

Genetic Studies of Salinity Tolerance in Wheat

By

Nawar Jalal Shamaya

B.Sc., M.Sc.

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

School of Agriculture, Food and Wine

Discipline of Plant Breeding and Genetics

Australian Centre for Plant Functional Genomics



March 2013

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT.....	I
DECLARATION.....	III
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	IV
LIST OF FIGURES.....	VI
LIST OF TABLES.....	XI
CHAPTER 1: GENERAL INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	2
1.2.1 Salinity.....	2
1.2.1.1 What is salinity?	3
1.2.1.2 Phases of plant response and tolerance to salinity	4
1.2.1.2.1 First phase - osmotic effect	4
1.2.1.2.2 Second phase - ion-specific effect	5
1.2.1.3 Key conclusions.....	6
1.2.2 Physiological traits associated with salinity tolerance in plants....	7
1.2.2.1 Osmotic stress tolerance.....	7
1.2.2.1.1 Growth rate.....	8
1.2.2.1.2 Stomatal conductance	9
1.2.2.1.3 Measurement of osmotic stress tolerance.....	9
1.2.2.2 Na ⁺ exclusion	12
1.2.2.2.1 Na ⁺ exclusion in durum wheat	14
1.2.2.3 Na ⁺ tissue tolerance	16
1.2.2.4 Plant tolerance to two phases of salt stress (osmotic and ionic stress)	17
1.2.3 Wheat	18
1.2.4 Detection of the genetic loci associated with salinity tolerance ...	20
1.2.4.1 QTL analysis	21
1.2.4.1.1 Mapping population	21

1.2.4.1.2	Molecular markers	26
1.2.4.1.3	Linkage map	27
1.2.4.1.4	QTL analysis methods.....	27
1.2.4.2	Selective genotyping analysis (SGA).....	30
1.2.4.3	Bulked segregant analysis (BSA)	31
1.2.4.4	QTL for salinity tolerance traits	31
1.3	AIM	37

CHAPTER 2 IMPROVEMENT OF SCREENING

TECHNIQUES FOR SALINITY TOLERANCE..... 38

2.1	INTRODUCTION	38
2.1.1	Gladius and Drysdale	39
2.2	MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	41
2.2.1	Plant Materials:.....	41
2.2.2	Growth conditions.....	41
2.2.2.1	Field capacity	42
2.2.3	Phenotypic characterisation.....	44
2.2.4	Experimental Design.....	46
2.2.5	Statistical analysis	47
2.3	RESULTS	48
2.3.1	Shoot dry weight (SDW).....	48
2.3.2	Salt tolerance index (STI _{SDW}).....	49
2.3.3	4 th leaf Na ⁺ accumulation.....	51
2.3.4	4 th leaf K ⁺ accumulation	52
2.3.5	Plant height.....	54
2.3.6	A comparison of projected shoot area (PSA) with shoot fresh weight (SFW) and with shoot dry weight (SDW).....	55
2.4	DISCUSSION	57

CHAPTER 3: ENHANCING SALINITY TOLERANCE

IN ELITE BREAD WHEAT CULTIVARS..... 61

3.1	INTRODUCTION	61
3.2	MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	62
3.2.1	Plant materials	62
3.2.2	Growth conditions.....	63
3.2.2.1	Soil based experiment.....	63
3.2.2.2	Hydroponics experiment.....	63
3.2.3	Experimental design	65
3.2.3.1	Soil based experiment.....	65
3.2.3.2	Hydroponics experiment.....	68
3.2.4	Linkage analysis	70
3.2.5	Phenotypic characterisation.....	70
3.2.6	Statistical analysis	72
3.2.7	QTL analysis.....	73
3.3	RESULTS	74
3.3.1	Linkage analysis	74
3.3.2	Soil based experiment.....	76
3.3.2.1	Phenotyping.....	76
3.3.2.2	Trait correlation	82
3.3.2.3	QTL analysis	84
3.3.3	Hydroponics experiment	86
3.3.3.1	Phenotyping.....	86
3.3.3.2	Trait correlation	90
3.3.3.3	QTL analysis	93
3.3.4	The response of RILs to saline conditions varies between soil based and hydroponics experiments.....	99
3.4	DISCUSSION	102
3.4.1	Soil based experiment.....	102
3.4.2	Hydroponics experiment	105
3.4.3	The response of RILs to saline conditions varies between soil based and hydroponics experiments.....	108
3.5	CONCLUSION.....	110

CHAPTER 4 GENETIC BEHAVIOUR OF Na⁺	
EXCLUSION IN AFGHANI LANDRACES OF DURUM	
WHEAT	112
4.1 INTRODUCTION	112
4.2 MATERIALS AND METHODS	114
4.2.1 Plant materials	114
4.2.2 Crossing.....	114
4.2.3 Growth conditions.....	115
4.2.4 Experimental design	116
4.2.5 Measurement of 3rd leaf Na⁺ and 3rd leaf K⁺ accumulation	116
4.2.6 Genotyping characterising	116
4.2.6.1 DNA extraction	117
4.2.6.2 Selective Genotyping Analysis (SGA).....	117
4.2.6.2.1 DArT markers	118
4.2.6.2.2 Microsatellite markers	119
4.2.6.3 Bulked segregant analysis (BSA)	120
4.2.6.3.1 SNP markers	120
4.2.6.4 Marker regression analysis (MRA)	121
4.2.7 Statistical analysis	122
4.3 RESULTS	123
4.3.1 Phenotyping	123
4.3.2 3rd leaf Na⁺ accumulation in lines 740 and 752 and <i>Nax1</i>, <i>Nax2</i>	
loci.....	125
4.3.3 Selective genotyping analysis (SGA)	126
4.3.4 3rd leaf Na⁺ accumulation in selected F_{2:3} progeny	132
4.3.5 Bulked segregant analysis (BSA).....	135
4.4 DISCUSSION	138
4.5 CONCLUSION	142
CHAPTER 5 GENERAL DISCUSSION.....	143

APPENDIX.....	147
6.1 APPENDIX I.....	147
6.1.1 Soil based Experiment	147
6.1.2 Hydroponics Experiment	150
6.2 APPENDIX II	156
6.3 APPENDIX III.....	157
6.4 APPENDIX IV	158
6.4.1 Soil based experiment.....	158
6.4.2 Hydroponics experiment	159
6.4.3 Durum wheat.....	161
6.5 APPENDIX V	162
REFERENCES.....	163

Abstract

Salinity is an important issue in arid and semi-arid regions of the world, both in irrigated and dryland agriculture. Increasing salinity tolerance of crops is a feasible approach to tackling salinity. Focusing on the physiological traits associated with salinity tolerance such as Na^+ exclusion and osmotic stress tolerance simplifies the strategies for improving tolerance.

The first aim of the study described in this thesis was the development of a high throughput technique for the measurement of osmotic stress tolerance in bread wheat. This technique was then applied to 162 recombinant inbred lines derived from crossing two Australian bread wheat cultivars (Gladius and Drysdale), to identify the loci associated with osmotic stress tolerance and 4th leaf Na^+ accumulation. This population was grown under two growth conditions – a pot-soil set-up with non-destructive imaging system (LemnaTec Scanalyzer 3D technology) for the estimation of osmotic stress tolerance using high through-put system (conveyor belt system) and a supported hydroponics set-up for 4th leaf Na^+ and 4th leaf K^+ accumulation measurements. In the soil based study, QTL analyses revealed two major QTL on the distal regions of the short arms of chromosomes 2B and 1B, where the salinity tolerance index (shoot biomass in saline conditions relative to shoot biomass in control conditions) and osmotic stress tolerance overlapped. Another significant QTL for osmotic stress tolerance was mapped onto the distal region of the long arm of chromosome 5D. In the hydroponics study, two QTL associated with 4th leaf Na^+ accumulation were mapped to the distal regions of the long arms of chromosomes 1D and 3B. Loci containing a vernalisation gene (*VRN-A1*), on the long arm of chromosome 5A, and a photoperiod gene (*Ppd-D1*), on the short arm of chromosome 2D, had an impact on tiller number, shoot biomass and shoot water content in salt and control conditions.

The second aim of the research program was to study the genetics of Na⁺ exclusion in two Afghani durum wheat landraces, which accumulated half the amount of 3rd leaf Na⁺ compared to Australian commercial durum wheat cultivars. These landraces were crossed with an Australian durum wheat (cv Jandaroi) and F₂ populations were developed. The parents and F₂ population were grown in a supported hydroponics system at 100 mM NaCl, and the Na⁺ and K⁺ concentrations in the third leaf was measured after ten days growth in salt. Selective genotyping analysis using DArT markers and bulked segregant analysis (BSA) using SNP markers were carried out to detect the putative genomic regions responsible for salinity tolerance. Both analyses revealed a locus on the distal region of the long arm of chromosome 4B associated with Na⁺ and K⁺ accumulation and the ratio of K⁺/Na⁺ in the third leaf; the favourable allele derived from the Afghani landraces. BSA identified another locus on the distal region of the long arm of chromosome 3B, associated only with 3rd leaf Na⁺ accumulation and the favourable allele was inherited from Jandaroi. These loci on chromosomes 3B and 4B were validated in the entire F₂ population and marker regression analysis showed that both have a significant association with 3rd leaf Na⁺ accumulation.

The putative genomic loci identified in this thesis can be validated further and these would lead to the identification of genes and the development of markers to facilitate the breeding of salt tolerant wheat cultivars.

Declaration

I certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in my name, in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. In addition, I certify that no part of this work will, in the future, be used in a submission in my name, for any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of the University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the joint-award of this degree.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library Search and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Nawar Shamaya

/0 /201

Acknowledgement

One of the joys of completion is being able to thank the many people who have given me support and advice during my PhD study.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Iraqi government for offering me the scholarship to study at Adelaide University and Australian Centre for Plant Functional Genomics (ACPFPG) for funding my PhD project and giving me the opportunity to use their facilities.

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my principle supervisor Professor Mark Tester and my co-supervisors Dr. Yuri Shavrukov and Professor Peter Langridge for offering me the opportunity to undertake my PhD study at ACPFG, for designing such a fantastic wide-ranging challenging project, their words of wisdom, their continued support and countless laughs.

I would like to acknowledge Dr. Huwaida Rabie and Mr Paul Eckermann for their help, advice and guidance in statistics and for designing the experiments and analysing the data.

I would like to express my thanks to the plant Accelerator staff members and especially to Dr. Bettina Berger for her physical and scientific help. Also I would like to thank to Robin Hosking, Richard Norrish, Lidia Mischis and Nicole Bond for their help in setting up the soil based experiment in the plant accelerator.

A big thanks to Ursula Langridge, Alex Kovalchuk and Yuriy Onyskiv for their help in providing all the equipment I needed to carry out the experiments at the SARDI glasshouse.

Many thanks to Dr. Ken Chalmers for his guidance and advice on molecular markers and also to the molecular marker laboratory staff members. Also, to Cameron Grant for his guidance

and support in measuring field capacity of soil and to Anzu Okada for the time to train and help me to carry out multiplex PCR for durum wheat project.

I would like to acknowledge Joanne Tilbrook, Ruth Harris and Christina Morris for their help, support and time in both editing my thesis and improving my English.

For providing words of wisdom, support and an enjoyable laboratory experience I would like to thank the salt research group at ACPFG and specially group leader Stuart Roy and Joanne Tilbrook, Melissa Pickering, Jan Nield. For laboratory and scientific help, guidance, friendship, generous assistance and unwavering support, I would like to acknowledge all ACPFG staff members. Many thanks to the administrative staff for their help and laughter, in particular to Ruth Harris, Monica Ogierman, Ann Pace, Andrea French and David Harris.

Also I want to say thanks to all the PhD students at ACPFG in particular I would like to thank Gordon Wellman and his girlfriend Sami for their great friendship and support.

Finally, but most importantly, I would like to thank my family and friends for their help and support over the four years I have been away from home. Thanks to my parents for their support over my many years of schooling and for always believing that I could get through it all! Thanks to my brothers, Bashar and Hazar for their help, support and gentle pressure. Also I want to give thanks to my friends specially Ismail for his words of wisdom.

List of figures

- Figure 1.** The change in the growth rate after application of NaCl. The two phases of the response to salinity of shoot growth: osmotic stress (rapid response to salinity) and ion-specific phase (slower response to salinity after accumulation of Na⁺ in the shoot) (Munns and Tester 2008). 7
- Figure 2.** Increase in osmotic stress tolerance. The change in the growth rate after application of NaCl is denoted by the solid green line. The dashed green line shows the theoretical response of a plant with reduced sensitivity to the osmotic stress induced by salinity (Munns and Tester 2008). 10
- Figure 3.** Increase in ionic tolerance. The change in the growth rate after application of NaCl is denoted by the solid green line. The dashed red line denotes the theoretical response of a plant with reduced sensitivity to the ion-specific phase induced by salinity (Munns and Tester 2008)..... 14
- Figure 4.** Increase in osmotic and ionic stress tolerance. The change in the growth rate after application of NaCl is denoted by the solid green line. The green-and-red line denotes the theoretical response of a plant with reduced sensitivity to both osmotic stress and ion-specific stress induced by salinity (Munns & Tester 2008). 18
- Figure 5.** A scheme for generating bi-parental populations. Parent 1 (P₁) is crossed with parent 2 (P₂) to generate the first generation (F₁). Self-crossing of F₁ produces second generation (F₂) which can be used directly for mapping. It is also possible to develop genetically stable or immortal populations by going through single seed descent to produce a series of recombinant inbred lines, or through the generation of doubled haploids directly from the F₁. Backcross populations (one cycle of backcrossing) are produced by backcrossing F₁ to P₂. (Collard et al. 2005). 23
- Figure 6.** Different QTL analysis methods using QTL-Cartographer: single marker analysis using a *t*-test (black diamonds), simple interval mapping (SIM) (blue line) and composite interval mapping (CIM) (green line). The significant level (logarithm of odds (LOD) score) on the basis of 1000 permutations of the phenotypic data is denoted by the red line. Single marker analysis identified one significant marker, SIM detected four significant QTL and CIM located two maximum QTL regions on the LOD profile. The difference between single marker analysis and interval mapping (SIM and CIM) is due to the use of information obtained from an estimated genetic map. The difference between CIM and SIM is that two QTL identified from SIM have disappeared in CIM, because CIM allows detection of the interaction between these QTL and QTL identified in other regions (outside the region shown in the figure). This figure is taken from Doerge (2002) and is based on a study of experimental allergic encephalomyelitis (EAE) (Butterfield et al. 1999). The study mapped QTL for a quantitative trait on mouse chromosome 11. 633 F₂ mice were genotyped using microsatellite markers. 29

- Figure 7.** Selective genotyping analysis method involves selecting individual plants at end tails of a phenotypic distribution. The QTL can be detected by genotyping DNA of these selected individuals and constructing a linkage map. Axis x denotes the phenotypic values (e.g. disease score) and axis y denotes the number of plants of a population (Collard et al. 2005).30
- Figure 8.** Uncompleted Random Block Design (URBD), with four factors: two bread wheat cultivars - Gladius (G) and Drysdale (D); two soil types - mixed Roseworthy (M) and coco peat (C); two salt concentrations - 0mM (0) and 100 mM (100) NaCl; and two pot types - closed (C) and drained (D) pots. All factors were repeated four times, each replicate (R) has 16 experimental units and four factors: for example, the first experimental unit in R1 is DM0D which means: Drysdale * Mixed Roseworthy soil * 0mM NaCl * Drained pot. Each experimental unit has a unique colour across replicates.46
- Figure 9.** Shoot dry weight of Gladius and Drysdale grown under control and salt treatment conditions (X axis) in combinations of closed pot and coco peat mix (a), closed pot and mixed Roseworthy (b), drained pot and coco peat mix (c), and drained pot and mixed Roseworthy (d). Values are predicted mean \pm s.e.d (n = 3-4) with asterisks (*) indicating a significant difference (LSD, $p < 0.05$). LSD tests the significant differences of shoot dry weight between Gladius and Drysdale at each combination of pot and soil types.49
- Figure 10.** Salt tolerance index (relative shoot dry weight) of Gladius and Drysdale in combinations of closed pot and two types of soil (a) and combinations of drained pot and two types of soil (b). Values are predicted mean \pm s.e.d (n = 3-4) with asterisks (**) indicating a significant difference (LSD, $p < 0.01$). LSD tests the significant differences of salt tolerance index between Gladius and Drysdale at each combination of pot and soil types.50
- Figure 11.** 4th leaf Na⁺ accumulation (tissue water based) of Gladius and Drysdale in combinations of closed pot and two types of soil (a) and combinations of drained pot and two types of soils (b). Values are predicted mean \pm s.e.d (n = 3-4) with asterisks (**) indicating a significant difference (LSD, $p < 0.01$). LSD tests the significant differences of 4th leaf Na⁺ accumulation between Gladius and Drysdale at each combination of pot and soil types.52
- Figure 12.** 4th leaf K⁺ accumulation (tissue water based) of Gladius and Drysdale in combinations of closed pot and two types of soil (a) and combinations of drained pot and two types of soils (b). Values are predicted mean \pm s.e.d (n = 3-4) with asterisks (*, **) indicating a significant difference (LSD, $p < 0.05$ or $p < 0.01$). LSD tests the significant differences of 4th leaf K⁺ accumulation between Gladius and Drysdale at each combination of pot and soil types.53
- Figure 13.** Plant height of Gladius and Drysdale grown under control and salt treatment conditions (X axis) in combinations of closed pot and coco peat mix (a), closed pot and mixed Roseworthy (b), drained pot and coco peat mix (c), and drained pot and mixed Roseworthy (d). Values are predicted mean \pm s.e.d (n = 3-4) with asterisks (**) indicating a significant difference (LSD, $p < 0.01$). LSD tests the significant differences of shoot dry weight between Gladius and Drysdale at each combination of pot and soil types.54

- Figure 14.** Relationships between projected shoot area (PSA) and (a) shoot fresh weight (SFW) and (b) shoot dry weight (SDW) of *Gladius* and *Drysdale*, grown in both 0 mM and 100 mM NaCl, in two soil and two pot types. Fitted linear regression equations: (a) $Y=130x - 881.5$ and (b) $Y=97543x - 14941$56
- Figure 15.** Relationships between salt tolerance index calculated from relative projected shoot area (STI_{PSA}) and (a) STI_{SFW} calculated from relative shoot fresh weight, and (b) STI_{SDW} calculated from relative shoot dry weight of *Gladius* and *Drysdale*, grown in both 0 mM and 100 mM NaCl in two soil and two pot types. Fitted linear regression is described by following equation: (a) $Y=0.86x + 0.079$ and (b) $Y=0.82x+0.16$56
- Figure 16.** The supported hydroponics system used to grow RILs derived from crossing *Gladius* and *Drysdale* in control (0 mM NaCl) and salt (100 mM NaCl) treatments.....64
- Figure 17.** Layout of the soil based experiment in the greenhouse. The greenhouse was split into two sides. Each side had five rows which were divided into four blocks. Blocks 1, 2 and 3 in each side had sixteen columns, and block 4 in each side had five columns. Each block had 80 plants (pots) except for block 4 which had only 22 plants. The RILs, parents and standard Australian bread wheat cultivars were sown in the greenhouse and grown for 24 d before the plants were moved to the SmartHouse.66
- Figure 18.** Layout of the soil based experiment in the SmartHouse. *Gladius* is shown in red, *Drysdale* in green, *Excalibur* in pink, *Kukri* in bright blue, RILs which were replicated twice in tan, RILs which were not replicated in sky blue, and empty pots in yellow. The plants were divided into three groups. The plants were moved to the SmartHouse before the emergence of leaf 4. Plants were grown in the SmartHouse for 15 d in total; 4 d before and 11 d after salt application.....67
- Figure 19.** Layout of the experimental design for the hydroponics experiment. Three trollies were used for the control condition (0 mM NaCl) and three for the salt treatment (100 mM NaCl). Each trolley has two tubs. Plants were grown in nine columns and in five rows in each tub. 200 RILs and parents (*Gladius* and *Drysdale*) were used. RILs were partially replicated, whereas the parents were replicated six times.69
- Figure 20.** The evaluation of growth rate (which was used to estimate OST1) for RILs, parents and control cultivars grown over 10 days of salt application (0 mM NaCl and 75 mM NaCl). Projected shoot area (PSA) was evaluated by taking images from three angles of the plant and analysing the images using LemnaTec software (Version 2) (a). PSA per plant was then transformed using logarithm 10 (\log_{10}) (b). \log_{10} of PSA per plant was used to estimate fitted value per plant using the final fitted model (c). Finally, missing values of PSA were estimated and fixed coefficient was calculated (d). The growth rate for each plant was evaluated from the fixed coefficient. X axis denotes day 0 – 9 shown in table 6.77
- Figure 21.** Frequency distribution of osmotic stress tolerance – assay 1(OST1) (a), assay 2 (OST2) (b), number of tiller on salt treated plants (TN) (c) , 4th leaf Na⁺ accumulation (mM) (d), 4th leaf K⁺ accumulation (mM) (e), salt tolerance index (STI) (f) in the *Gladius* * *Drysdale* RILs. Arrows indicate the trait mean for parents, *Gladius* and *Drysdale*.80

- Figure 22.** Phenotypic correlation between salt tolerance index (STI) and osmotic stress tolerance—assay 1 (OST1) and assay 2 (OST2), number of tiller (TN), 4th leaf Na⁺ accumulation (Na) and 4th leaf K⁺ accumulation (K) for the Gladius * Drysdale RIL population under salt treatment.....83
- Figure 23.** Frequency distribution of shoot fresh weight (a), shoot dry weight (b), number of tiller (c), water content (g) in the Gladius * Drysdale RILs in control condition. Also, frequency distribution of shoot fresh weight (d), shoot dry weight (e), number of tiller (f), water content (j), 4th leaf Na⁺ accumulation (h), 4th leaf K⁺ accumulation (k) in the Gladius * Drysdale RILs in salt treatment. Figures i and l denote the frequency distribution of salt tolerance and water content indexes. Arrows indicate the trait means (n = 6) for both parents, Gladius and Drysdale. Values of X-axis for salt treatment are different from values of X-axis for control condition.88
- Figure 24.** Phenotypic correlation between salt tolerance index (STI) with 4th leaf Na⁺ (Na) and 4th leaf K⁺ (K) accumulations, shoot fresh weight in control condition (cSFW) and on salt treatment (sSFW), shoot dry weight in control condition (cSDW) and on salt treatment (sSDW), number of tiller in control condition (cTN) and on salt treatment (sTN), water content in control condition (cWC) and on salt treatment (sWC) and water content index (WCI) of the Gladius * Drysdale RIL population.91
- Figure 25.** Genetic map of chromosomes 1B, 1D, 2B, 2D, 3A, 3B, 4B, 5A, 5D, 6A, 7A and 7B of the Gladius * Drysdale RIL population and quantitative trait loci (QTL) for 4th leaf Na⁺ accumulation (Na), 4th leaf K⁺ accumulation (K), shoot fresh weight (SFW), water content (WC), tiller number (TN), salt tolerance index (STI), water content index (WCI) and osmotic stress tolerance-assay1 (OST1) for the hydroponics experiment (QTL shown in black bars) and for the soil based conditions experiment (QTL shown in green bars). SFW-control, WC-control, TN-control indicate these traits from the control treatment, whereas SFW-Salt, TN-Salt and WC-Salt indicate these traits from the salt treatment in the hydroponics experiment. The solid bars denote QTL that are significant (LOD \geq 3) whereas the dashed bars denote QTL that are not significant (LOD < 3). A dash on the QTL bar represents the peak or maximum LOD score associated with the most significant markers. Molecular markers (on the right of the chromosome) and genetic distance cM (the ruler at the left of the page) are indicated. The photoperiod genes on chromosomes 2B and 2D are shown in pink, and the vernalisation genes on chromosomes 5A and 5D are shown in brown.97
- Figure 26.** Phenotypic correlations between biomass [shoot fresh weight (hSFWc) and shoot dry weight (hSDWc) in control condition. Shoot fresh weight (hSFWs) and shoot dry weight (hSDWs) in salt treatment] collected from the hydroponics experiment and biomass [projected shoot area (pPSAc) in control condition and (pPSAs) in salt treatment] collected from the soil based experiment. BLUE data of the Gladius * Drysdale RIL population was used to conduct the correlation analysis.100
- Figure 27.** Phenotypic correlation between accumulation of 4th leaf Na⁺ and 4th leaf K⁺ (hNa and hK) collected from the hydroponics experiment and accumulation of 4th leaf Na⁺ and 4th leaf K⁺ (pNa and pK) collected from the soil based experiment. BLUE data of the Gladius * Drysdale RIL population was used to conduct the correlation analysis.101

Figure 28. Na⁺ concentration in fully expanded third leaves of wheat genotypes; two bread wheat cultivars (Krichauff and Kharchia-65) are controls and represented by the shaded bars; two durum wheat landraces (line 740 and line 752) are represented by the black bars and 35 durum wheat cultivars and accessions are depicted as clear bars. Plants were grown in a supported hydroponics system at 100 mM NaCl for 10 d. Each value is the mean of four replicates ± standard error (Shavrukov et al. 2011)..... 113

Figure 29. A supported hydroponics system providing growth conditions used to evaluate two F₂ populations derived from crossing Jandaroi and two Afghani landraces under 100 mM NaCl..... 115

Figure 30. Distributions of Na⁺ accumulation (a and d), K⁺ accumulation (b and e) and K⁺/Na⁺ ratio (c and f) of two F₂ populations derived from crossing Jandaroi and line 740 (A) and line 752 (B). Arrows indicate parental means (n=10). 100 mM NaCl was applied at the time of the third leaf emergence. Na⁺ and K⁺ concentrations were measured in the fully expanded third leaf 10 d after salt application..... 124

Figure 31. Relationship between low- and high-selected F₂ families and their F_{2.3} progeny means for 3rd leaf Na⁺ accumulation at 100 mM NaCl for Jandaroi * line 740 cross. Families homogenous in the selected F_{2.3} generation (□), families segregating in the selected F_{2.3} generation (○), means for high (Jandaroi) and low (line 740) Na⁺ parents (◆) are shown. The least-squares relationship for 3rd leaf Na⁺ accumulation of F₂ families and the mean of 3rd leaf Na⁺ accumulation of F_{2.3} progeny was $y=0.7819x + 85.517$ ($r^2=0.80$). 135

List of tables

Table 1. Plant processes and gene families associated with osmotic and ionic stress tolerance in the plant.	21
Table 2. Types of mapping populations used for QTL detection in crops and their advantages and disadvantages.	24
Table 3. QTL and genes mapped in populations of rice, barley and wheat selected for salinity tolerance studies. QTL, gene location and chromosome, and wheat homoeologous groups are listed, along with likely osmotic and ionic stress tolerance.....	33
Table 4. Electrical conductivity (EC dS/m) and pH (with and without CaCl ₂) of mixed Roseworthy and coco peat mix. The mean values of three replicates for EC and pH are given along with ± standard error (n=3).	44
Table 5. Improved linkage maps of RILs derived from the cross between Gladius and Drysdale. The first column shows 30 linkage groups across the 21 chromosomes of bread wheat. The second column indicates the number of markers on each chromosome. The third column represents the improved map re-constructed using R software (version 2.12.1).....	75
Table 6. Dates of the daily plant imaging before 4 d and 10 d after application of 75 mM NaCl. The plants were grown in the SmartHouse in The Plant Accelerator as mentioned in Sections 3.2.2.....	79
Table 7. Salt tolerance index (STI), osmotic stress tolerance–assay 1 (OST1) and assay 2 (OST2), number of tiller on salt treated plants (TN), 4 th leaf Na ⁺ accumulation (Na) and 4 th leaf K ⁺ accumulation (K) for Gladius, Drysdale, standard cultivars and RILs - mean, range (min–max) and heritability (h ²). The values are means ± s.e.m (n = 2, 5 or 6). The accumulation of Na ⁺ and K ⁺ were measured in the fully expanded fourth leaf after 10 d in salt.	82
Table 8. Coefficient of phenotypic correlation (r) between salt tolerance index (STI) and osmotic stress tolerance–assay 1 (OST1) and assay2 (OST2), number of tiller (TN), 4 th leaf Na ⁺ accumulation (Na) and 4 th leaf K ⁺ accumulation (K) of the Gladius * Drysdale RIL population under salt treatment.....	84
Table 9. QTL for salt tolerance index (STI), osmotic stress tolerance-assay1 (OST1), number of tiller (TN), 4 th leaf Na ⁺ accumulation (Na) and 4 th leaf K ⁺ accumulation (K) under salt treatment for the Gladius * Drysdale RIL population grown in the soil based conditions. Locus, chromosome, phenotypic variation explained by the QTL (% Variation), LOD score, additive effect, and parental allele are shown.....	85

- Table 10.** 4th leaf Na⁺ accumulation (Na), 4th leaf K⁺ accumulation (K), shoot fresh weight (SFW), shoot dry weight (SDW), number of tiller (TN), water content (WC), salt tolerance index (STI) and water content index (WCI) for Gladius, Drysdale and RILs mean, range (min–max) and heritability (h²) in control and salt treatment. Na and K were measured after 20 d in salt. Other traits were measured at day 45 after germination (at day 30 in salt). 87
- Table 11.** Coefficient of phenotypic correlation (r) between salt tolerance index (STI) with 4th leaf Na⁺ (Na) and 4th leaf K⁺ (K) accumulation, shoot fresh weight in control condition (cSFW) and on salt treatment (sSFW), shoot dry weight in control condition (cSDW) and on salt treatment (sSDW), number of tiller in control condition (cTN) and on salt treatment (sTN), water content in control condition (cWC) and on salt treatment (sWC) and water content index (WCI) of the Gladius * Drysdale RIL population..... 92
- Table 12.** QTL for 4th leaf Na⁺ accumulation (Na), 4th leaf K⁺ accumulation (K), shoot fresh weight (SFW), shoot dry weight (SDW), number of tiller (TN), water content (WC), salt tolerance index (STI) and water content index (WCI) for the Gladius * Drysdale RIL population grown in a hydroponics system. Locus, chromosome, phenotypic variation explained by QTL (% Variation), LOD score, additive effect and parental allele are shown.. 94
- Table 13.** Coefficient of phenotypic correlation (r) between biomass [shoot fresh weight (hSFWc) and shoot dry weight (hSDWc) in control condition, shoot fresh weight (hSFWs) and shoot dry weight (hSDWs) in salt treatment] collected from the hydroponics experiment and biomass [projected shoot area (pPSAc) in control condition and (pPSAs) in salt treatment] collected from the soil based experiment. BLUE data of the Gladius * Drysdale RIL population was used to conduct the correlation analysis. 101
- Table 14.** Coefficient of phenotypic correlation (r) between accumulation of 4th leaf Na⁺ and 4th leaf K⁺ (hNa and hK) collected from the hydroponics experiment and accumulation of 4th leaf Na⁺ and 4th leaf K⁺ (pNa and pK) collected from the soil based experiment. BLUE data of the Gladius * Drysdale RIL population was used to conduct the correlation analysis..... 102
- Table 15.** Na⁺ accumulation (Na), K⁺ accumulation (K) and K⁺/Na⁺ ratio values for Jandaroi, line 740, line 752 and F₂ population mean, range (min–max) and heritability (h²) in 100 mM NaCl. Na and K were measured in the fully expanded third leaf 10 d after salt application. 125
- Table 16.** The association analysis between 3rd leaf Na⁺ accumulation in two F₂ populations derived from crossing Jandaroi and two lines (740 and 752), and microsatellite markers flanking loci *Nax1* and *Nax2*. This analysis was conducted using MRA in QTX MapManager software. The table shows the LOD scores of each association and the percentage of 3rd leaf Na⁺ accumulation variation explained by each microsatellite marker (% Variation). 126

Table 17. Allele frequency of DArT markers in selected F₂ plants with lowest and highest 3rd leaf Na⁺ accumulation. The alleles were categorised into AA (homozygous for the allele from Jandaroi parent), BB (homozygous for the allele from line 752 and 740 parents) and AB is heterozygous. DArT are dominant markers, where homozygotes and heterozygotes cannot be distinguished. Therefore, the dominant alleles from DArT analysis were labelled as AA/AB or BB/AB. Selected F₂ plants derived from the cross Jandaroi * line 740 (A1 and A2) show that DArT markers located on chromosome 4B have a strong association with the trait, whereas other markers show a partial association with 3rd leaf Na⁺ accumulation. Selected F₂ plants derived from the cross Jandaroi * line 752 (B) show a partial association with 3rd leaf Na⁺ accumulation in both lowest and highest 3rd leaf Na⁺ accumulation with all DArT markers. 127

Table 18. Allele frequency of microsatellite markers in selected F₂ plants. The alleles were categorised into AA (homozygous for the allele from Jandaroi parent), BB (homozygous for the allele from lines 752 or 740 parents) and AB (heterozygous). Selected F₂ plants derived from crossing Jandaroi with line 740 (A) show that *Xgwm160*, *Xbarc60* and *Xgwm375* have an association with lowest 3rd leaf Na⁺ accumulation plants, whereas other markers do not show an association. Selected F₂ plants derived from crossing Jandaroi with line 752 (B) do not show any association with the trait. 131

Table 19. Association analysis between the 3rd leaf Na⁺ accumulation for the entire Jandaroi * line 740 F₂ population and microsatellite markers was conducted using MRA in QTX MapManager software. The LOD score of the association, percentage of 3rd leaf Na⁺ accumulation variation explained by each marker (% Variation.), and the parental allele responsible for the trait, are shown. 132

Table 20. Na⁺ accumulation in the fully expanded third leaf and allele frequency of DArT and microsatellite markers of parents, selected F₂ plants and F_{2:3} progeny grown at 100 mM NaCl. 134

Table 21. Association analysis between SNP markers of interest and phenotypic traits (3rd leaf Na⁺ accumulation, 3rd leaf K⁺ accumulation and K⁺/Na⁺ ratio) in the F₂ population derived from the cross Jandaroi * line 740. This analysis was conducted using MRA in QTX MapManager. The table shows the LOD score of the association, the percentage of phenotypic trait variation explained by each SNP markers (% Variation) and parental allele which has a positive effect on the trait. 137