54gDH 1446.20g6.56jDH-315.00f5.54gDH 1473.55d3.97dDH-326.66h5.90iDH 1491.33a1.59aDH-346.66h5.90iDH 1491.93a1.59aDH-356.66h5.90iDH 1491.53a3.74DH-366.66h5.90iDH 1491.5	Morex	2.83c	2.53c	DH-112	7.73i	7.02k
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Septoe	6.46h	6.38i	DH-116	6.87h	6.47j
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-1	5.30f	4.90g	DH-120	7.37i	6.88k
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-2	6.36g	6.25j	DH-124	2.44b	2.30c
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	DH-3	4.60e	4.46f	DH-125	5.73g	6.51i
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-5	5.75g	5.87i	DH-126	7.31i	7.07k
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	DH-7	2.49b	3.096	DH-127	3.17f	3.006
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-10 DH-11	/.891	6.94k	DH-129	5.1/t 2.524	5.6/g
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-II DH 12	1.39a 5.00a	1.23a 5.70;	DH-130 DH 132	3.330	2.930
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-14	5.90g 4 98f	3.701 4.05f	DH-132	3.460	3.27C 4.40e
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-16	3 53d	3 75d	DH-134	3.36c	3 19d
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-20	2.78c	3.19c	DH-135	4.79e	5.69i
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-21	4.33e	3.98d	DH-136	7.16h	6.76k
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	DH-22	5.94g	5.52h	DH-137	3.53d	4.06f
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	DH-23	7.57Ĭ	6.73j	DH-139	6.71h	6.24j
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-24	2.68b	2.63c	DH 141	5.50f	5.28h
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-25	3.69d	4.46e	DH-143	2.22b	2.33c
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	DH-27	6.21g	5.57h	DH-144	6.20g	6.56j
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-30	1.27a	1.16a	DH 145	7.20i	7.01j
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-31	5.00f	5.54g	DH-146	5.13f	4.78g
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-32	6.19g	6.161	DH-147	3.55d	3.97d
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	DH-35	6.66h	5.901	DH-149	1.93a	1.59a
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	DH-40 DH-41	6.1/g 5.44f	5.61h	DH-150 DH-151	4.961	4./2g 9.101
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-41 DH 42	5.44I 6.08h	5.00g	DH-151 DH 152	7.99J 7.10;	8.12K 6.45h
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-42 DH-43	0.96Π 6.13α	0.27J 6.841	DH-152 DH-153	7.101 5.62a	6 30h
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-50	0.15g 1.66a	2.83h	DH-154	5.02g 4 94f	5.78g
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-54	5 31f	5.40g	DH-155	5 51f	4 47e
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-55	5.29f	5.53g	DH-156	7.07i	6.51i
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-56	7.04h	6.75i	DH 157	5.13f	6.70i
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-57	1.40a	2.05a	DH-158	2.99c	2.93b
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-58	5.56f	6.35j	DH-159	6.05g	7.05i
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-59	5.40f	5.66i	DH-160	5.43f	5.39h
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-61	1.37a	2.12a	DH-162	6.18g	6.69i
DH-64 $6.14h$ $6.89i$ DH-166 $4.01d$ $3.81d$ DH-67 $3.78d$ $3.51c$ DH-167 $5.38f$ $6.37h$ DH-68 $5.00f$ $5.26f$ DH-168 $3.20c$ $3.58c$ DH-69 $5.97g$ $5.13f$ DH-169 $3.50d$ $4.60e$ DH-70 $7.19i$ $7.26k$ DH-170 $2.66b$ $3.04b$ DH-71 $6.38h$ $7.13j$ DH-171 $6.07g$ $6.19h$ DH-72 $6.02g$ $6.62j$ DH-172 $1.40a$ $2.18a$ DH-74 $3.50d$ $3.61e$ DH-173 $6.81h$ $6.86i$ DH-75 $5.58f$ $6.24j$ DH-174 $3.03c$ $3.48c$ DH-76 $4.77e$ $4.88g$ DH-176 $6.37h$ $6.45h$ DH-78 $2.77c$ $3.44c$ DH-179 $7.03i$ $7.10j$ DH-79 $2.87c$ $4.17d$ DH-180 $6.52h$ $7.39j$ DH-81 $5.03f$ $6.03i$ DH-181 $7.22i$ $6.77i$ DH-82 $4.90e$ $5.57i$ DH-184 $3.37c$ $2.28a$ DH-83 $6.23g$ $5.82i$ DH-184 $3.37c$ $2.28a$ DH-85 $4.76e$ $5.29h$ DH-185 $5.40f$ $6.29h$ DH-88 $8.18j$ $7.14k$ DH-187 $6.09g$ $6.71i$ DH-89 $7.61j$ $6.30j$ DH-188 $4.06d$ $3.77d$ DH-91 $3.12c$ $4.68g$ DH-194 $5.37f$ $6.70i$ DH-93 $6.32g$ $5.86i$ DH-197 $7.28i$ $7.83k$ </td <td>DH-63</td> <td>4.46e</td> <td>4.50f</td> <td>DH-164</td> <td>1.78a</td> <td>1.91b</td>	DH-63	4.46e	4.50f	DH-164	1.78a	1.91b
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-64	6.14h	6.89i	DH-166	4.01d	3.81d
DH-685.0015.261DH-1685.20c5.38cDH-695.97g5.13fDH-1693.50d4.60eDH-707.19i7.26kDH-1702.66b3.04bDH-716.38h7.13jDH-171 $6.07g$ 6.19hDH-726.02g6.62jDH-1721.40a2.18aDH-743.50d3.61eDH-1736.81h6.86iDH-755.58f6.24jDH-1743.03c3.48cDH-764.77e4.88gDH-1766.37h6.45hDH-782.77c3.44cDH-1797.03i7.10jDH-792.87c4.17dDH-1806.52h7.39jDH-815.03f6.03iDH-1817.22i6.77iDH-824.90e5.57iDH-1826.15g6.73iDH-836.23g5.82iDH-1843.37c2.28aDH-854.76e5.29hDH-1855.40f6.29hDH-875.95g6.07iDH1866.64h7.05iDH-888.18j7.14kDH-1876.09g6.71iDH-897.61j6.30jDH-1884.06d3.77dDH-913.12c4.68gDH-1945.37f6.70iDH-927.02h5.63iDH-1966.87h6.63jDH-936.32g5.86iDH-1977.28i7.83kDH-1032.42b3.50cDH-1986.33h6.37hDH-1054.65e4.56eDH-200 <td>DH-67</td> <td>3.78d</td> <td>3.51c</td> <td>DH-167</td> <td>5.381</td> <td>6.37h</td>	DH-67	3.78d	3.51c	DH-167	5.381	6.37h
DH-69 $3.97g$ 5.131 DH-169 $3.30d$ $4.60e$ DH-70 $7.19i$ $7.26k$ DH-170 $2.66b$ $3.04b$ DH-71 $6.38h$ $7.13j$ DH-171 $6.07g$ $6.19h$ DH-72 $6.02g$ $6.62j$ DH-172 $1.40a$ $2.18a$ DH-74 $3.50d$ $3.61e$ DH-173 $6.81h$ $6.86i$ DH-75 $5.58f$ $6.24j$ DH-174 $3.03c$ $3.48c$ DH-76 $4.77e$ $4.88g$ DH-176 $6.37h$ $6.45h$ DH-78 $2.77c$ $3.44c$ DH-179 $7.03i$ $7.10j$ DH-79 $2.87c$ $4.17d$ DH-180 $6.52h$ $7.39j$ DH-81 $5.03f$ $6.03i$ DH-181 $7.22i$ $6.77i$ DH-82 $4.90e$ $5.57i$ DH-182 $6.15g$ $6.73i$ DH-83 $6.23g$ $5.82i$ DH-184 $3.37c$ $2.28a$ DH-85 $4.76e$ $5.29h$ DH-185 $5.40f$ $6.29h$ DH-87 $5.95g$ $6.07i$ DH186 $6.64h$ $7.05i$ DH-88 $8.18j$ $7.14k$ DH-187 $6.09g$ $6.71i$ DH-89 $7.61j$ $6.30j$ DH-188 $4.06d$ $3.77d$ DH-91 $3.12c$ $4.68g$ DH-194 $5.37f$ $6.70i$ DH-93 $6.32g$ $5.86i$ DH-197 $7.28i$ $7.83k$ DH-103 $2.42b$ $3.50c$ DH-198 $6.33h$ $6.37h$ DH-105 $4.65e$ $4.56e$ DH-200 $3.56d$ $4.13f$ <	DH-68	5.00f	5.261	DH-168	3.20c	3.58c
DH-707.1917.26kDH-1702.6005.040DH-71 $6.38h$ 7.13jDH-171 $6.07g$ $6.19h$ DH-72 $6.02g$ $6.62j$ DH-172 $1.40a$ $2.18a$ DH-74 $3.50d$ $3.61e$ DH-173 $6.81h$ $6.86i$ DH-75 $5.58f$ $6.24j$ DH-174 $3.03c$ $3.48c$ DH-76 $4.77e$ $4.88g$ DH-176 $6.37h$ $6.45h$ DH-78 $2.77c$ $3.44c$ DH-179 $7.03i$ $7.10j$ DH-79 $2.87c$ $4.17d$ DH-180 $6.52h$ $7.39j$ DH-81 $5.03f$ $6.03i$ DH-181 $7.22i$ $6.77i$ DH-82 $4.90e$ $5.57i$ DH-182 $6.15g$ $6.73i$ DH-83 $6.23g$ $5.82i$ DH-184 $3.37c$ $2.28a$ DH-85 $4.76e$ $5.29h$ DH-185 $5.40f$ $6.29h$ DH-87 $5.95g$ $6.07i$ DH186 $6.64h$ $7.05i$ DH-88 $8.18j$ $7.14k$ DH-187 $6.09g$ $6.71i$ DH-89 $7.61j$ $6.30j$ DH-188 $4.06d$ $3.77d$ DH-91 $3.12c$ $4.68g$ DH-194 $5.37f$ $6.70i$ DH-93 $6.32g$ $5.86i$ DH-197 $7.28i$ $7.83k$ DH-103 $2.42b$ $3.50c$ DH-198 $6.33h$ $6.37h$ DH-105 $4.65e$ $4.56e$ DH-200 $3.56d$ $4.13f$	DH-69 DH 70	5.9/g 7.10:	5.13I 7.261	DH-169 DH 170	3.50d	4.60e
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-70 DH 71	7.191 6.38h	7.20K 7.13i	DH-170 DH 171	2.000 6.07g	5.040 6.10h
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-72	0.38Π 6.02σ	7.13j 6.62i	DH-172	0.07g 1.40a	2 189
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-74	3.50d	3.61e	DH-172 DH-173	6.81h	6.86i
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-75	5.58f	6.24i	DH-174	3.03c	3.48c
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-76	4.77e	4.88g	DH-176	6.37h	6.45h
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-78	2.77c	3.44c	DH-179	7.03i	7.10j
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-79	2.87c	4.17d	DH-180	6.52h	7.39j
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-81	5.03f	6.03i	DH-181	7.22i	6.77i
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-82	4.90e	5.57i	DH-182	6.15g	6.73i
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-83	6.23g	5.82i	DH-184	3.37c	2.28a
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DH-85	4.76e	5.29h	DH-185	5.40f	6.29h
DH-88 8.18j /.14k DH-18/ 6.09g 6.71i DH-89 7.61j 6.30j DH-188 4.06d 3.77d DH-91 3.12c 4.68g DH-194 5.37f 6.70i DH-92 7.02h 5.63i DH-196 6.87h 6.63j DH-93 6.32g 5.86i DH-197 7.28i 7.83k DH-103 2.42b 3.50c DH-198 6.33h 6.37h DH-105 4.65e 4.56e DH-200 3.56d 4.13f DH-110 5.29f 7.28j 7.28j 3.50c 3.56d 4.13f	DH-87	5.95g	6.071	DH186	6.64h	/.051
DH-69 7.01J 0.30J DH-188 4.06d 5.7/d DH-91 3.12c 4.68g DH-194 5.37f 6.70i DH-92 7.02h 5.63i DH-196 6.87h 6.63j DH-93 6.32g 5.86i DH-197 7.28i 7.83k DH-103 2.42b 3.50c DH-198 6.33h 6.37h DH-105 4.65e 4.56e DH-200 3.56d 4.13f DH-110 5.29f 7.28j 7.28j 7.28j 7.28j	DH-88	8.18j 7.61:	/.14K	DH-187	6.09g	0./11 2.77.1
DH-91 5.12c 4.00g DH-194 5.571 6.701 DH-92 7.02h 5.63i DH-196 6.87h 6.63j DH-93 6.32g 5.86i DH-197 7.28i 7.83k DH-103 2.42b 3.50c DH-198 6.33h 6.37h DH-105 4.65e 4.56e DH-200 3.56d 4.13f DH-110 5.29f 7.28j 7.28j 7.28j	DH-89 DH 01	/.01J 2.12a	0.30J	DH-188	4.06d 5.27f	5.//d 6.70;
DH-92 7.0211 5.051 DH-190 6.3711 6.053 DH-93 6.32g 5.86i DH-197 7.28i 7.83k DH-103 2.42b 3.50c DH-198 6.33h 6.37h DH-105 4.65e 4.56e DH-200 3.56d 4.13f DH-110 5.29f 7.28j 7.28j 7.28j	DH 02	5.120 7.02h	4.00g 5.63i	DH 104	5.5/1 6.87h	0.701
DH-103 2.42b 3.50c DH-198 6.33h 6.37h DH-105 4.65e 4.56e DH-200 3.56d 4.13f DH-110 5.29f 7.28j 7.28j 7.28j 7.28j	DH-92	7.0211 6.32g	5.051 5.86i	DH-190 DH-197	0.07II 7.28i	0.05j 7.83k
DH-105 4.65e 4.56e DH-200 3.56d 4.13f DH-110 5.29f 7.28j	DH-103	2.32g	3 50c	DH-198	6 33h	6 37h
DH-110 5.29f 7.28j	DH-105	4.65e	4.56e	DH-200	3.56d	4.13f
	DH-110	5.29f	7.28j			

^a Means with the same letter do not differ significantly at P = 0.05. The values represent the mean of the host reaction rate, scale range 1 to 9, from three replications

Table 2 Genetic gain for partial resistance to bacterial leaf streak in DH lines of barley. The values represent the mean of the host reaction rate, scale range 1 to 9, from three replications

Parent or DH lines	Experiment 1	Experiment 2
Steptoe (P1) Morex (P2) P1-P2	6.46 2.83 3.63*	6.38 2.53 3.85*
$\overline{X}P = (P1 + P2/2)$ $\overline{X}DH^{a}$ $\overline{X}DH-\overline{X}P$	4.64 5.06 0.42 NS	4.45 5.2 0.75*
Best DH (BDH) BDH-Best parent (BP) ^b 100(BDH-BP)/BP = GG ^c	1.27 - 1.56* - 55.12*	1.16 - 1.37* - 54.15*
5% Selected DH (5% SDH) 5% SDH-BP 100(5%SDH-BP)/BP = GG Least significant difference LSD	$\begin{array}{r} 1.48 \\ - 1.35^{*} \\ - 47.70^{*} \\ 0.71 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{r} 1.67 \\ - \ 0.85^{*} \\ - \ 33.72^{*} \\ 0.55 \end{array}$

* Significant at P, 0.05; NS, not significant

^a XDH, Mean of all doubled-haploid lines

^b BP, Best parent ('Morex')

 $^{\circ}$ GG, Genetic gain when the best DH line or 5% of the selected DH lines are compared with the best parent ('Morex')

1993) and in barley (Kim et al. 1982; Noval 1989; Alizadeh et al. 1994).

The difference between DH lines and their parents was not significant in the first experiment but significant in the second one, showing that the 119 randomized DH lines used in these experiments are not quite representative of the total number of DH lines of the cross 'Morex' × 'Steptoe'.

The comparison between the best parent and the best DH line showed a significant difference for resistance to bacterial leaf streak in both experiments with genetic gains of 55.12% and 54.13% in the first and second experiment, respectively (Table 2). This phenomenon might be due to the accumulation of favourable alleles for resistance in this DH line. The same phenomenon was observed when the best parent was compared with the mean of 5% selected DH lines; the genetic gains are

47.70% and 33.72% in the first and second experiment, respectively.

The use of DH lines in plant breeding has been already reported by several authors. For example, favourable DH lines resistant to Fusarium head blight in wheat (Simmonds et al. 1993) and DH lines resistant to leaf rust, stem rust and powdery mildew in barley (Steffenson et al. 1995) have been mentioned. The present results indicate that a high genetic variability for partial resistance to bacterial leaf streak caused by *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *hordei* can be obtained in DH lines coming from F_1 progeny of resistant and susceptible genotypes and that significant genetic gain can be obtained by selecting the most partial resistant lines. Finally, doubled-haploid production can be considered as an efficient method for breeding diseaseresistant genotypes.

As far as QTL analyses are concerned, the threshold values at a 5% significance level computed over 10,000 permutations were very similar for both experiments. Values of 12.7 and 36.8 were used for SIM and sCIM tests, respectively.

In both experiments we found strong evidence for the presence of two QTLs, about 60 cM apart, on chromosome 3. These QTLs were detected with almost the same effects and positions in the two experiments (Table 3) and are in coupling phase. Figure 1 shows the test profile for the mean over the two experiments, the profiles for each experiment being very similar. The sCIM method gives two major peaks, indicating the likely positions of the QTLs, whereas SIM gives three peaks. The peak located at position 43.3 cM (midway between the two QTLs) is very likely to be a 'ghost' QTL.

Allele substitution effects and positions relative to markers of the two QTLs on chromosome 3 are given in Table 3. Both QTLs had relatively strong effects, accounting for about 13% and 20% (respectively) of the variation in disease severity in the entire population. As expected, the susceptible parent ('Steptoe') contributed the positive value allele; QTL allele values are 0.64 and 0.80 in rating units (for the mean

Table 3 Mapping positions andeffect of QTL detected onchromosome 3

Experiments	Position in centiMorgans ^a	sCIM test	QTL effect ^b	Marker interval ^e
1	13.6	39.6	0.68	ABA307B-ABC171
	76	55.3	0.81	ABG377-MWG555B
2	13.6	43.0	0.61	ABA307B-ABC171
	77	68.6	0.82	ABG377-MWG555B
1 + 2	13.6	44.2	0.64	ABA307B-ABC171
	77	63.9	0.80	ABG377-MWG555B

^a From the leftmost marker of the chromosome

^b Allele substitution effect of 'Steptoe' in rating units

° Nearest marker in boldface



Fig. 1 Profiles of test values for sCIM (*solid line*) and SIM (*dashed line* for *chromosome* 3). The *straight line* is the threshold value for sCIM test

experiments). The estimated location of the first QTL is 3 cM from marker *ABC171* in a region where QTLs have been detected (in the 'Steptoe' × 'Morex' population) for tiller number rand malt extract (near marker *ABG471*, 17 cM from marker *ABC171*, Han et al. 1995; Hayes et al. 1996). The second QTL is located in the long arm of chromosome 3 (4 cM from marker *MWG555B*) in the vicinity of QTLs acting on grain weight and about 60 cM far from a net blotch resistance QTL.

Another QTL was detected for experiment 2 on chromosome 7 at position 167.1 cM, 2 cM from marker *ABC155*. For the mean of the two experiments, a peak was found at position 167.1 cM, but the sCIM test value was 35.4 (one unit under the threshold) and the QTL substitution effect was -0.55. Experiment 1 gave a non-significant peak at 177.6 cM, near marker *ABG391*. Note that this QTL was not detected in either experiments (nor the mean) by the SIM method (low test values). This putative QTL mapped to a chromosome region in the vicinity of marker *ABG495A* (10 cM from it), where QTLs have been reported for kernel weight, and 80 cM from a marker (*CDO057*) linked to a major QTL of stripe rust resistance (Chen et al. 1994).

We calculated the multilocus allelic effects of the three QTLs and found that they accounted for almost 54% of the mean difference between the parents and nearly 30% of the phenotypic variation of the trait in the mean experiment. The resistance locus on chromosome 3, near *ABG377*, appears to be a major gene. Further investigations with additional markers in the region and measurements of other traits are needed to characterize the action of these QTLs and to assess the importance of their linkage with agronomic, quality and other disease resistance QTLs.

References

- Akhtar MA, Aslam M (1985) Bacterial stripe of wheat in Pakistan. Rachis 4:49
- Akhtar MA, Aslam M (1986) Xanthomonas campestris pv. undulosa on wheat. Rachis 5:34–37
- Alizadeh A, Rahimian (1989) Bacterial leaf streak of gramineae in Iran. OEPP/EPPO Bull 19:113–117
- Alizadeh A, Benetti V, Sarrafi A, Barrault G, Albertini L (1994) Genetic analysis for partial resistance to an iranian strain of bacterial leaf streak (X. campestris pv. hordei) in barley. Plant Breed 113:323–326
- Arabi MI, Barrault G, Sarrafi A, Albertini L (1990) Inherance of partial resistance to net blotch in barley. Plant Breed 105:150–155
- Backes G, Graner A, Foroughi Wehr B, Fischbeck G, Wenzel G, Jahoor A (1995) Localization of quantitative trait loci (QTL) for agronomic important characters by the use of a RFLP map in barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.). Theor Appl Genet 90:294–302
- Bedo Z, Karsai I, Vida G, Long L (1992) Bread making quality of doubled haploid lines derived from wheat anther culture. J Genet Breed 46:263–268
- Chen F, Hayes PM (1989) A comparaison of *Hordeum bulbosum*mediated haploid production efficiency in barley using in vitro floret and tiller culture. Theor Appl Genet 77:701–704
- Chen FQ, Prehn D, Hayes PM, Mulrooney D, Corey A, Vivar H (1994) Mapping genes for resistance to barley stripe rust (*Puccinia striiformis f.* sp. *hordei*). Theor Appl Genet 88:215–219
- Choo TM, Reinbergs E, Kasha KJ (1985) Use of haplids in breeding barley. Plant Breed Rev 3:219–252
- Cunfer BM (1988) Bacterial disease of wheat and their potential importance in tropical regions. In: Klatt A (ed) Wheat production constraints in tropical environments. CIMMYT, Mexico, pp 263–273
- Duveiller E (1989) Research on '*Xanthomonas translucens*' of wheat and triticale at CIMMYT. OEPP/EPPO Bull 19:97–103
- Duveiller E (1990) Screening criteria for bacterial leaf streak in bread wheat, durum wheat and triticale in CIMMYT. In: Klement Z (ed.) Proc 7th Int Conf Plant Pathogenic Bacteria vol 2. Akademiai Kiado, Budapest, pp 1011–1016
- Duveiller E (1994) A pictorial series of assessment keys for bacterial leaf streak of cereals. Plant Dis 78:137–141
- Duveiller E, Van Ginke M, Thijssen M (1993) Genetic analysis to bacterial leaf streak caused by *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. undulosa in bread wheat. Euphytica 66:35–43
- Han F, Ullrich SE, Chirat S, Menteur S, Jestin L, Sarrafi A, Hayes PM, Jones BL, Blake TK, Wesenberg DM, Kleinhofs A (1995) Mapping of β-glucan content and β-glucanase activity loci in barley grain and malt. Theor Appl Genet 91:921–927
- Hayes PM, Chen FQ, Kleinhofs A, Kilian A, Mather D (1996) Barley genome mapping and its applications. In: Jauhar PP (ed) Methods of genome analysis in plants. CRC Press, Boca Raton, pp 229–249
- Heun M (1992) Mapping quantitative powdery mildew resistance of barley using a restriction fragment length polymorphism map. Genome 35:1019–1025
- Johnson JW, Cunfer BM, Morey DD (1987) Inheritance to Xanthomonas campestris pv. translucens in triticale. Euphytica 36: 603–607
- Kim HK, Sasser M, Sands DC (1982) Selective medium for Xanthomonas campestris pv. translucens. Phytopathology 72:936
- Kleinhofs A, Kilian Q, Saghai Maroof MA, Biyashev RM, Hayes P, Chan FQ, Lapitan N, Fenwick A, Blake TK, Kanazin V, Ananiev E, Dahleen L, Kudrna D, Bollinger J, Knapp SJ, Liu B, Sorrells M, Heun M, Franckowiak JD, Hoffman D, Skadsen R, Steffensen BJ (1993) A molecular, isozyme and morphological map of the barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) genome. Theor Appl Genet 86:705–712
- Mather DE (1995) Steptoe × Morex base map, version 2. Graingenes database. http://wheat.pw.usda.gov/ggpages/newggmaps.html

- Milus EA, Kirkpatrick TL (1990) Wheat disease and fungicide evaluations. Ark Agric Exp Stn Rep 31
- Mouzeyar A, Roeckel-Drevet P, Gentzbittel L, Philippon J, Tourvieille de Labrouhe D, Vear F, Nicolas P (1995) RFLP and RAPD mapping of the sunflower PI1 locus for resistance to *Plasmopara halstedii* race 1. Theor Appl Genet 91: 733–737
- Noval C (1989) Maladies bactériennes des graminées en Espagne. OEPP/EPPO Bull 19:131–135
- Sands DC, Mizrak G, Hall VN, Kim HK, Bockelman HE, Golden MJ (1986) Seed-transmitted bacterial diseases of cereals: epidemiology and control. Arab J Plant Protect 4: 125–127
- Schaad DC, Forster RL (1985) A semiselective agar medium for isolating Xanthomonas campestris pv. translucens from wheat seeds. Phytopathology 75:260–263

- Shane WW, Baumer JS, Teng PS (1987) Crop losses caused by *Xanthomonas* streak on spring wheat and barley. Plant Dis 71:927–930
- Simmonds J, Fregean-Reid J, Pandeya R, Sampson D, Fedak G (1993) Potential of anther culture in breeding for Fusarium head blight resistance in wheat. Cereal Res Commun 21:141–147
- Steffenson BJ, Jin Y, Rossnagel BG, Rasmussen TB, Kao K (1995) Genetics of multiple disease resistance in a doubled haploid population of barley. Plant Breed 114:50–54
- Tinker NA, Mather DE (1995) MOTL: software for simplified composite interval mapping of QTL in multiple environments. J QTL 1, no. 2
- Young NS, Danesh D, Menancio-Hautea D, Kumar L (1993) Mapping oligenic resistance to powdery mildew in mungbean with RFLPs. Theor Appl Genet 87:243–249