Inheritance of Silicon Uptake Ability in Rice Blast Resistant Varieties

V. M. L. Jackson[1,2*], P. Rubaihayo[1], P. Wasswa[1] and A. T. Hashim[2]

[1]*School of Agricultural Sciences, Makere University, P.O.Box 7062, Kampala, Uganda.*
[2]*National Crops Resources Research Institute, P. O.Box 7084, Kampala, Uganda.*

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. Author VMLJ designed the study, performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Authors PR and PW managed the correction of conscript. Author PW managed the lab. assistance. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

Original Research Article

ABSTRACT

Rice blast disease is the most destructive disease to rice plants and can cause a lost in a yield ranging from 50 to 100%. To develop resistant genotypes, it is necessary to determine the source of resistance, the nature of resistance and the mode of gene action that gives resistance to the disease. It is known that Silicon enhances durable resistance to rice blast disease. The rice silicon uptake inheritance can be studied through crossing the high silicon uptake with low silicon uptake genotypes. Seven genotypes were crossed in a full-dialel design, two genotypes having very high silicon uptake ability, two having moderate silicon ability, two having low silicon uptake ability and the last one was having very low silicon ability. The F1 plants were selfed and F2 plants were tested for silicon uptake ability. Then genetic traits of the segregating F2 populations and their parents were analyzed in order to determine the heritability. A high narrow sense coefficient of genetic determination suggested that there was a considerable heritability of resistance for rice blast. The analysis of gene action revealed that additive gene effects contributed more than the non-additive effects for the inheritance of silicon uptake ability as indicated by high Baker's ratio (above 0.8 and 0.3) for both silicon uptake and water lose respectively. Genotypes, GIZA182 and E20 were found to have the most desirable GCA among the genotypes used in the study.

_____

Corresponding author: E-mail: davidbilly772@gmail.com;

1. INTRODUCTION

Rice is the principal food grain consumed by half of the world's population [1]. The crop has been cultivated for over 10,000 years [2] with Asia and Africa being the leading consumers [3]. Globally, the area under rice production is estimated at 150 million hectares with an annual output of 500 million metric tons [4]. India, Indonesia and Bangladesh are among the leading producers of rice [5]. In Africa, the crop is cultivated in over 75% of the countries and is an important food security crop in several countries including Benin, Angola, Ghana, Burkina Faso and Uganda [3].

In Uganda rice production from year 2010 to 2014 increased from 93 to 95 thousand hectares, with a production increase from 214 to 237 thousand tones [6]. Several constraints were responsible for the lack of attaining the potential yield including pests and disease, changing weather patterns and unfavorable soil conditions [7]. Among these constraints, diseases like rice yellow mottle virus, bacterial blight and blast presented the most formidable challenge to the farmers [7]. Rice blast, caused by *Magnaporthe grisea,* is one of the most devastating diseases, causing yield losses of 50 to 90% [8]. Identifying sources of resistance to the disease has been a major objective for many researchers involved in rice breeding   programs [3].

Improving of genotypes with excellent properties such as resistance to both biotic and abiotic barriers, is necessary. To develop resistant varieties, it is necessary to determine the source of resistance, the nature of resistance and the mode of gene action that gives resistance to the disease. The inheritance can be identified by crossing the genotypes having high silicon uptake ability varieties with those that have low silicon uptake ability. The objective of the study was to determine the mode of gene action governing resistance to rice blast.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Parental Genotypes Selected

All experiments were conducted at National Crop Resources Research Institute (NaCRRI) Namulonge in Uganda. Seven rice varieties from two sources were selected as parents for F2 populations development in this experiment (Table 1). Three genotypes were selected based on an earlier screening of introduced lines under screen house conditions. The three genotypes were classified as having very high silicon uptake ability, and two had high silicon uptake. Four additional genotypes were selected, two had moderate silicon uptake abilities and two additional were had low and very low silicon uptake ability (Table 1).

2.2 Populations Development

The parental genotypes were planted in buckets filled with soil. Four seeds were planted in each bucket staggered at four week interval to synchronize flowering, planting was staggered at four weekly intervals and a full-diallel mating design was used to generate populations.

Crossing was done with the aid of a vacuum emasculator in the late morning (10:00 am 12:00 pm) and late afternoon (3:00 pm-5:00 pm) on panicles that had already started flowering [9]. Immature spikelets and any that had already undergone anthesis were cut off at the bottom of the panicle, leaving only the emasculated spikelets in the panicle. After emasculation, panicles were covered with a pollinating bag secured with paper clips to keep out any external pollen [9]. A flowering panicle of the male parent was cut and dusted onto the emasculated panicle, gently tapped onto the receptive stigma and then covered with the pollinating bag [9]. Mature seeds from successful crosses were harvested and bagged according to the cross number.

The harvested F_1 seeds were placed in an air-dry oven for 7 days at 50°C in order to break dormancy [10]. The F_1 seeds were later surface sterilized by 0.1% Tween 20, followed by 70% ethanol and washed twice with distilled water. Sterilized seeds were placed in sterile petridishes on moistened tissue papers and incubated for 48 hours at 30°C. Pregerminated F_1 seeds were transferred to small cups where they germinated until they became strong enough for transplanting. Seedlings were transplanted into buckets filled with soil, and kept in the screen house. Morphological markers including plant height, tillering, days-to-flowering and days-tomaturity were used to differentiate successful crosses from selfed plants [9].

Table 1. Genotypes used in the study

Genotypes	Silicon uptake rating source	
METP48	Very High Si Uptake	African Rice
METP49	High Si Uptake	African Rice
GIZA 182	High Si Uptake	Egypt
MET P68	Moderate Si Uptake	African Rice
KOMBOKA	Moderate Si Uptake	IRRI
E 20	Low Si uptake	IRRI
METP20	Very low Si Uptake	African Rice

IRRI = International Rice Research Institute

Table 2. Analysis of variance of F2 segregating rice genotypes with eight missing crosses for Silicon uptake and water loss under screen house condition at NaCRRI in (2018 A) season

SOV	d.f.	MS uptake	MS water lose
Replications	2	13917 ns	0.000305***
Entries	40	21246**	0.014675**
GCA	6	16392**	0.002354***
SCA	27	74964*	0.004663**
Crosses	33	91138ns	0.004243ns
Error (Residual)	80	46390	0.000010
Additive component (σ^2 GCA)	48396ns	Additive component (σ^2 GCA)	0.000965***
Dominance component (σ^2 SCA)	28574ns	Dominance component (σ^2 SCA)	0.004653**
Bakers ratio	0.7721	Bakers ratio	0.293216564
CGD – BS	0.7299	CGD – BS	0.99848079
CGD – NS	0.5635	CGD – NS	0.292771106

*Significant at P < 0.05 = *, P < 0.01 = **, P < 0.001= ***, p = probability, ns= non-significant, SOV= source of variation, CGD= coefficient of genetic determination, BS = Broad sense, NS= Narrow sense, GCA = general combining ability, and SCA = specific combining ability*

2.3 Experimental Design

The F_2 segregating population and parents were evaluated at National Centre for Rice Research Institute (NaCRRI) in the pots in Complete Random Design (CRD), replicated three times. All agronomic practices including fertilizer applications were done.

2.4 Data Collection and Analysis

Data for silicon uptake ability were collected according to IRRI's standard evaluation system for rice [11]. Three weeks after planting the data were analyzed by Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Method [12] at a confidence level of P < 0.05.

In order to select a good combination of parents, heritability, general combining ability and specific combining ability were calculated using recommend method Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) [13] at a confidence level of P < 0.05. The statistical model used was:

$$Y_{ijkl} = \bar{\bar{Y}}... + g_i + g_j + s_{ij} + R_k + e_{ijk}$$

$\bar{\bar{Y}}...$ is the grand mean, g_i and g_j are GCA effects of the ith and j^{th} parents respectively, s_{ij} is the SCA effect for the crosses between the ith and j^{th} parents, R_k is replication means effects, and e_{ijk} is experimental error.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Gene Action Determining rice Blast Resistance

Analysis of variance of F2 segregating populations grown in screen house in season (2018A) is presented in Table 3. ANOVA revealed significant (P ≤ 0.001) differences among genotypes for silicon uptake abilities suggested wide genetic variability of genotypes resistance to rice blast.

The narrow sense coefficient of genetic determination was 0.56 for silicon uptake. The broad sense coefficient of genetic determination was 0.73 for silicon uptake and 0.99 for water loss effect. The relative importance of additive to non-additive gene action for silicon uptake was 0.77.

Estimates of the effects of general combining ability for individual parental lines for rice blast are presented in Table 3 For silicon uptake and water loss effect the desirable GCA effect for parents should be negative. Significant effects (P ≤ 0.001) of GCA and SCA variation among genotypes were observed. The results showed that three genotypes used in this experiment, H1,H4 and L6 had highly significant negative effect(-103.1765), (89.1765), (-118.176) respectively for silicon uptake suggesting that these genotypes had good levels of silicon

uptake and hence had resistance to rise blast and as good general combiners would transfer resistance to rice blast. On the other hand, highly positive significant (P ≤ 0.001) GCA effects were obtained on the locally adapted genotypes H2 and L5 suggesting that these genotypes could not be a source of resistance to rice blast.

Generally, GCA effects were much higher than SCA effects, as illustrated by Baker's ratio (Table 4), suggesting that gene action was predominantly additive for silicon uptake ability.

Table 3. Summary of GCA effects of rice genotypes to water lose and silicon uptake

Parents	Wl P means	Si upk P means	Wl GCA effects	Si upk GCA effects
METP48	0.091	5318	0.0018 ns	-103.1765 ns
METP49	0.286	0598	-0.0091***	273.8235**
GIZA182	0.143	0197	-0.0132***	-25.1765 ns
METP68	0.262	1701	0.0187***	-89.1765ns
KOMBOKA	0.091	0194	0.0216***	161.8235ns
E20	0.237	0302	-0.0252***	-118.1765 ns
METP20	0.156	0052	0.0026 ns	-34.1765ns

*Significant at P < 0.05 = *, P < 0.01 = **, P < 0.001= ***, p = probability, ns= non-significant, Si = silicon, Wl = Water lose, upt = uptake and p = parent. And GCA = general combining ability, and SCA = specific combining ability*

Table 4. SCA effects for water loss and silicon uptake in F2 segregating populations

Cross	Water loss SCA Effect	Si uptake SCA Effect
METP48× METP49	-0.048***	79.233 ns
METP48× GIZA182	0.000 ns	-126.21 ns
METP48× METP68	-0.031***	333.55 ns
METP48×KOMBOKA	-0.138***	-108.484 ns
METP48× E20	-0.016 ns	424.863 ns
METP48× METP20	0.048***	-39.54 ns
METP49×METP48	0.006 ns	-55.667 ns
METP49× GIZA182	0.081***	-115.83 ns
METP49× METP68	0.086***	997.036***
METP49×KOMBOKA	0.012 ns	-233.317 ns
METP49× E20	-0.041***	-116.119 ns
METP49× METP20	0.006 ns	-61.11 ns
GIZA182× METP68	-0.029***	22.211 ns
GIZA182×KOMBOKA	0.038***	73.828 ns
GIZA182× E20	-0.01 ns	-278.706 ns
GIZA182× METP20	0.114***	-11.959 ns
METP68× KOMBOKA	-0.068***	46.838 ns
METP68× E20	0.067***	-101.55 ns
METP68× METP20	-0.03***	-197.23 ns
KOMBOKA× E20	-0.005 ns	177.628 ns
KOMBOKA× METP20	0.014 ns	-9.646 ns
E20× METP20	0.032***	-211.2 ns

*Significant at P < 0.05 = *, P < 0.01 = **, P < 0.001= ***, p = probability, ns= non-significant, and GCA = general combining ability, and SCA = specific combining ability*

The specific combining ability of crosses are shown in Table 4 For silicon uptake ability, the most desirable SCA effects were obtained in cross METP49×MET P68 ((997.036 ***) and water loss effect had significant SCA effects for crosses (METP48×METP49), (METP48× METP68),(METP48×KOMBOKA),(METP48×ME TP20),(METP49×GIZA182),(METP49×METP68), (METP49×E20),(GIZA182×METP68),(GIZA182× KOMBOKA),(GIZA182×METP20),(MET P68× KOMBOKA),(MET P68× E 20), (MET P68× METP20), and (E 20× METP20).

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 Combining Ability for Resistance to Rice Blast

Understanding the mode of inheritance of resistance to rice blast is essential to facilitate the resistance breeding. Since the inheritance of resistance to rice blast or rice high silicon uptake ability in the genotypes depends on the genotype involved in the crossing, the pathogen race and environmental condition, it is important to assess the pattern of inheritance in every new resistance sources before the start of the breeding work [14]. The analysis of data from this study showed significant differences among the progenies tested with their parents. The results indicated that both additive and non-additive gene actions were involved in the inheritance of Silicon uptake ability. However, the additive portion was greater than the non-additive, suggesting that additive gene effects contribute more to silicon uptake ability and resistance to rice blast. Similar results were reported [14]. The low GCA values obtained in the genotypes used (GIZA 182 and E20) indicated their importance in contributing resistance to rice blast in crosses involving them. However, other genotypes showed positive GCA effects, suggesting their poor contribution for resistance to rice blast when crossed with other parents. Parent E20 with high negative GCA effects was potentially superior and may be included in breeding programs to introduce resistance to susceptible cultivars which otherwise have acceptable traits [14].

The proportion of additive to non-additive gene effects for rice silicon uptake was high, as estimated by Baker's ratio of 0.8 and 0.3 for both Silicon uptake and water loss effect respectively (obtained at 21 days), implying that additive genes effects were more important than non-additive [15]. The high Baker's ratio also implies that selection in early generations can be effective and therefore, methods such as pedigree selection, modified pedigree, or mass selection can be used.

A high narrow sense coefficient of genetic determination was obtained, suggesting that 56% of the inheritance to silicon uptake ability was governed by additive genes and transmissible to the progeny. High broad sense coefficient of genetic determination (73%) for inheritance to silicon uptake and (99%) for water loss were observed in this study that showed the proportion of genotypic to environmental factors is very high suggesting that heritability of resistance to rice blast was high.

5. CONCLUSION

The analysis of gene action revealed that additive gene effects contributed more than the non-additive effects for the inheritance of silicon uptake ability. Genotypes, GIZA 182 and E20 were found to be the most desirable source of resistance to rice blast GCA among the genotypes used in this study. The number of genotypes involved in the study for the silicon uptake ability showed variation in inheritance of resistance depending on the genotypes involved in the cross.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Kush, Gurdev. What it will take to Feed 5.0 Billion Rice consumers in 2030; 2005.
2. Wilfred OR. Final survey report on the status of rice production, processing and marketing in Uganda. A report submitted to the Embassy of Japan in Uganda through JICA and Sasakawa Africa Association-Uganda; 2006.
3. Jackson V, Rubaihayo P, Wasswa P, Kanaabi M, Hashim AT. Identification of rice resistant lines to rice blast from rice germplasm under silicon amendment in Uganda; 2018.
4. Uganda National Rice Development Strategy; 2009.
5. Mohanty S, Wassmann R, Nelson A, Moya P, Jagadish SVK. Rice and climate

change: Significance for food security and vulnerability; 2012.

6. FAO. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Statistics division; 2014.

7. Lawrence. The climate change in Uganda; 2017.

8. Chuwa CJ, Mabagala RB, Reuben MSOW. Assessment of grain yield losses caused by rice blast disease in major rice growing areas in Tanzania. 2015;4:2211–2218.

9. Zewdu Z, Edema R, Lamo J. Genetic study of resistance to rice blast in crosses between Korean and locally adapted rice genotypes; 2018.

10. Herrera R. Coffman. Emasculation of rice by vacuum extraction. Proc. Crop Sci. Soc. Philipp. 1974;5:12–14.

11. IRRI. Standard evaluation system for rice. International Rice Research Institute. Los Banos, Manila, Philippines; 2014.

12. Payne RW, Harding SA, Murray DA, Soutar DM, Baird DB, Glaser AI. VSN International; 2009.

13. Griffing B. Concept of general and specific combining ability in relation to diallel crossing system. Aust. J. Biol. Sci. 1956;9: 463–493.

14. Mulbah S, QuaquaShimelis HA, Laing MD. Combining ability and gene action of three components of horizontal resistance against rice blast. Euphytica. 2015;206: 805–814.

15. Fehr WR. Prniciples of cultivar development, theory and technique. Iowa State University; 1987.