# Genetical evidence for diploidy in Phytophthora

## BY DAVID S. SHAW AND IKRAM A. KHAKI\*

School of Plant Biology, University College of North Wales, Bangor, North Wales

## (Received 19 November 1970)

#### SUMMARY

A spontaneous mutant of *Phytophthora drechsleri*, resistant to *p*-fluorophenylalanine and two induced mutants resistant to chloramphenicol have been selected and analysed. The pattern of inheritance of the mutant phenotypes was identical and conformed to that expected in a diploid organism.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Phytophthora belongs to a group of non-septate, oogamous fungi, many of which cause blights and downy mildews of plants. Although Phytophthora and other members of the class Oömycetes were assumed to have haploid somatic nuclei, recent cytological and micro-chemical evidence leads to a questioning of this assumption (Sansome, 1965; Bryant & Howard, 1969). Genetical data are required to establish the position of meiosis in the life-cycle and to provide a basis for the investigation of the control of host specificity, incompatibility and other natural variation.

Attempts to analyse Phytophthora genetically have been frustrated by lack of suitable stable nuclear markers and the results have been inconclusive. Here we report briefly on the results of some simple matings designed to provide definitive genetical evidence of ploidy in *Phytophthora drechsleri*.

Shaw & Elliott (1968) chose drug resistance as a marker in P. cactorum because 'resistance mutations have often been found to be dominant or semi-dominant in other fungi and would be expected to express themselves in a heterozygote'. Developing this approach with the heterothallic species P. drechsleri, we have analysed the inheritance of resistance to p-fluorophenylalanine and chloramphenicol.

#### 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Compatible isolates 6500 and 6503,† used by Galindo & Zentmyer (1967), were chosen as suitable wild-types because they produce hybrid oospores with a high percentage and rate of germination. A spontaneous mutant (6503 FA1) resistant to p-fluorophenylalanine was selected by adding 10<sup>8</sup> zoospores of 6503 to liquid standard medium (Shaw & Elliott, 1968) containing 100  $\mu$ g/ml p-fluorophenylalanine. Four mutants resistant to chloramphenicol were induced by treating 10<sup>9</sup> zoospores with N-methyl-N-nitroso-N'nitroguanidine to give 75 % survival and selecting in liquid standard medium containing 100  $\mu$ g/ml chloramphenicol. Two of these mutants, 6503 C1 and 6503 C2, were analysed further. Details of the selection of mutants will be published elsewhere.

\* Permanent address: The Central Bacteriology Institute, Ministry of Health, Baghdad, Iraq.

<sup>†</sup> We are much indebted to Dr Jorge Galindo, Escuela Nacional de Agricultura, Chapingo, Mexico, for supplying us with solates 6500 and 6503.

## DAVID S. SHAW AND IKRAM A. KHAKI

Table 1 shows phenotypes of wild-type and mutant isolates on agars containing drugs. It can be seen that mutants are not cross-resistant. Crosses were made by placing 4 mm hyphal inocula of compatible isolates 1 cm apart on the surface of plates of oat-extract agar (Shaw & Elliott, 1968) and incubating in a light-dark regime for 14 days (Galindo & Zentmyer, 1967). Mature oospores were germinated on standard medium agar after treatment on water agar (Shaw, 1967).

#### 3. RESULTS

Analysis of each mutant was carried out by crossing to the compatible wild-type, backcrossing selected progeny  $(F_1$ 's) to each parent, and intercrossing compatible  $F_1$ 's to give an  $F_2$  generation (see Table 2). In backcrosses and inter-crosses an  $F_1$  was selected which was compatible and highly fertile. Phenotypes of progeny are recorded in Table 2.

Linear growth was compared on medium with and without 100  $\mu$ g/ml of the appropriate

 Table 1. The response of parental isolates to p-fluorophenylalanine

 and chloramphenicol

|                 | <i>p</i> -Fluorophenylalanine |           | Chloramphenicol |                |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|----------------|
| Isolates        | $10 \mu \mathrm{g/ml}$        | 100 µg/ml | 10 $\mu$ g/ml   | 100 $\mu$ g/ml |
| 6500 wt         | _                             |           | -               | _              |
| 6503 wt         | _                             |           | _               | _              |
| 6503 FA 1       | +                             | +         | _               | _              |
| 6503 <i>C 1</i> | _                             |           | +               | +              |
| $6503 \ C2$     | _                             |           | +               | +              |

+, Linear growth on standard medium agar uninhibited by presence of drug.

- Linear growth on standard medium agar inhibited by presence of drug.

 Table 2. Crosses between resistant and sensitive isolates and their progeny

| Mutant          | Mating                            | Progeny,<br>resistant/<br>sensitive | Expected*<br>ratio | Germi-<br>nation of<br>oospores<br>(%) |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| 6503 FA 1       | $6503 \; FA 1 \times 6500 \; wt$  | 125:0                               | 1:0                | 100                                    |
|                 | $F_1 \times 6500 wt$              | 68:57                               | 1:1                | 100                                    |
|                 | $F_1 \times 6503 FA1$             | 65:0                                | 1:0                | 100                                    |
|                 | $F_1 \times F_1$                  | 35:11                               | 3:1                | •                                      |
| 6503 <i>C 1</i> | $6503 C1 \times 6500 wt$          | 66:0                                | 1:0                | 51                                     |
|                 | $F_1 \times 6500 \ wt$            | 60:48                               | 1:1                | 76                                     |
|                 | $F_1 \times 6503 \ C1$            | 59:0                                | 1:0                | 47                                     |
|                 | $F_1 \times F_1$                  | 51:17                               | 3:1                | 58                                     |
|                 | $F_{2}(1) \times 6500 \ wt$       | 25:19                               | 1:1                | 44                                     |
|                 | $F_{2}(2) \times 6500 \ wt$       | 18:23                               | 1:1                | 41                                     |
| 6503 <i>C2</i>  | 6503~C2 	imes 6500~wt             | 71:0                                | 1:0                | 97                                     |
|                 | $F_1 \times 6500 \ wt$            | 43:32                               | 1:1                | 75                                     |
|                 | $\overline{F_1} \times 6503 \ C2$ | 60:0                                | 1:0                | 60                                     |
|                 | $F_1 \times F_1$                  | 40:13                               | 3:1                | 53                                     |

\* Expected if parents are diploid and if resistant parents are homozygous.

drug and in all cases progeny were either resistant (completely uninhibited) or sensitive (totally inhibited).

No phenotypes intermediate between resistant and sensitive were recorded in these progenies. Analysis of two test crosses of  $F_2$ 's is included in Table 2.

## 4. DISCUSSION

The pattern of inheritance of drug resistance shown by all three mutants is similar: (1) no segregation in the  $F_1$  generation; (2) segregation fitting a 1:1 ratio in backcrosses to wild-type; (3) no segregation in backcrosses to resistant parent; (4) segregation in  $F_2$ fitting a 3:1 ratio. This pattern is consistent with diploidy of the somatic nuclei and determination of drug resistance by a single dominant allele. This interpretation is further supported by the results of two test crosses of resistant  $F_2$ 's with wild-type. Both progenies showed a segregation fitting a 1:1 ratio, indicating that both  $F_2$ 's were heterozygous. Our data indicate that all three mutants are homozygous for a dominant allele determining resistance. The origin of these homozygotes remains obscure, but we think the most likely explanation is that a heterozygote, formed by mutation of one allele, became homozygous by mitotic recombination. This possibility will be investigated.

Although we do not exclude the possibility that there are other interpretations, the simplest explanation of our data is entirely consistent with the somatic nuclei being diploid, and we propose to make this our working hypothesis.

This research is supported by a research grant from the Agricultural Research Council. The authors are grateful to Mrs F. M. Baylis and Miss P. McNeil for technical assistance.

#### REFERENCES

- BRYANT, T. R. & HOWARD, K. L. (1969). Meiosis in the Oomycetes. A microspectophotometric analysis of nuclear deoxyribonucleic acid in *Saprolegnia terrestis*. American Journal of Botany 56, 1075-1083.
- GALINDO, J. A. & ZENTMYER, G. A. (1967). Genetical and cytological studies of Phytophthora strains pathogenic to pepper plants. *Phytopathology* 57, 1300–1304.
- SANSOME, E. (1965). Meiosis in diploid and polyploid sex organs of Phytophthora and Achlya. Cytologia 30, 103–117.
- SHAW, D. S. (1967). A method of obtaining single oospore cultures of *Phytophthora cactorum* using live water snails. *Phytopathology* 57, 454.
- SHAW, D. S. & ELLIOTT, C. G. (1968). Streptomycin resistance and morphological variation in *Phytophthora cactorum. Journal of General Microbiology* 51, 75-84.