Zagazig J. Agric. Res., Vol. 51 No. (5) 2024 1109-1117

Biotechnology Research

Available online at http://zjar.journals.ekb.eg
http:/www.journals.zu.edu.eg/journalDisplay.aspx?Journalld=1&queryType=Master

# UNRAVELING THE GENETIC MECHANISMS OF RICE BLAST RESISTANCE

**Asmaa S. Nofal*, S.S. Soliman, T.A. Ismail and H.A. Wafa**

Genet. Dept., Fac. Agric., Zagazig Univ., Egypt

**Received: 30/09/2024; Accepted: 02/10/2024**

**ABSTRACT:** The ongoing battle between rice and the devastating blast fungus *Magnaporthe oryzae* is a complex interplay of genetic factors and evolutionary pressures. The gene-for-gene model governs this interaction, where plant resistance genes (R-genes) specifically recognize corresponding avirulence genes (AVR genes) in the pathogen, triggering a hypersensitive response to thwart infection. While monogenic R-genes have initially provided valuable protection, their effectiveness is often compromised by the pathogen's rapid adaptation. Polygenic resistance, linked to quantitative trait loci (QTLs), offers a more durable defense. Understanding the intricate mechanisms underlying blast resistance is crucial for developing sustainable disease management strategies. These mechanisms include direct and indirect recognition pathways, cell wall modifications, antimicrobial compound production, and systemic acquired resistance. Despite significant progress in these areas, challenges persist. The pathogen's capacity for rapid evolution, the limitations of monogenic resistance, and the complex genetic architecture of blast resistance all pose obstacles to sustainable rice production. Future research should prioritize the development of innovative approaches, such as deploying resistance genes through techniques like pyramiding and gene editing, utilizing QTL mapping to identify and characterize resistance loci, and integrating diverse disease management practices. By addressing these challenges, we can ensure the continued resilience of rice to blast and safeguard global food security.

**Key words:** Rice, R-genes, Monogenic R-genes, Polygenic resistance, Quantitative trait loci (QTLs).

## INTRODUCTION

Rice blast, caused by the fungal pathogen *M. oryzae*, is a significant threat to global rice production **(Simkhada and Thapa, 2022**). It can cause substantial yield losses, especially in regions with favorable environmental conditions for the disease. This fungal pathogen can infect rice plants at any stage of their growth, leading to a variety of symptoms, including leaf spots, lesions, and eventually, complete plant death. The ability of *M. oryzae* to rapidly adapt and evolve new virulence factors further complicates the challenge of managing this disease **(Kumar *et al.*, 2024; Shahriar *et al.*, 2020**).

The impact of rice blast on food security is particularly severe in countries where rice is a staple food. In regions with limited access to modern agricultural practices, farmers often struggle to control the disease, leading to significant economic losses and food insecurity. The development of rice varieties with durable resistance to blast is therefore a critical priority for agricultural research and development (**Skamnioti and Gurr, 2009**).

The genetic basis of blast resistance in rice is complex and involves interactions between multiple genes in the plant and the pathogen (**Sharma *et al.*, 2012**). These interactions are influenced by a variety of factors, including environmental conditions, host genotype, and pathogen virulence. Understanding the genetic mechanisms underlying blast resistance is essential for developing effective breeding strategies to improve disease resistance in rice (**Ashkani *et al.*, 2015**).

* **Corresponding author: Tel. :** + 201025865872
**E-mail address:** as.nofal@agri.zu.edu.eg

Over the past several decades, significant progress has been made in identifying and characterizing genes involved in blast resistance. These genes, known as resistance genes (R-genes), encode proteins that recognize specific pathogen-derived molecules, triggering a defense response that prevents pathogen growth and spread (**Bent, 1996**). However, the durability of resistance conferred by individual R-genes is often limited due to the ability of *M. oryzae* to evolve new virulence factors that can overcome the resistance (**Devanna *et al.*, 2022**).

To address this challenge, researchers have focused on developing strategies for pyramiding multiple R-genes into a single rice variety. This approach can enhance the durability of resistance by making it more difficult for the pathogen to overcome all of the resistance genes simultaneously (**Devanna *et al.*, 2022**). Additionally, efforts are underway to identify and characterize quantitative trait loci (QTLs) associated with blast resistance. QTLs are genomic regions that contribute to a complex trait, such as disease resistance. By identifying QTLs, researchers can develop marker-assisted selection (MAS) tools to accelerate the breeding of blast-resistant rice varieties (**Mehta *et al.*, 2019**).

In addition to genetic approaches, a variety of agronomic and cultural practices can be used to manage rice blast. These include crop rotation, field sanitation, and the use of fungicides. However, the effectiveness of these practices can vary depending on local conditions and the specific characteristics of the pathogen population (**Pooja and Katoch, 2014**).

Rice blast is a major challenge to global rice production, and the development of durable resistance to this disease is a critical priority (**Valent, 2021**). By understanding the genetic basis of blast resistance and employing a combination of genetic and agronomic strategies, researchers can make significant progress in improving rice resilience to this devastating pathogen. The main objective of this review article is to provide a comprehensive overview of rice blast disease, its impact on global food security, and the current strategies for managing it. The article discusses the biology of the fungal pathogen *M. oryzae*, the symptoms of rice blast, and the challenges associated with controlling the disease. It also explores the genetic basis of blast resistance in rice, the development of resistance genes and quantitative trait loci, and the role of agronomic practices in disease management.

## The Gene-for-Gene Model

The interaction between rice and *M. oryzae* is governed by the gene-for-gene model. This model posits that a plant resistance gene (R-gene) interacts specifically with a corresponding avirulence gene (AVR gene) in the pathogen (**Moffett, 2009**). When an R gene encounters its cognate AVR gene, a hypersensitive response (HR) is triggered, leading to localized cell death and preventing pathogen spread (**Feechan *et al.*, 2015**).

The gene-for-gene model was first proposed by **Flor (1971)** based on his studies on flax rust. Flor observed that different races of the flax rust fungus *Melampsora lini* were able to infect only specific flax cultivars, suggesting a genetic basis for resistance. He hypothesized that a specific resistance gene in the flax plant interacted with a corresponding virulence gene in the fungus, leading to either resistance or susceptibility.

The mechanisms by which R-genes recognize AVR proteins are diverse and complex (**Moffett, 2009**). Several models have been proposed, including: (1) Direct recognition: R-genes may directly bind to AVR proteins, leading to the activation of downstream signaling pathways. (2) Indirect recognition**:** R-genes may recognize pathogen-derived molecules indirectly through adaptor proteins or signaling complexes. (3) Guard hypothesis: This model suggests that R-genes monitor the activity of AVR proteins. When an AVR protein interferes with a host protein, the R gene recognizes the altered host protein and triggers the HR (**Marwal and Gaur, 2020**).

The gene-for-gene model has had a profound impact on plant pathology and plant breeding (**Crute, 1994**). It has provided a framework for understanding the genetic basis of disease resistance and has led to the development of new strategies for disease control. Some of the key implications of the gene-for-gene model include: (1) Disease resistance breeding: By identifying and pyramiding multiple R-genes

into a single cultivar, breeders can develop varieties with durable resistance to pathogens. (2) Pathogen evolution: The gene-for-gene model helps to explain why pathogens can rapidly evolve to overcome resistance genes. (3) Disease management: Understanding the gene-for-gene model can inform the development of effective disease management strategies, such as the use of resistant cultivars, crop rotation, and fungicides (**Manoharachary and Kunwar, 2014**). Despite its success, the gene-for-gene model has limitations. For example, not all plant-pathogen interactions can be explained by this model, and some pathogens may employ strategies to evade R gene-mediated resistance (**Tailor and Bhatla, 2024**).

Numerous R genes and corresponding AVR genes have been identified and characterized in this system. Pi genes, such as Pi-ta, Pi-ka, Pi-b, and Pi-z, are a large family of R genes that confer resistance to various races of M. oryzae (**Ou, 1979; Victoria and Martinez, 2009**). Another family of R genes implicated in blast resistance are RGA genes, including RGA4, RGA5, and RGA6 (**López *et al.*, 2003**). The AVR genes in M. oryzae corresponding to these R genes include AVR-Pia, AVR-Pita, AVR-Pib, and AVR-Piz, respectively (**Yoshida *et al.*, 2009**). These are just a few examples of the many R genes and AVR genes that have been studied in detail in rice, and ongoing research continues to uncover new aspects of the gene-for-gene interaction between these two organisms.

## Types of Blast Resistance Genes

Several types of blast resistance genes have been identified in rice:

### Monogenic R-genes

Monogenic R-genes, such as *Pi-ta*, *Pi-k*, and *Pi-z*, which confer resistance to specific races or isolates of a pathogen, play a crucial role in plant disease resistance. In rice, these genes have been extensively studied and utilized to develop cultivars with enhanced resistance to various pathogens, including blast, bacterial blight, and brown spot **(Pradhan *et al.*, 2020)**.

Monogenic R-genes offer several advantages, including rapid deployment due to their simple genetic basis, which allows for easy introgression into breeding programs. When matched with the corresponding avirulence gene in the pathogen, monogenic R-genes can provide highly effective resistance. Additionally, the availability of molecular markers linked to these genes enables efficient and accurate selection for resistance in breeding programs (**Salgotra and Stewart Jr, 2020**).

Key characteristics of monogenic R-genes include their specificity to particular pathogen races or isolates and their dominant inheritance, requiring only a single copy to confer resistance. The interaction between an R gene and its cognate avirulence gene often leads to a hypersensitive response (HR), a rapid and localized defense response. While monogenic R-genes can provide durable resistance, their effectiveness can be compromised by pathogen evolution or the emergence of new races (**Stuthman *et al.*, 2007**).

Despite their advantages, monogenic R-genes face several challenges. Pathogens can rapidly evolve to overcome monogenic resistance by mutating their avirulence genes or acquiring new virulence factors. Over time, monogenic R-genes may lose their effectiveness as pathogens adapt. Moreover, monogenic R-genes often confer resistance to a limited range of pathogen isolates (**Crill and Khush, 1982**).

### Polygenic resistance

Unlike monogenic R-genes that confer resistance to specific pathogen races or isolates, polygenic R-genes offer a more durable and broad-spectrum resistance (**Stuthman *et al.*, 2007**). These genes are often associated with quantitative trait loci (QTLs) and are inherited in a quantitative manner. Polygenic R-genes are particularly crucial for rice, a staple crop facing constant threats from various pathogens, including blast and bacterial blight.

Polygenic R-genes contribute to the overall resistance phenotype in a gradual and additive manner, providing resistance to a wider range of pathogen genotypes. This makes them less susceptible to pathogen adaptation. Compared to monogenic R-genes, polygenic R-genes are generally more durable as pathogens find it challenging to overcome multiple resistance genes simultaneously. The genetic basis of polygenic R-genes is complex, influenced by multiple genes and environmental factors (**Van Rheenen *et al.*, 2019**).

Several QTLs linked to polygenic R-genes have been identified in rice. These QTLs can confer resistance to various pathogens, including blast, bacterial blight, and brown spot. For instance, the QTL qRht1 has been shown to confer resistance to blast, while qRht2 is associated with resistance to bacterial blight.

While the mechanisms underlying polygenic R-genes are not fully understood, they are believed to involve a combination of factors. Polygenic R-genes may confer a general level of resistance, known as basal resistance, that helps prevent pathogen infection (**Michelmore *et al.*, 2013**). They might indirectly recognize pathogen-derived molecules through signaling pathways or by modifying the host environment. Additionally, polygenic R-genes may have small individual effects but, when combined, can provide significant resistance (**Mapuranga *et al.*, 2022**).

Breeding for polygenic R-genes is a complex process requiring a combination of phenotypic selection, marker-assisted selection (MAS), and genomic selection (GS) (**Cobb *et al.*, 2019**). Phenotypic selection involves selecting individuals based on their observed resistance to pathogens. MAS utilizes molecular markers to identify individuals carrying specific QTLs associated with resistance. GS employs genomic information to predict the genetic value of individuals for a particular trait, such as disease resistance (**Ragimekula *et al.*, 2013**).

### Quantitative trait loci (QTLs)

QTLs are genomic regions associated with complex traits, such as disease resistance. In rice, QTLs have been identified for various traits, including blast resistance (**Zarbafi and Ham, 2019**). These QTLs offer a more durable and broad-spectrum resistance compared to monogenic R-genes.

Blast resistance is often a polygenic trait, involving multiple genes that contribute to the overall resistance phenotype. QTLs for blast resistance exhibit quantitative variation, with alleles contributing to resistance in a gradual and additive manner. Environmental factors, such as temperature, humidity, and nutrient availability, can influence the expression of these QTLs (**Mafakheri and Kordrostami, 2020**).

QTL mapping, a statistical technique, is used to identify genomic regions associated with a particular trait. In rice, QTL mapping has been employed to locate QTLs for blast resistance. This involves crossing parents with contrasting phenotypes for blast resistance and analyzing the segregation of the trait in the progeny (**Miah *et al.*, 2013**).

QTL mapping identifies regions based on the correlation between marker genotypes and the trait phenotype. This method accounts for the effects of other QTLs in the genome, providing a more accurate estimate of QTL effects. Genome-wide association studies (GWAS) involve analyzing the association between genetic markers and the trait phenotype in a large population of individuals (**Uffelmann *et al.*, 2021; Wang *et al.*, 2012**).

Several QTLs for blast resistance have been identified in rice. These QTLs are often located on different chromosomes and can confer resistance to various races or isolates of the *M. oryzae* pathogen. Examples include QTLs on chromosome 1 associated with blast resistance in various rice varieties, QTLs on chromosome 6 linked to resistance, particularly in indica rice varieties, and QTLs on chromosome 12 associated with blast resistance, especially in japonica rice varieties (**Koide *et al.*, 2009; Volante *et al.*, 2020**).

QTLs can be utilized in breeding programs to develop rice varieties with improved blast resistance. Marker-assisted selection (MAS) employs molecular markers linked to QTLs to select individuals with desired resistance traits. Genomic selection, another approach, predicts the genetic value of individuals for blast resistance based on their genomic information (**Ragimekula *et al.*, 2013**).

## Mechanisms of Blast Resistance

### Direct recognition

Direct recognition involves the plant's direct interaction with the pathogen, triggering defense responses. This differs from indirect recognition, where the plant perceives host-derived signals to indirectly identify pathogen-derived molecules.

**Pattern-triggered immunity (PTI)**

PTI is a rapid and general defense response activated in plants when they recognize conserved molecular patterns associated with pathogens, known as pathogen-associated molecular patterns (PAMPs). Examples of PAMPs include flagellin (found in bacterial flagella), chitin (a component of fungal cell walls), and lipopolysaccharides (present in the outer membrane of Gram-negative bacteria) (**Vidhyasekaran and Vidhyasekaran, 2014**).

Pattern recognition receptors (PRRs) are surface receptors on plant cells that bind to PAMPs. These receptors are typically transmembrane proteins with extracellular domains for PAMP recognition and intracellular domains that initiate signaling pathways. When a PAMP binds to a PRR, a signaling cascade is activated, involving various proteins and molecules. This signaling pathway leads to the activation of downstream defense responses (**Li and Wu, 2021; Vidhyasekaran and Vidhyasekaran, 2014**).

**Effector-triggered immunity (ETI)**

Effector-Triggered Immunity (ETI) is a highly specific and rapid plant defense response triggered by the recognition of pathogen effectors (**Tsuda and Katagiri, 2010**). Effectors are proteins secreted by pathogens that manipulate host cellular processes to facilitate infection. ETI is a crucial component of plant innate immunity, enabling plants to effectively combat a wide range of pathogens, including fungi, bacteria, and viruses (**Kumar *et al.*, 2021**).

ETI is crucial for plants to effectively resist blast infections. By recognizing and responding to pathogen effectors, plants can mount a swift and powerful defense, limiting the damage caused by the fungus (**Ghosh *et al.*, 2019**). However, the effectiveness of ETI can be influenced by various factors, including the specific R-genes present in the plant, the virulence of the pathogen strain, and environmental conditions (**Naveed *et al.*, 2020**).

**Cell wall modifications**

Cell wall modifications play a crucial role in preventing fungal penetration and colonization. By altering the composition and structure of the cell wall, rice plants can create a physical barrier that hinders the fungus's ability to invade and establish infection. There are some specific mechanisms involved in cell wall modifications for blast resistance. Rice plants can increase the thickness of their cell walls, making it more difficult for the fungus to penetrate (**Kankanala *et al.*, 2007; Naveed *et al.*, 2020**). This thickening is often achieved by the deposition of additional cellulose, hemicellulose, and lignin. The composition of the cell wall can be altered to make it less susceptible to fungal degradation. For example, rice plants may increase the levels of certain polysaccharides or proteins that are resistant to fungal enzymes (**Kubicek *et al.*, 2014; Ward *et al.*, 1989**).

**Production of antimicrobial compounds**

Rice plants have evolved various defense mechanisms to resist blast infection, one of which is the production of antimicrobial compounds. These compounds, synthesized by the plant, directly target the fungus, inhibiting its growth and development (**Ribera and Zuñiga, 2012**). Phytoalexins such as sakuranetin, orobanchin, and momilactone are low-molecular-weight compounds that are synthesized de novo in response to pathogen attack. Reactive Oxygen Species (ROS) such as hydrogen peroxide and superoxide radicals, are produced by the plant as a defense response. They can directly damage the fungal cells and also trigger other defense mechanisms. Hydrolytic Enzymes like chitinases and β-1,3-glucanases can degrade the fungal cell wall, rendering the fungus susceptible to attack (**Kaur *et al.*, 2022; Sood *et al.*, 2021**).

**Systemic acquired resistance (SAR)**

Systemic Acquired Resistance (SAR) is a plant defense mechanism that provides broad-spectrum resistance against a wide range of pathogens, including fungi, bacteria, and viruses (**Hammerschmidt, 2009**). It is triggered by an initial infection, which leads to a systemic signal that activates defense responses throughout the plant. This systemic response can protect the plant from subsequent infections, even in parts of the plant that were not initially infected. Rice plants have evolved various mechanisms to resist blast infection, including SAR (**Gozzo, 2003; Hammerschmidt, 2009**). SAR is an important mechanism of blast resistance in rice plants. By understanding how SAR works,

scientists can develop strategies to improve blast resistance in rice cultivars. For example, breeding programs can be focused on selecting rice varieties that are more efficient at activating SAR.

### Indirect recognition

Indirect recognition is a defense mechanism employed by plants to combat pathogens like *M. oryzae*, the causal agent of rice blast disease (**Devanna *et al.*, 2022**). Unlike direct recognition, which involves the direct interaction between plant resistance genes and pathogen avirulence genes, indirect recognition relies on the plant's ability to detect and respond to pathogen-associated molecular patterns (PAMPs) (**Rathore and Ghosh, 2018; Zipfel, 2014**). Plant cells possess specialized receptors that can recognize PAMPs, such as chitin, β-glucan, and flagellin, which are common components of fungal cell walls. Upon recognition of PAMPs, a cascade of signaling events is initiated within the plant cell (**Newman *et al.*, 2013**). This involves the activation of various proteins and enzymes, leading to the production of reactive oxygen species (ROS) and hormones like salicylic acid (SA) and jasmonic acid (JA). The generated ROS and hormones trigger a range of defense responses in the plant (**Ali and Baek, 2020**).

## Challenges and Future Directions

Despite significant progress in understanding blast resistance in rice, several challenges persist. Pathogen evolution is a major hurdle, as *M. oryzae* can rapidly adapt to overcome resistance genes through mutations in avirulence genes or by acquiring new virulence factors. Durability of resistance is another concern, as monogenic resistance genes often become ineffective due to pathogen adaptation. Moreover, the complex genetic architecture of blast resistance, involving multiple genes, makes it difficult to develop varieties with long-lasting protection. These challenges highlight the need for continued research and innovative approaches to combat this devastating disease. Future research efforts should focus on developing durable and effective strategies for managing blast disease in rice. This includes deploying resistance genes through pyramid resistance and gene editing techniques, as well as utilizing QTL mapping to identify and characterize genetic loci associated with resistance. Additionally, continuous pathogen monitoring and forecasting can help identify emerging resistant races and predict disease outbreaks, enabling timely interventions. Integrating various disease management strategies, such as cultural practices, chemical control, and biological control, can reduce the pressure on resistance genes and prolong their effectiveness. Moreover, basic research on host-pathogen interactions can provide valuable insights into the molecular mechanisms underlying blast resistance and pathogen virulence, informing the development of novel resistance strategies. By addressing these challenges and pursuing these future directions, researchers can make significant progress in ensuring food security and mitigating the impact of blast disease on rice production.

## Conclusions

Despite significant advancements in understanding and combating rice blast disease, ongoing challenges necessitate continued research and innovation. While monogenic R-genes have been effective in improving resistance, their durability is often limited by pathogen evolution. Polygenic R-genes offer a more sustainable approach, requiring a deeper understanding of their genetic basis. QTL mapping and advanced breeding techniques, such as pyramiding and gene editing, hold promise for developing rice varieties with enhanced and long-lasting resistance. By addressing the complexities of pathogen evolution, durability, and genetic architecture, researchers can create rice cultivars that are resilient to blast disease and contribute to global food security.

# REFERENCES

Ali, M.S., K.H. Baek (2020). Jasmonic acid signaling pathway in response to abiotic stresses in plants. Int. J. Molec. Sci., 21: 621.

Ashkani, S., M.Y. Rafii, M. Shabanimofrad, G. Miah, M. Sahebi, P. Azizi, F.A. Tanweer, M.S. Akhtar and A. Nasehi (2015). Molecular breeding strategy and challenges towards improvement of blast disease resistance in rice crop. Frontiers in Plant Sci., 6: 886.

Bent, A.F. (1996). Plant disease resistance genes: function meets structure. The Plant Cell., 8: 1757.

Cobb, J.N., P.S. Biswas and J.D. Platten (2019). Back to the future: revisiting MAS as a tool for modern plant breeding. Theoretical and Appl. Genet., 132: 647-667.

Crill, J. and G. Khush (1982). Effective control with resistance monogenic. Evolution of the Gene Rotation Concept for Rice Blast Control: A Compilation of 10 Res. Papers, 87.

Crute, I.R. (1994). Gene-for-gene recognition in plant-pathogen interactions. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biol. Sci., 346: 345-349.

Devanna, B.N., P. Jain, A.U. Solanke, A. Das, S. Thakur, P.K. Singh, M. Kumari, H. Dubey, R. Jaswal and D. Pawar (2022). Understanding the dynamics of blast resistance in rice-Magnaporthe oryzae interactions. J. Fungi. 8: 584.

Feechan, A., D. Turnbull, L.J. Stevens, S. Engelhardt, P.R. Birch, I. Hein and E.M. Gilroy (2015). The hypersensitive response in PAMP-and effector-triggered immune responses. Plant Programmed Cell Death, 235-268.

Flor, H.H. (1971). Current status of the gene-for-gene concept. Annual Rev. Phytopathol., 9: 275-296.

Ghosh, S., K.K. Malukani, R.K. Chandan, R.V. Sonti and G. Jha (2019). How plants respond to pathogen attack: Interaction and communication. Sensory Biol. Plants, 537-568.

Gozzo, F. (2003). Systemic acquired resistance in crop protection: from nature to a chemical approach. J. Agric. and Food Chem., 51: 4487-4503.

Hammerschmidt, R. (2009). Systemic acquired resistance. Advances in Bot. Res., 51: 173-222.

Kankanala, P., K. Czymmek and B. Valent (2007). Roles for rice membrane dynamics and plasmodesmata during biotrophic invasion by the blast fungus. The Plant Cell, 19: 706-724.

Kaur, S., M.K. Samota, M. Choudhary, M. Choudhary, A.K. Pandey, A. Sharma and J. Thakur (2022). How do plants defend themselves against pathogens-Biochemical mechanisms and genetic interventions. Physiol. and Molec. Biol. Plants, 28:485-504.

Koide, Y., N. Kobayashi, D. Xu and Y. Fukuta (2009). Resistance genes and selection DNA markers for blast disease in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). Japan Agricultural Research Quarterly: JARQ 43: 255-280.

Kubicek, C.P., T.L. Starr and N.L. Glass (2014). Plant cell wall–degrading enzymes and their secretion in plant-pathogenic fungi. Ann. Rev. Phytopathol., 52: 427-451.

Kumar, J., A. Ramlal, K. Kumar, A. Rani and V. Mishra (2021). Signaling pathways and downstream effectors of host innate immunity in plants. Int. J. Molec. Sci., 22: 9022.

Kumar, P., R. Sharma and K. Kumar (2024). A perspective on varied fungal virulence factors causing infection in host plants. Molec. Biol. Reports, 51: 392.

Li, D. and M. Wu (2021). Pattern recognition receptors in health and diseases. Signal Transduction and Targeted Therapy, 6: 291.

López, C.E., I.F. Acosta, C. Jara, F. Pedraza, E. Gaitán-Solís, G. Gallego, S. Beebe and J. Tohme (2003). Identifying resistance gene analogs associated with resistances to different pathogens in common bean. Phytopathol., 93: 88-95.

Mafakheri, M. and M. Kordrostami (2020). Role of molecular tools and biotechnology in climate-resilient agriculture. Plant Ecophysiology and Adaptation under Climate Change: Mechanisms and Perspectives II: Mech. Adapt. and Stress Amelior., 491-529.

Manoharachary, C. and I.K. Kunwar (2014). Host–pathogen interaction, plant diseases, disease management strategies, and future challenges, Future Challenges in Crop Prot. Against Fungal Pathogens. Springer, 185-229.

Mapuranga, J., N. Zhang, L. Zhang, W. Liu, J. Chang and W. Yang (2022). Harnessing genetic resistance to rusts in wheat and integrated rust management methods to

develop more durable resistant cultivars. Front. in Plant Sc., 13: 951095.

Marwal, A. and R.K. Gaur (2020). Host plant strategies to combat against viruses effector proteins. Current Genomics, 21: 401-410.

Mehta, S., B. Singh, P. Dhakate, M. Rahman and M.A. Islam (2019). Rice, marker-assisted breeding, and disease resistance. Dis. Resist. in Crop Plants: Molec., Genet. and Genomic Persp., 83 - 111.

Miah, G., M. Rafii, M. Ismail, A. Puteh, H. Rahim, R. Asfaliza and M. Latif (2013). Blast resistance in rice: a review of conventional breeding to molecular approaches. Molec. Biol. Reports, 40: 2369-2388.

Michelmore, R.W., M. Christopoulou and K.S. Caldwell (2013). Impacts of resistance gene genetics, function, and evolution on a durable future. Ann. Rev. Phytopathol., 51: 291-319.

Moffett, P. (2009). Mechanisms of recognition in dominant R gene mediated resistance. Adv. Virus Res., 75: 1-229.

Naveed, Z.A., X. Wei, J. Chen, H. Mubeen and G.S. Ali (2020). The PTI to ETI continuum in Phytophthora-plant interactions. Front. Plant Sci., 11: 593905.

Newman, M.A., T. Sundelin, J.T. Nielsen and G. Erbs (2013). MAMP (microbe-associated molecular pattern) triggered immunity in plants. Front. Plant Sci., 4: 139.

Ou, S. (1979). Breeding rice for resistance to blast: a critical review, Proceeding of the rice blast workshop. International Rice Research Institute PO Box 933, Manila, The Philippines, 81-137.

Pooja, K. and A. Katoch (2014). Past, present and future of rice blast management. Plant Sci. Today, 1: 165-173.

Pradhan, S., S. Barik, D. Nayak, A. Pradhan, E. Pandit, P. Nayak, S. Das and H. Pathak (2020). Genetics, molecular mechanisms and deployment of bacterial blight resistance genes in rice. Crit. Rev. Plant Scie., 39: 360-385.

Ragimekula, N., N.N. Varadarajula, S.P. Mallapuram, G. Gangimeni, R.K. Reddy and H.R. Kondreddy (2013). Marker assisted selection in disease resistance breeding. J. Plant Breed. and Genet., 1: 90-109.

Rathore, J.S. and C. Ghosh (2018). Pathogen-associated molecular patterns and their perception in plants. Molec. Aspects of Plant-Path. Interact., 79-113.

Ribera, A. and G. Zuñiga (2012). Induced plant secondary metabolites for phytopatogenic fungi control: a review. J. Soil Sci. and Plant Nutr., 12: 893-911.

Salgotra, R.K. and C.N. Stewart Jr (2020). Functional markers for precision plant breeding. Int. J. Molec. Sci., 21: 4792.

Shahriar, S.A., A.A. Imtiaz, M.B. Hossain, A. Husna, M. Eaty and N. Khatun (2020). Rice blast disease. Ann. Res. and Rev. Biol., 35: 50 - 64.

Sharma, T., A. Rai, S. Gupta, J. Vijayan, B. Devanna and S. Ray (2012). Rice blast management through host-plant resistance: retrospect and prospects. Agric. Res., 1:37-52.

Simkhada, K. and R. Thapa (2022). Rice Blast, A Major Threat to the Rice Production and its Various Management Techniques. Turkish J. Agric. Food Sci. and Technol., 10: 147-157. doi:10.24925/turjaf.v10i2.147-157.4548.

Skamnioti, P. and S.J. Gurr (2009). Against the grain: safeguarding rice from rice blast disease. Trends in Biotechnol., 27, 141-150.

Sood, M., D. Kapoor, V. Kumar, N. Kalia, R. Bhardwaj, G.P. Sidhu and A. Sharma (2021). Mechanisms of plant defense under pathogen stress: A review. Current Protein and Peptide Sci., 22: 376-395.

Stuthman, D., K. Leonard and J. Miller-Garvin (2007). Breeding crops for durable resistance to disease. Advances in Agron., 95: 319-367.

Tailor, A. and S.C. Bhatla (2024). R gene-mediated resistance in the management of plant diseases. J. Plant Biochem. and Biotechnol., 33: 5-23.

Tsuda, K. and F. Katagiri (2010). Comparing signaling mechanisms engaged in pattern-triggered and effector-triggered immunity. Current Opinion In Plant Biol., 13: 459-465.

Uffelmann, E., Q.Q. Huang, N.S. Munung, J. De Vries, Y. Okada, A. R. Martin, H.C. Martin, T. Lappalainen and D. Posthuma (2021). Genome-wide association studies. Nature Rev. Methods Prim., 1: 59.

Valent, B. (2021). The impact of blast disease: past, present, and future. Magnaporthe oryzae: Methods and Protocols, 1-18.

Van Rheenen, W., W.J. Peyrot, A.J. Schork, S.H. Lee and N.R. Wray (2019). Genetic correlations of polygenic disease traits: from theory to practice. Nature Rev. Genet., 20: 567-581.

Victoria, F.C. and C. Martinez (2009). Breeding rice cultivars with durable blast resistance in Colombia, Advances in genetics, genomics and control of rice blast disease. Springer, 375-383.

Vidhyasekaran, P. and P. Vidhyasekaran (2014). PAMP signaling in plant innate immunity. Springer.

Volante, A., A. Tondelli, F. Desiderio, P. Abbruscato, B. Menin, C. Biselli, L. Casella, N. Singh, S.R. McCouch, D. Tharreau (2020). Genome wide association studies for japonica rice resistance to blast in field and controlled conditions. Rice, 13: 1-17.

Wang, H., I. Misztal, I. Aguilar, A. Legarra and W. Muir (2012). Genome-wide association mapping including phenotypes from relatives without genotypes. Genetics Res., 94: 73-83.

Ward, O.P., M. Moo-Young and K. Venkat (1989). Enzymatic degradation of cell wall and related plant polysaccharides. Critical Rev. Biotechnol., 8: 237-274.

Yoshida, K., H. Saitoh, S. Fujisawa, H. Kanzaki, H. Matsumura, K. Yoshida, Y. Tosa, I. Chuma, Y. Takano and J. Win (2009). Association genetics reveals three novel avirulence genes from the rice blast fungal pathogen Magnaporthe oryzae. The Plant Cell., 21: 1573-1591.

Zarbafi, S.S. and J.H. Ham (2019). An overview of rice QTLs associated with disease resistance to three major rice diseases: blast, sheath blight, and bacterial panicle blight. Agron., 9: 177.

Zipfel, C. (2014). Plant pattern-recognition receptors. Trends in immunology, 35: 345-351.

# كشف الأليات الوراثية لمقاومة مرض اللفحة فى الأرز

**أسماء سمير نوفل - سعيد سعد سليمان - طارق أبو المحاسن اسماعيل - هانى عبدالرءوف وفا**

قسم الوراثة – كلية الزراعة – جامعة الزقازيق – مصر

المعركة المستمرة بين الأرز والفطر المسبب لمرض اللفحة *Magnaporthe oryza*e هي تفاعل معقد بين العوامل الوراثية والضغوط التطورية. يحكم هذا التفاعل نموذج الجين مقابل الجين، حيث تتعرف جينات مقاومة النبات (R-genes) بشكل خاص على جينات عدم الضراوة المقابلة (AVR-genes) في المسبب المرضى، مما يؤدي إلى استجابة فرط الحساسية لمنع العدوى. في حين أن الجينات المونوجينية R قد قدمت حماية أولية قيمة، إلا أن فعاليتها غالباً ما تتعرض للخطر بسبب التكيف السريع للمسبب المرضى .تقدم المقاومة متعددة الجينات، المرتبطة بأماكن التركيب الكمي (QTLs) حماية أكثر دواماً. إن فهم الآليات المعقدة الكامنة وراء مقاومة الفطر المسبب لمرض اللفحة أمر حيوي لتطوير استراتيجيات إدارة الأمراض المستدامة. تشمل هذه الآليات مسارات التعرف المباشر وغير المباش، وتعديلات جدار الخلية، وإنتاج المركبات المضادة للميكروبات، والمقاومة المكتسبة الجهازية. على الرغم من التقدم الكبير في هذه المجالات، فإن التحديات تستمر. إن قدرة المسبب المرضى على التطور السريع، والقيود المفروضة على المقاومة أحادية الجين، والهيكل الوراثي المعقد لمقاومة فطر اللفحة كلها تشكل عقبات أمام الإنتاج المستدام للأرز. يجب أن يركز البحث المستقبلي على تطوير نهج مبتكرة، مثل نشر جينات المقاومة من خلال تقنيات مثل التراص والتحرير الجيني، واستخدام رسم خرائط QTL لتحديد وتوصيف مواقع المقاومة، وتكامل ممارسات إدارة الأمراض المتنوعة. من خلال معالجة هذه التحديات، يمكننا ضمان استمرار مرونة الأرز ضد فطر اللفحة وحماية الأمن الغذائي العالمي.

**الكلمات الإسترشادية**: الأرز، جينات المقاومة، جينات المقاومة الأحادية، مقاومة متعددة الجينات، مواقع الصفات الكمية.

**المحكمـــون :**

**1- د. ضياء محمد عبدالمنعـــم** أستاذ الوراثة المساعد – كلية العلوم البيئية الزراعية – جامعة العريش.

**2- د. عبدالله عبدالعظيم حسانين** أستاذ الوراثة المساعد – كلية الزراعة – جامعة الزقازيق.