# The Search for Novel Resistance Alleles: Screening Teosinte-Maize Introgression Lines for Resistance to Northern Leaf Blight

Honors Thesis

Presented to the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences,
Plant Science Research Honors Program,
of Cornell University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Research Honors Program

by Oliver O. Ott

December 2008

# **Commonly Used Acronyms**

AUDPC: Area Under the Disease Progress Curve

DLA: Diseased Leaf Area IP: Incubation Period

NAM: Nested Association Mapping Population

NIL: Near Isogenic Line NLB: Northern Leaf Blight QTL: Quantitative Trait Loci

SNP: Single Nucleotide Polymorphism

## Introduction

Wild teosintes (*Zea* spp.) are the ancestors of domesticated maize (*Zea mays* ssp. *mays*) and are native to Mexico, Guatemala and Nicaragua. As early as the nineteenth century, botanists realized that there was a relationship between the teosintes and maize. It is now known that the subspecies *Z. mays* ssp. *parviglumis* is the direct ancestor of modern cultivated maize (Fukunaga, 2005). Currently four species and three subspecies of *Z. mays* are collectively called teosinte: *Z. diploperennis*, *Z. nicaraguensis*, *Z. luxurians* and, *Z. perennis* and the subspecies, *Z. mays* spp. *huehuetenangensis*, *Z. mays* ssp. *mexicana* and, *Z. mays* ssp. *parviglumis* (Funkunaga, 2005).

Cytologically, all of the teosintes have chromosome lengths and centromere positions similar to those of modern maize, which facilitates cross-species study as hybrids can be easily made. The subspecies *Z. mays* spp. *huehuetenangensis*, *Z. mays* ssp. *parviglumis*, and *Z. mays* ssp. *mexicana* are all diploid with 10 chromosomes, which distinguish them from the other species which have 20 chromosomes. Teosinte morphology is also very similar to that of maize, but teosinte produces tillers more profusely than maize, and the tillers are often as tall as the main stalk. Teositne also has a

between teosinte and maize occur in the female inflorescence. In maize, the female flowers are born singly and are solid, thus forming the ear. In teosinte, the female flower develops as a spike, is very brittle, and shatters at maturity for seed dispersal. The teosinte seeds are enclosed in hard triangular fruit cases, which are indigestible. The maize ear bears naked seeds, having lost this hard fruit case. Maize has also lost the trait of seed shattering, so kernels remain attached to the ear at maturity (Manglesdorf, 1974).

Despite the differences in ear and seed morphology between teosinte and maize, all species of teosinte can form hybrids with maize under natural conditions. Crosses of maize with *Z. mays* ssp. *mexicana* and *parviglumis* are the most common and fertile. The progeny of these hybrids show a range of morphological traits intermediate between the parents. Since the 1920s, maize breeders have collected teosinte throughout Mexico and Central America. From these collections, introgression lines were developed to further understand the domestication process of maize. George Beadle observed that about one in 500 F<sub>2</sub> progeny from a maize – teosinte cross were either completely maize-like or teosinte-like. These ratios correspond to the expectation of four or five major genes controlling the modern maize growth habit (Doebley, 2004). Most the work done with teosinte has focused on understanding domestication; there has been little investigation of the use of teosinte as a source of alleles for improved traits in maize breeding.

As teosinte crosses readily with maize to produce fertile hybrids, introgression lines have been used for years to study the inheritance of differences between species (Desjardins, 2000). Many of the domestication characteristics of maize are recessive. The

recessive alleles are fixed in maize and the dominant alleles are found only in teosinte. It is estimated that during domestication maize lost about 25% of the genetic diversity that is found in teosinte (Doebley, 2004). The teosintes represent an important potential resource for maize breeding that has not yet been widely used to improve many traits of interest in elite maize. This makes exotic teosinte germplasm a potential source of new and valuable alleles that are capable of improving agronomic qualities in maize, such as disease resistance, yield, and increasing nutrient levels. Today, with the use of genetic linkage maps, it is possible to identify, map, and study the effect of individual loci that control quantitatively inherited traits or quantitative trait loci (QTL), such as quantitative disease resistance. Due to hidden genetic variation, phenotypically inferior plants may contain favorable alleles that can be utilized for breeding and crop improvement. The use of markers has the potential to affect the way that wild and primitive germplasm can be utilized (Tanksley, 1997). It has been found that the advanced backcross QTL method can be applied to identify and manipulate useful QTLs in elite maize. The gains that are made genetically by using the backcross approach are more useful when combining them with more traditional maize improvement methods like mass selection for favorable gene complexes by (Ho, 2002).

## Rationale

The use of genetic resistance is the most important strategy for reducing yield-limiting diseases in maize production. Fungal pathogens are especially harmful in Africa where there is little distribution of resistant seed stocks, the environment is highly conducive for disease progression, and preventive cultural methods are not practiced

(Tripp, 2006). Northern leaf blight (NLB) caused by *Exserohilum turcicum*, has been one of the most consistent economically damaging foliar disease of field corn in the U.S. Corn Belt and in developing countries. The disease is typified by cigar-shaped lesions that are gray to tan in color, which reduce photosynthesizing leaf area, resulting in yield loss (Corn Compendium; White, 1999).

Until now there has been little work done evaluating resistance to fungal pathogens in wild teosinte populations Teosintes are reported to be susceptible to some fungi that are pathogenic to maize, but the potential of teosinte species as sources of genes for improving resistance to northern leaf blight is unknown (White, 1999). As teosinte grows in a tropical environment with no winter freeze to keep pathogen populations under control and as it is a perennial, teosinte must tolerate significant disease and insect exposure because its long life span renders it more likely to come into contact with pests. Thus we hypothesize that teosinte may be a resource that harbors a large range of defense related alleles different than those found in modern, annual temperate maize.

For this study, a set of near isogenic lines (NILs) derived from five teosinte accessions were used to study genetic disease resistance for NLB resistance from teosinte. NILs are genetic stocks that are nearly genetically identical, differing only at one (or a very few) chromosomal segments. NIL series are produced by repeated backcrossing and selection (either phenotypic or genotypic). This brings a range of loci from one or more sources (donors) into a common genetic background (recurrent parent). A chromosome segment substitution library is a set of NILs that together carries most or

all of a donor genotype in the genetic background of the recurrent parent. Each line carries a distinct chromosomal segment, and when ordered through molecular marker analysis, the final set of NILs represents a "tiling path" of introgressions that cover the genome. Each member is called a chromosome segment substitution line (CSSL).

NILs are useful genetic stocks for investigating gene function and regulation.

NILs remove the genetic background effect and allow the effect of the introgressed QTL allele to be precisely analyzed. With a uniform genetic background, causal introgressions can be identified and easily characterized. NILs also permit fine mapping of QTL. In the Nelson lab, NILs have been used to discover disease resistance QTL (Chung, 2008). The purpose of this study was to utilize an existing NIL series for teosinte / maize to discover disease resistance QTL from teosinte. A set of maize teosinte introgression lines derived from *Z. parviglumis* in the background of B73, an elite maize inbred, have been developed and provided by Dr. Sherry Flint-Garcia of the USDA unit at Columbia Missouri. Five *Z. parviglumis* accessions were used as parental donor lines. These lines are documented by the North Central Plant Introduction Station, Ames, Iowa, and are a small sample of the available teosinte genetic variation.

Four accessions (Ames 21889, Ames 21785, Ames 21786, and Ames 21789) were used to develop populations of BC<sub>4</sub>S<sub>2</sub> (**B**acrossed four times **S**elfed twice) lines (Flint-Garcia S. personal communication, 2008). At this level of backcross introgression, each line should contain approximately 3% teosinte alleles and 97% maize alleles, which should represent a random sample of the genome of the donor accession for that given line. The fifth population is a BC<sub>4</sub> population from teosinte accession PI 384071, which

has gone through a doubled haploid (DH) system to produce completely homozygous lines. These lines are expected to be segregating for many traits, such as flowering time, tiller number, and disease resistance. The double haploid population is expected to be similar to the BC<sub>4</sub>S<sub>2</sub> populations, except with increased homozygosity. In the future, these CSSL lines will be developed into formal NILs after two or three more generations of backcrossing in order to reach near-isogenic status that can be used for further study. Molecular marker analysis will be used to identify the specific introgression(s) in each line (Flint-Garcia S. personal communication, 2008). These intogressions will be compared with the location of known resistance QTL. In the present study, a sample (four populations; n=50 per population) of the available pre-NILs have been evaluated for resistance to NLB. This allowed preliminary assessment of the hypothesis that teosinte carries a novel genetic variation (relative to cultivated maize) for resistance to NLB.

## **Objectives**

The general objectives of this project were to identify chromosomal segments introgressed from teosinte that affect the level of disease resistance when compared to B73. This was be done by phenotypically comparing the teosinte introgression lines to the recurrent parent, B73. Lines with significantly different phenotypic disease ratings were interpreted to be the result of introgressions carrying a QTL from teosinte. By comparing the disease responses of a set of CSSLs lines carrying different *Z. mays* ssp. *parviglumis* introgressions into the genetic background of the recurrent parent B73, we inferred that changes in disease resistance resulted from the introgression of teosinte alleles at quantitative and/or qualitative resistance loci.

#### **Methods and Materials**

## Plant Resources

The teosinte introgression lines were provided by Dr. Sherry Flint-Garcia of the USDA of Columbia Missouri and were evaluated during the summer of 2008 at the Cornell Musgrave research farm at Aurora, NY. Fifty lines of each of the five populations were evaluated. The experimental material was planted on May 14<sup>th</sup> and laid out in an augmented incomplete block design with two replications. The two replications of a given population were planted together or continuously in order to minimize field variation within a population. Within each replication, there were five incomplete blocks. Individual lines of the populations were randomized within the incomplete blocks of 10 with two rows of B73 per block as control (see field map in appendix). Lines were planted in two meter rows with 12 seeds per row.

## Pathogen Materials

The maize/teosinte lines were artificially inoculated with the NLB pathogen *Exserohilum turcicum*, isolate EtNY001, which was originally collected in 1983 in Freeville, New York. The inoculum consisted of both a liquid spore suspension and a dry inoculum preparation. The spore suspension was prepared from cultured media plates of lactic acid agar grown for three weeks. The plates were washed with autoclaved distilled water to remove the spores. Spores were diluted to a concentration of 4000 spores per ml, and 0.5 ml of this spore suspension was then applied to the whorl of the plant. The dry inoculum was prepared using sorghum grains. The sorghum was produced by autoclaving 1200 ml of sorghum and 1000 ml of distilled water together in 1-gallon plastic jugs. This

autoclaved sorghum was then inoculated with *Exserohilum turcicum* isolate EtNY001, which was grown for about three weeks until there was an even layer of mycelium on all of the sorghum in the jug. Two to three ml of this dried infected sorghum was then placed in the whorl of each plant to provide an additional source of inoculum. Plants were inocluated at the five to seven leaf stage on the 27<sup>th</sup> of June 2008.

#### Data Collection

Data were collected throughout the season. The following phenotypes were recorded: (1) incubation period (IP; number of days after inoculation until 50% of plants in a row showed disease symptoms), (2) diseased leaf area (DLA is measured on a 0-100% scale with one percent increments, (3) days to anthesis (number of days until 50% of plants in row had shed pollen) (4) plant height, (5) ear height, (6) tiller score (0-3 depending on number of tillers) (7) number of plants in a row (stand count) and (8) number of plants in a row that had lodged at the end of the season.

IP was scored starting 15 days after inoculation, the day that B73 typically showed 50% lesions in previous year's experiments. Rows found to have lesions on day 15 were marked; unmarked rows were then scored and marked until all of the rows in the experiment had IP scores. Individuals that did not have credible IP scores, which may have been skipped during inoculation, may still have had DLA or AUDPC estimates as they were infected by surrounding inoculum.

Diseased leaf area measurements were taken at three time points in the season at 10 day intervals corresponding to August 5<sup>th</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup>. DLA was rated using a continuous scale with 1% increments considering the entire leaf area of each plant. From these three

DLA measurement the area under disease progress curve (AUDPC) was calculated. AUDPC is a measurement that requires the use of repeated disease assessments that are taken during the growth season. This measurement gives a better understanding of the extent of disease accumulation on a genotype at different growth stages, as well as the overall disease progression on the individual genotypes and populations through the whole season. AUDPC was calculated by using the below formula, where  $t_{i+1}$ - $t_i$  is the number of days between the i rating and the i+1 rating and T the number of days between the first and last DLA ratings .

$$AUDPC = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left( \frac{DLA_{i+1} + DLA_i}{2} \right) \left( \frac{t_{i+1} - t_i}{T} \right)$$

A qualitative disease assessment was made by examination of lesion types. It has been observed that NLB lesions on different maize genotypes can differ in their color, shape, average size, and other characteristics that may or may not affect fecundity of the plant or the pathogen. Variations were noted when comparing the normal B73 lesion type with several of the introgression lines, and were visually assessed. Infected leaves with lesions from these diverse materials, and material that was identified as more resistant in an early analysis of the DLA scores were collected, documented and contributed to the Cornell Plant Pathology Herbarium.

# Statistical Analysis

The field data set was analyzed using a mixed linear model in ASReml. ASReml is a statistical software package, (ASReml version 2.0, VSN International, Hemel Hempstead, UK) that is used for fitting linear mixed models using restricted maximum

likelihood, a technique commonly used in plant breeding and quantitative genetics.

Based on the field design used, replication was nested within population, and the incomplete blocks were nested within replication and population. The model used was: audpc (trait) WT ~ mu source !r rep.pblock block.rep.pblock Where:

- audpc = AUDPC calculated using the three DLA ratings (other traits were substituted for audpc)
- WT= each trait weighted by stand count
- mu = intercept of model fixed effect
- source = individual genotypes
- !r = randomization of the following effects
- rep.pblock = replications nested within populations
- block.rep.pblock = blocks nested within reps within populations

This model was used to obtain least square (LS) mean estimates of the fixed source effects. Each line was then compared to B73 and introgression lines that were two standard deviations from the LS mean of B73 were selected (95% confidence interval based on standard error for each line). These lines may harbor QTL that affect the amount of disease resistance, and were identified for further analysis.

## Genotype Analysis

These populations were genotyped with 1536 single nucleotide polymorphism (SNPs) over the summer of 2008 by S. Flint-Garcia at the University of Missouri, The location of putative QTL can be identified by comparing disease responses of lines carrying different introgressions to the recurrent parent B73. This data provides us only a moderate resolution and certainty to identify QTLs affecting disease resistance. The putatively resistant NILs then must be used in subsequent validation experiments in order to definitively identify the chromosomal segment(s) associated with resistance. Initial

genotype data were obtained on three lines of interest. Using these genotype data, we analyzed the teosinte/maize introgressions by comparing the locations of the chromosomal segments from teosinte to the known locations of QTL that have been identified in the maize Nested Association Mapping Population (NAM) and identified in a summary of prior QTL studies on disease resistance in maize (Wisser, 2006).

The NAM population is a joint linkage and association mapping population consisting of 5000 recombinant inbreed lines (RILs) from 25 families, with 200 recombinant inbred lines (RILs) per family. These families were generated by crossing 25 diverse maize inbred lines that were chosen to maximize the diversity that was available in the *Z. mays ssp. mays* breeding pool, with B73 as a common parent. Additionally, the well-known intermated B73 x Mo17 (IBM) mapping population was included as a 26<sup>th</sup> family. The entire population of 26 families have been genotyped with 1536 SNP loci (1106 informative). This was the same set of SNPs that were used to genotype the populations of teosinte maize introgressions (Yu, 2007).

The NAM population has been screened for resistance to NLB by Jesse Poland of the Rebecca Nelson Lab (Poland, 2008). By comparison of the putative QTL from teosinte with those identified in the NAM it is hoped that novel loci may be distinguished from those already identified in the maize gene pool. Teosinte-derived QTL that are not in these regions may either be novel QTL not detectable in the NAM, or random introgressions that are not associated with enhanced disease resistance. These resistance loci and/or novel alleles at established loci then have the potential to be used in breeding

for resistance to NLB As noted above the comparisons made to date are preliminary and not presented as definitive.

#### Results

The first trait of the season that was recorded was IP. This is a measurement of the plants initial response to pathogen infection. Lines were first examined for IP at 15 days after inoculation. After day 15, rows were checked every day for the remaining time until all of the rows had 50% of the plants showing lesions. By rating for IP after day 15 we were able to identify genotypes that were more resistant than B73. IP data ranged from 15 to 19 days after inoculation, when the last row was called. The average IP of B73 was 15.4 days. Three genotypes were identified with an IP score of 18 or 19 days in both replications of the experiment. From these three lines, four plants in each replicate that looked the least diseased at flowering time were marked. The lines of interest include 07PR140101A, 07PR141901A, and 7PR172301A. These plants were both selfed and backcrossed to B73. Backcrossing was done in an attempt to further clean up the background, to provide genetic material for future confirmation of introgressed QTL, and for fine-mapping. From each of these three lines, four plants were selected from each genotype as seed sources to be sent to the winter nursery in Homestead Florida to self and to backcross to B73 in order to further clean up the background.

The main trait of interest for this project is AUDPC, corresponding to the progress of the disease throughout the growing season. The amount of diseased leaf area that a genotype accumulates over the growing season is the best representation of the level of

disease resistance of that genotype. AUDPC ranged from 9.9 to 35.5 with the average of B73 being 20.8.

One of the traits of teosinte that is not present in cultivated maize is profuse tillering. Some lines showed a difference in tiller number relative to B73. The average tiller score for B73 was 0.094 with scores ranging from 0 to 3.04. It was also noted that there seemed to be an increased number of plants that had lodged in comparison to B73. This trait was scored with the number plants in the row that had lodged with the break point within three nodes of the primary ear. The average number of lodged plants for B73 was 1.02, with a range in the experiment from 0 to 4.78 this may be due to a wind storm that occurred the night before the lodging score was recorded.

Plant and ear height were also measured. The average B73 height was 241 cm and the average ear height 100 cm. No lines were found to have ears that were outside of the 95% confidence interval for B73. For plant height, plants were found to be both taller and shorter than B73, with heights ranging from 191 cm to 279 cm. Genotype 07PR173201A, with the average height of 191 cm, was also the genotype with the lowest ears; it was also one of the lines that was later in flowering. From an early stage, it was noted that this line had unique leaf morphology with very thin erect leaves with a somewhat silvery sheen. As they developed, the plants kept their phenotype, which may have reduced their overall fitness. This line also had a higher-than-average number of tillers but was not outside of the range for B73.

Table 1. Summary of all the traits measured and the results of the statistical analysis including the relative LS means, the corrected actual values with the  $\mu$  added back in, and the standard error. B73 trait means are indicated and lines that were significantly

different from B73 are also included.

TRAIT	GENOTYPE	LS MEAN	EFECT ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR
Plant Height (cm)	B73	241.6	-1.2	7.17
	Shorter			
	07PR173201A	191.0	-51.8	10.07
	AR70760_1	195.1	-47.7	12.39
	07PR146901A	210.4	-32.4	9.956
	07PR148901A	211.0	-31.7	10.08
	07PR141901A	213.8	-28.9	9.986
	<u>Taller</u>			
	AR70735_1	271.6	28.8	10.06
	07PR160901A	273.6	30.8	10.07
	07PR155801A	273.7	30.8	10.08
	07PR148801A	278.3	35.5	10.09
	07PR151701A	279.2	36.4	10.09
Ear Height (cm)	B73	100.8	-4.15	7.02
<u> </u>	Shorter			
	07PR173201A	70.4	-34.5	9.85
	AR70760_1	74.3	-30.6	12.0
	AR70751_1	80.5	-24.4	9.85
Incubation period	B73	15.4	0.49	0.57
(days after	Longer			
inoculation)	07PR140101A	17.9	3.0	0.79
,	07PR141901A	17.5	2.6	0.80
	07PR141701A	17.8	2.9	0.99
	07PR172301A	17.4	2.4	0.80
AUDPC	B73	20.9	-1.0	0.51
	Less Disease			
	07PR144901A	9.1	10.7	4.03
	07PR140101A	11.0	8.8	2.08
	AR70760_1	11.3	8.5	3.60
	07PR172301A	12.2	8.3	2.28
	07PR143701A	12.7	7.6	2.36
	07PR169101A	13.5	7.1	2.14
	07PR150801A	13.9	6.3	2.02
	07PR162801A	14.1	5.9	2.50
	07PR170601A	14.2	5.7	2.43
	07PR141801A	14.3	5.6	2.20
	07PR146101A	14.5	5.5	2.22
	07PR147501A	14.5	5.4	2.35
	07PR168901A	14.5	5.3	2.34
	More Disease			
	07PR167101A	28.9	-9.1	2.42
	07PR159901A	31.2	-11.3	2.42
	07PR154301A	33.7	-13.8	3.33
Tiller score	B73	8.35E-02	9.40E-02	0.31
	More Tillers			
	07PR148901A	3.04E+00	3.0	0.43
	07PR151001A	2.02E+00	2.0	0.43
	07PR160901A	2.00E+00	2.0	0.43
	07PR139201A	1.99E+00	1.9	0.43
	AR70769_1	1.55E+00	1.5	0.43

Number Lodged	B73	1.02	0.6	0.92
	More lodging			
	07PR162001A	4.7	4.3	1.31
	07PR151001A	4.1	3.7	1.31
	07PR170901A	3.7	3.4	1.31
	07PR160101A	3.7	3.3	1.31
Days to anthesis	B73	79.4	-2.6	1.42
(days after planting)	Later Flowering			
	07PR159501A	91.9	10.0	2.43
	07PR143401A	91.6	10.0	1.97
	07PR155601A	89.4	7.4	1.98
	AR70776_1	89.0	7.0	1.99
	07PR148801A	87.7	5.7	1.99
	07PR153001A	87.5	5.5	1.99
	07PR174701A	87.4	5.4	1.99
	07PR159201A	86.6	4.6	2.43
	07PR141701A	85.7	3.7	2.42

The three lines discussed below had genotype data available. These lines were identified as the lines with the longest incubation period (days until lesions appearance) and were also genotypes that had reduced AUDPC values. One of the lines that stood, both in the analysis for AUDPC and IP was line 07PR172301A in the (B73×Ames 21789) BC4S2 population. 07PR172301A had an AUDPC score of 12.2  $\pm$  2.28 (B73: 21.0  $\pm$  0.52) and an average IP score of  $17.4 \pm 0.81$  (B73:  $15.4 \pm 0.577$ ). This line showed introgressions in several regions on several chromosomes, including chromosomes 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, and 10. An introgression of particular interest covers the region where qEt8.06.2 (for quantitative resistances to *E. turcicum* chromosome 8 bin 06 2<sup>nd</sup> QTL) and qET8.06.1 have been found in the NAM. Locus qET8.06.2 is the QTL with the largest effect on NLB resistance in the NAM population, and affects both AUDPC and IP. Other introgressions in this line that co-localize with identified resistance QTL are a single introgression that covers two QTL indentified on chromosome 1, and an introgression that ends 0.6 cM from a QTL that had been identified on chromosome 7. The possible QTL for this line may lie in the regions  $8.06_{A221789}$ ,  $1.06_{A221789}$  and  $1.07_{A221789}$  and very close to region  $7.02_{A221789}$ .

The introgressions on chromosomes 2, 4, and 10 are not near any known QTL. Further work with segregation analysis is needed to confirm which of these introgressions affect disease resistance.

Another line that stood out, with an IP of  $17.9 \pm 0.79$  (B73:  $21.0 \pm 0.52$ ) and AUDPC of  $11.0 \pm 2.08$  (B73:  $15.4 \pm 0.577$ ) was 07PR140101A. This line contained two introgressions, both on chromosome 1. The first introgression overlaps with the introgression on chromosome 1 in 07PR172301A. This first introgression also covers the region that includes qEt1.06, which contains the third largest QTL in the NAM. The second introgression lies 1.7 cM from the interval that contains qEt1.08, another QTL that was identified in the NAM.

The third line that stood out in the field was line 07PR141901A, with an IP score of  $17.6 \pm 0.79$  B73:  $21.0 \pm 0.52$ ) and an AUDPC of  $9.18 \pm 4.03$  (B73:  $15.43 \pm 0.577$ ). This line had three introgressions, on chromosomes 2, 5, and 7. The introgression on chromosome 2 corresponds to the area were qEt2.02 is located. This QTL is the 8<sup>th</sup> largest QTL that had been identified in the NAM. The introgression on chromosome 5, located in bin 5, is not in the same interval as any resistance QTL that have been identified with the use of the NAM by our lab, but may correspond to a cluster of NLB resistance genes that have been identified through a syntheses of previous studies on chromosome 5 (Wisser, 2006). More work is needed to see if this introgression could contain beneficial QTL. The introgression on chromosome 7 is very large, covering 20 cM. This region includes the location of qEt7.02, a small-effect QTL in NAM. The

to determine if these introgressions contain novel alleles for an already identified locus qET2.02 or qET7.02, or a another QTL on chromosome 5.

For each of these lines, eight individuals were selfed/and back-crossed to B73. Tissue was collected from all of the plants in the row and will be genotyped to ascertain which of the selfed/plants were homozygous for the teosinte introgression region. Progeny from plants in these lines will be used for characterization using different pathogen races. Tissue was also collected and bulked from the rows of several other lines that were noted for their low AUDPC scores during initial data analysis and identified as potential lines of interest.

Table .2 Summary of teosinte introgressions in the three lines that have been found in the same regions as QTL that have been identified in Nested Association Mapping population with subscript of teosinte germplasm source (Poland, 2008).

INTROGRESSION AREA WITH NOTATION OF GERMPLASM SOURCE	PRIORITY FOR FURTHER STUDY	RANK IN EFFECT IN NAM			
8.06.2 <sub>A221789</sub>	1	1			
1.06 <sub>A21889</sub>	3	3			
2.02 <sub>A21889</sub>	4	8			
1.08 <sub>A21889</sub>	5	9			
$8.06.1_{A221789}$	6	11			
1.07 <sub>A221789</sub>	7	20			
$7.02_{A221789}$ and $7.02_{A21889}$	2	23			
5.05 <sub>A21889</sub>	8	Not indicated by NAM			

Lesion Types

Several lines with lesion types distinct from those of B73 were noted. The typical B73 lesion was a moderately sized cigar shaped lesion that was often surrounded by a slightly purple border. This purple border (caused by a buildup of anthocyanin in the lesion margin) varied from non-existent, to thin and light colored. The actual shade of the purple

also varied highly, from a red flushed color to a very deep purple with even greater extremes of these observations found in the introgression lines.

There was a large range of phenotypes in lesion types in the introgression lines. The categories that were scored included the overall size of the lesion. Relative length and width of lesions was also examined and the extent of coloring of the lesion margin. On some lines, lesions were of normal length but were narrower than the typical B73 lesion. By far the most variable lesion trait was the extent of the purple coloring. One of the most interesting lines, 07PR177401A (see picture bellow), showed large swathes of red/purple coloring that connected lesions at opposite ends of the leaf, thus causing almost the entire plant to appear purple.

Figure 1. Teosinte introgression line 07PR177401A, note large amount of red/purple streaking along leaf length.



It will be interesting to determine whether there is any correlation with the visual phenotype of a lesion and the resistance QTL. Based on the preliminary analysis of the AUDPC, introgression lines that had means outside the 95% confidence interval of B73 were collected and mounted to examine the differential lesion type that may occur on genotypes that had lower DLA scores in the middle of the season. These selected samples

were dried, pressed and mounted on herbarium sheets for donation to the Cornell Plant

Pathology Herbarium. A photographic record of these sheets was also made so that a digital
copy can be used by interested parties and thus the specimens do not have to leave the
herbarium. Upon receiving additional genotypic data we can try to match up the lines that
had differential lesion types to introgressions to look at the different characteristics of the
lesions, and to examine the mode of action of single QTL.

### Discussion

### *QTL Discovery*

This study has identified teosinte-maize introgression lines that have enhanced resistance to NLB when compared to the recurrent maize parent B73. Some of the more resistant lines contain teosinte introgressions in locations that correspond to previously identified NLB QTL. It will be important to confirm which of these chromosomal segments are actually associated with resistance. It will be interesting to determine whether introgressions at recognized QTL loci carry novel alleles. It is also possible that novel QTL at loci that have not been previously identified are associated with resistance and have been captured in the resistant introgression lines.

In addition to genetic studies to confirm the location of resistance QTL, next steps include tests to determine to what extent, and how differently, the teosinte-derived alleles affect disease progression when compared to those of maize. The region where the major NLB resistance gene *Htm1* is located is covered by an introgression in the line 07PR172301A on chromosome 8. *Htm1* is unusual in that it causes a longer incubation period rather than the more common hypersensitive response that is conditioned by most

other major genes. As noted above, qEt8.06.2 maps in the same chromosomal region as Htn1. A QTL in the same region,  $qEt8.06_{DK888}$ , shows race specificity (Chung, 2008). Breeders may be reluctant to use these available resistance alleles the 8.06 region in breeding for NLB resistance due to race specificity. If a teosinte resistance QTL is confirmed to reside in the same chromosomal region, it will be worthwhile to determine its race specificity.

# Lesion Types

It is hypothesized, but not confirmed, that the anthocyanin is produced in the margins of a lesion may play a role in disease resistance. The syntheses of phenolic compounds like anthocyanin are often important components of disease resistance in plants. The accumulation of phenols around infection sites acts to restrict pathogen growth, perhaps by protecting tissue from the accumulation of oxidative metabolites. It has been found that there is an up regulation of anthocyanin in maize lines resistant to *Biopolaris maydis*, the causal pathogen of southern leaf blight, while anthocyanins were not found surrounding the lesions of susceptible controls, and the "anthocyanin ring" was only present in healthy tissue were the pathogen had not yet progressed (Hipskid, 1996). There were also no anthocyanins present in non-inoculated control plants of either susceptible or resistant varieties.

# Future Work

The lines 07PR172301A, 07PR140101A, and 07PR141901A, which were identified as more resistant than B73 in our analysis, were back-crossed to B73, the recurrent parent, and are being selfed at the winter nursery in Homestead, Florida. The F<sub>2</sub>

progeny will then be segregating at the introgression sites and with segregation analysis it can be determined which of the introgressed chromosomal segments are associated with of the differential disease resistance response. It will be interesting to see when genotypes are available for the other introgression lines, if there are introgressions in other regions of the genome that are associated with lesion type differences.

Further identification of both novel QTL and potentially novel QTL alleles at known loci will facilitate the use of marker assisted selection, in conjunction with phenotypic selection to enhance the breeding processes of disease resistance in elite maize. The localization of chromosomal segments from teosinte affecting disease resistance that are not found in maize, may then be used as a genetic resource for the development of disease resistance in modern maize, in order to gauge the true potential of teosinte for increasing the amount of disease resistance in yield-focused breeding programs. The development of NILs using subspecies, or species of teosinte that are even farther away from *Z. mays* ssp. *mays* on the phylogenetic tree, would be useful to further study to examine if more distant relatives would be a source of other novel disease resistance alleles.

Prior to this study, little work had been done looking at the resistance to foliar diseases in teosinte. By using maize-teosinte introgression lines, to gain insight into the resistance of teosinte, we have been able to tentatively localize chromosomal segments that may carry resistance QTL to NLB, and identify potentially novel resistance alleles in chromosomal locations that are similar to those already identified. This project gives us a starting point to further identify genetic resources for NLB resistance that are unexploited in teosinte for the breeding of NLB resistant varieties.

# Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the following people who helped me with this research.

- Sherry Flint-Garcia: for providing the material to work with and the genotype data.
- Jesse Poland: for help with statistical analysis and data from the NAM for introgression comparison.
- Chia-lin Chung: for providing advice and about the pathogen inoculation and data collection.
- My funding sources: The Robert Morley Undergraduate Research Fund, The Generation Challenge Program, and the Plant Science Research Honors Program.
- Rebecca Nelson: for guidance on the writing process and allowing me to do this work in her lab.

## References

1999 Compendium of corn diseases. Third edition.

BERNACCHI, D., T. BECK-BUNN, Y. ESHED, S. INAI, J. LOPEZ *et al.*, 1998 Advanced backcross QTL analysis of tomato. II. Evaluation of near-isogenic lines carrying single-donor introgressions for desirable wild QTL-alleles derived from Lycopersicon hirsutum and L-pimpinellifolium. Theoretical and Applied Genetics 97: 170-180.

CHUNG, C., J. POLAND, R. WISSER, J. KOLKMAN and R. NELSON, 2008 Genetic dissection of loci conditioning disease resistance in maize bin 8.06, Phytopathology Vol. 98 No. 6pp. S39-S39. Amer Phytopathological Soc.

DESJARDINS, A. E., R. D. PLATTNER and T. R. GORDON, 2000 Gibberella fujikuroi mating population A and Fusarium subglutinans from teosinte species and maize from Mexico and Central America. Mycological Research 104: 865-872.

DOEBLEY, J., 2004 The genetics of maize evolution. Annual Review of Genetics 38: 37-59.

FUKUNAGA, K., J. HILL, Y. VIGOUROUX, Y. MATSUOKA, J. G. SANCHEZ *et al.*, 2005 Genetic diversity and population structure of teosinte. Genetics 169: 2241-2254.

GILMOUR, A. R., R. THOMPSON and B. R. CULLIS, 1995 Average information REML: An efficient algorithm for variance parameter estimation in linear mixed models. Biometrics 51: 1440-1450.

HIPSKIND, J., K. WOOD and R. L. NICHOLSON, 1996 Localized stimulation of anthocyanin accumulation and delineation of pathogen ingress in maize genetically resistant to Bipolaris maydis race O. Physiological and Molecular Plant Pathology 49: 247-256.

HO, J. C., S. R. MCCOUCH and M. E. SMITH, 2002 Improvement of hybrid yield by advanced backcross QTL analysis in elite maize. Theoretical and Applied Genetics 105: 440-448.

MANGELSDORF, P., 1974 Corn: its origin, evolution, and improvement. Cambridge, Mass., Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

NELSON, R., 2008 Nelson lab: Genetic Dissection of Maize Disease Resistance Web Page. Ithaca, NY., <a href="http://www.plantpath.cornell.edu/Labs/Nelson\_R/index.html">http://www.plantpath.cornell.edu/Labs/Nelson\_R/index.html</a>

- POLAND, J. A., THE MAIZE DIVERSITY PROJECT, R. NELSON., 2008 Uncovering Molecular Mechanisms of Quantitative Disease Resistance Using Nested Association Mapping. Poster for Maize Genetics Conference.
- TANKSLEY, S. D., and S. R. MCCOUCH, 1997 Seed banks and molecular maps: Unlocking genetic potential from the wild. Science (Washington D C) 277: 1063-1066.
- TANKSLEY, S. D., and J. C. NELSON, 1996 Advanced backcross QTL analysis: A method for the simultaneous discovery and transfer of valuable QTLs from unadapted germplasm into elite breeding lines. Theoretical and Applied Genetics 92: 191-203.
- TRIPP, R. 2006. Strategies for Seed System Development in Sub-Saharan Africa. ICRISAT Open Access Journal.
- WELZ, H. G., and H. H. GEIGER, 2000 Genes for resistance to northern corn leaf blight in diverse maize populations. Plant Breeding 119: 1-14.
- YU, J. M., J. B. HOLLAND, M. D. MCMULLEN and E. S. BUCKLER, 2008 Genetic design and statistical power of nested association mapping in maize. Genetics 178: 539-551.

Appendix
Field map of Teosinte Introgression lines (color coded by population)

14 <b>5</b> 143	144		140	435	436		<b>420</b> 441	442		U
141	142		152	433	434		443	444		
139	140		154	431	432		445	446		
137 135	138		156	429 427	430 428		447 449	448		
133	136 134		158 160	425	42.6		451	450 452		
131	132		162	423	424		453	454		
129	130		164	421	422		455	456		
127 125	128 126		166 168	419 417	420 418		457 459	458 460		
123	124		170	415	416		461	462		
121	122		172	413	414		463	464		
119 117	120 118		174 176	411 409	412 410		465 467	466 468		
115	116		178	407	408		469	470		
113	114	179	180	405	406		471	472.		
111 109	112 110		182 184	403 401	404 402		473 475	474 476		
107	108		186	399	400		477	478		
105	106	187	188	397	398		479	480		
103	104		190	395	396		481	482		
101 99	102 100		192 194	393 391	394 392		483 485	484 486		
97	98	195	196	389	390		487	488		
95 93	96 94		198	387	388		489	490		
91	92		2.00 2.02	385 383	386 384		491 493	492 494		
89	90	203 ′	204	381	382		495	496		
87	88	205	206	379	380		497	498		
85	86	2.07	2.08	377	378		499	500		
83	84		210	375	376		501	502		
81	82.		2.12.	373	374		503	504		
79 77	80 78		214 216	371 369	372 370		505 507	506 508		
75	76		218	367	368		509	508 510		
73	74	219 ′	2.20	365	366		511	512		
71	72.		222	363	364 362		513 515	514		
69 67	70 68		224 226	361 359	360		517	516 518		
65	66	2.2.7	2.2.8	357	358		519	520		
63	64		230	355	356		521	522		
61 59	62 60		232 234	353 351	354 352		523 525	524 526		
57	58	235	236	349	350		527	528		
55	56		238	347	348		529	530		
53 51	54 52		240 242	345 343	346 344		531 533	532 534		
49	50		244	341	342		535	536		
47	48		246	339	340		537	538		
45 43	46 44		248 250	337 335	338 336		539 541	540 542		
41	42		252	333	334		543	544		
39	40		254	331	332		545	546		
37 35	38 36		256 258	329 327	330 328		547 549	548 550		
35 33	34		260	325	326		551	552		
31	32	261	262	323	324		553	554		
29 27	30 28		264 266	321 319	322 320		555 557	556 558		
25	26		2.68	317	318		559	560		
23	24	269	270	315	316		561	562		
21 19	22. 20		272 274	313 311	314 312		563 565	564 566		
17	18		276	309	310		567	568	08PN1	
15 13	16	777 '	278	307	308	[	560	570	500	KNN
13 11	14 12		280 282	305 303	306 304		571 573	572 574	597 595	598 596
9	10		284	301	302		575	576	593	594
7	8	2.85	286	299	300		577	578	591	592
5	6	2.87	2.88	2.97	2.98		579	580	589	590
3	4	289	290	295	296		581	582	587	588
08PT1	2		292	293	294		583	584	585	586