

Fungal Genetics Reports

Volume 15

Article 6

Cytoplasmic contribution to protoperithecius formation

T. Itoh

K. Morishita

Follow this and additional works at: <https://newprairiepress.org/fgr>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

Recommended Citation

Itoh, T., and K. Morishita (1969) "Cytoplasmic contribution to protoperithecius formation," *Fungal Genetics Reports*: Vol. 15, Article 6. <https://doi.org/10.4148/1941-4765.1909>

This Research Note is brought to you for free and open access by New Prairie Press. It has been accepted for inclusion in Fungal Genetics Reports by an authorized administrator of New Prairie Press. For more information, please contact cads@k-state.edu.

Cytoplasmic contribution to protoperithecius formation

Abstract

Cytoplasmic contribution to protoperithecius formation

Itoh, T. and K. Morishita. Cytoplasmic contribution

to protoperithecium formation in *N. crassa*.

ility can depend on physiological conditions. Fitzgerald (1963 *Heredity* 18:47), moreover, states that inability to form protoperithecia in a sterile strain of *Neurospora*, which is controlled by two genes at least, and the variation of the phenotypic expression are not due to gene differences but appear to be determined by different equilibrium states, some of which are self-perpetuating under certain conditions.

We frequently find that the formation of protoperithecia decreases spontaneously, so that fruiting bodies become scarce, in cultures of *N. crassa*. Results from successive subcultures of strains varying in the frequency of formation of protoperithecia provide apparent evidence of a gradual decrease (Table 1). A culture that forms few perithecia reaches the zero level more rapidly in the course of serial subcultures than does a culture that forms protoperithecia abundantly. Moreover, subcultivation by the successive isolation of single conidia also results in a gradual decrease of protoperithecium formation (Table 2). Accordingly, it is probably preferable to say that the change in subsequent cultures stems either from effects of environmental factors on gene action or from abnormalities of the cellular systems of conidia and mycelia as stated by Jinkx and Fitzgerald.

To determine whether the factor for phenotypic expression is genic or cytoplasmic, reciprocal crossing would be the best type of experiment. As shown in Table 3, the distribution of the frequency among ascospore segregants was obviously different between paired reciprocal crosses involving non-protoperithelial strains 8A, 13A and protoperithelial strains 28a, 120, 220 and 32a. In other words, there were many more progeny protoperithecia in the first cross than in the second, and more progeny not forming protoperithecia in the second than in the first (Table 3). Therefore, it is possible to say that the cytoplasm of the maternal strain, which will be used for forming ascospores, contains many more factors which influence protoperithecium formation than do the nuclei of those strains which are being crossed with them.

Jinkx (1957 *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. B* 146:527) suggested that, in *Aspergillus glaucus*, although phenotypic variations (wiring during unselected asexual propagation of the selected liner and established by selection) are purely cytoplasmic in origin, variation of fertility are not due to gene differences but appear to be determined by different equilibrium states, some of which are self-perpetuating under certain conditions.

Table 1. Protoperithecium formation in successive transfers of moss spores of several strains.

Strain	Transfers								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
730	*100	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
STA4	100	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
40a	200	200	100	10	0	0	0	0	0
7a	500	200	100	10	0	0	0	0	0
8a	600	-	-	200	100	10	0	0	0
17a	900	-	-	-	300	200	100	10	0

*Number of protoperithecia produced around a small filter paper circle (1 cm. d.) put on agar crossing medium and counted 5-6 days after inoculation.

Table 2. Protoperithecium formation through three successive transfers of single spores of strain @a.

Transfer	No. of cultures producing perithecia at given level					
	0	10	100	200	300	400
I*(600)	10	16	16	5	1	0
II (300)	25	6	3	2	0	0
III (200)	32	2	1	0	0	0

*Level of perithecium production by culture from which spore inoculum was taken.

Table 3. Segregation of level of protoperithecium formation from reciprocal crosses of strains derived from 74A and 73a.

Parental Strains		Level of protoperithecium formation							
Maternal	Paternal	0	10	100	200	300	400		
28a (10)	x 8A (0)	7	0	2	6	7	4	1	0
12a (10)	x 13A (0)	6	2	1	3	8	7	0	0
22a (100)	x 8A (0)	59	26	14		9	1		0
32a (100)	x 13A (0)	2	8	36	15	14	8		4
8A (0)	x 28a (10)	105	4	1		0	0		0
13A (0)	x 12a (10)	91	3	1		1	0		0
8A (0)	x 22a (100)	107	4	3		1	0		0
13A (0)	x 32a (100)	101	5	1		0	0		0

*

Even though the influential factors in protoperithecium formation are first and foremost cytoplasmic rather than genic, the problem was left unsolved as to whether the variation seen in subsequent propagation results from external effects of environmental factors or from abnormalities of the cellular system. In order to investigate this point, monospore and hyphal-tip isolation tests were carried out (Table 4). The protoperithecial formation of an isolated conidium varied, never equally or surpassing the number formed by the parental clone. In monospore isolation, the maximum level of formation was from 10 to 3×10^2 , and in hyphal-tip isolation it was $3-5 \times 10^2$. The variation shown in monospore and hyphal-tip isolation tests seems to depend upon an irregular distribution of the cytoplasmic factors responsible for protoperithecium formation. Therefore, it seems that the variation seen in subsequent propagation (Table 2) results from irregular distribution of cytoplasmic factors and a change of cellular physiological state depending upon the distribution of the factors during subculture, rather than resulting from external effects of environmental factors. In conclusion, the observations reported here would therefore seem to support the view that the factors for protoperithecium formation are cytoplasmic, that they are inherited only when they are carried by the protoperithecial parent, and are distributed irregularly into conidia produced from mycelia. The possibility that something is being transmitted through the cytoplasm is immediately suggested. However, conclusions regarding the mechanism of its variation must await further investigation. ■ ■ ■ Biology Laboratory, Obihiro Zootechnical University, Obihiro, Hokkaido, Japan.

Table 4. Variation in level of protoperithecium formation of monospore and hyphal tip isolates from strains STA4 and 12a.

Strain	Number of isolates producing protoperithecia at level						
	0	10	100	200	300	400	500
0. Mono-spore isolation							
STA4 (100)	31	13	0	0	0	0	0
12a (600)	10	16	16	1	1	0	0
b. Hyphal-tip isolation							
STA4 (100)	18	16	3	6	1	0	0
12a (600)		32	21	7	4	1	1