SUSCEPTIBILITY OF SOME FLAX GENOTYPES TO POWDERY MILDEW AND EFFECT OF THE DISEASE ON YIELD AND YIELD COMPONENTS

Zayed, S.M.E.¹; T.A. Abou-Zaid² and M.R. Omar¹

1. Plant Pathology Res. Ins., Agric. Res. Center, Giza, Egypt.

2. Field Crops Res. Ins., Agric. Res. Center, Giza, Egypt.

ABSTRACT

A two-year field study was conducted in EL-Gemmeiza Agricultural Research station to : (1) estimate heritability to powdery mildew disease when disease incidence and disease severity were used as criteria to evaluate resistance. (2) assess the susceptibility of 12 flax genotypes to powdery mildew; and (3) determine the effect of the disease on yield and yield components. Disease incidence (DI) and disease severity (DS) were used to evaluate susceptibility of the genotypes to the disease. DI was associated with high heritability and with high genetic advance expected from selection. DS was environmentally unstable. Most of the tested genotypes did not show satisfactory levels of resistance to the disease. However, line 42 / 140 / 5 / 11, line 3 and cultivar Sakha3 were the least susceptible genotypes. These genotypes also showed superiority in some agronomic traits compared with the other genotypes. Many significant correlations were observed among agronomic traits each year. On the other hand, no significant correlations were observed between disease intensity variables (DI and DS) and agronomic traits.

INTRODUCTION

Powdery mildew (PM) of flax (*Linum usitatissumum* L.) is caused by the obligate parasite *Oidium lini* Škoric. This fungus infects all the aboveground flax organs including stems, leaves, flowers and capsules. PM occurs annually in all flax production areas in Egypt. Physiological races of the pathogen have not been identified because no differential host lines are available to date (Aly *et al.*, 2001). The importance of this disease has increased probably due to the appearance and rapid distribution of new races capable of attacking the previously resistant cultivars (Aly *et al.*, 1994).

Accurate assessment of losses due to the disease in Egypt has not been reported. However, (Aly *et al.*, 1994) found significant negative correlations between disease intensity ratings and agronomic traits (yield and yield components). In India, (Pandy and Misra, 1993) reported that as the disease increased, yield losses increased ranging from 11.8 to 38.9 %. Yield losses were greater when the disease appears earlier in the season. (Ashry *et al.*, 2002) found that total plant length was negatively correlated with each of the early and the late disease incidence, while straw yield per plant was negatively correlated only with the late disease incidence. (Perryan and Fitt, 2000) reported a substantial yield loss in flax due to the decrease in yield components by powdery mildew disease.

Fungicides are currently the only commercially available management practice for controlling the disease and minimizing associated losses in seed and straw yield (Aly *et al.*, 1994 and Mansour, 1998). Complete dependence on fungicides for the disease control carries risks for

the producers, in that accurate coverage and distribution of fungicides may not be achieved and there are potential problems with correct timing of applications. Furthermore, increasing concern for the environment will likely mean greater regulation of pesticide usage (Pearce *et al.*, 1996).

Use of cultivars with PM resistance can resolve all these problems. Therefore, there is a need to improve PM resistance in flax cultivars through the introgression of resistance genes.

Extensive genetic variation for PM resistance has been identified in some flax populations. For example, (Prasad et al., 1988) evaluated 2822 linseed varieties for rust and PM resistance. The germplasm was classified depending on percentage of leaf area infected/plant. Only, 24 lines were free from both rust and PM, and 17 showed multiple resistance (1-10 % of leaf area infected/plant). In addition, 38 genotypes were free from rust and resistant to PM, and 3 were free from PM and resistant to rust. Sinha et al. (1993) evaluated 313 flax lines for their reaction to rust and PM over three years. 22 showed resistance towards rust and one line showed resistance to rust and PM. (Basandrai et al., 1994) evaluated 200 indigenous and exotic flax genotypes for resistance to PM under field conditions. Twenty-four genotypes were free of infection, and 12 genotypes were resistant to PM. (Mahto et al., 1995) reported a significant variability among 26 flax genotypes in resistance to PM. 11 had above average stability and 7 of these had high yields. (Kar and Lenka, 1998) found that, of 40 linseed were evaluated for their susceptibility to alternaria blight (A. lini) and powdery mildew (Oidium *lini*) in India. There were no resistant genotypes but several were moderately resistant. (Tomas et al., 1999) found that PM occurred in linseed cultivar trails every year from 1993 to 1998 in either the south or east of the UK, but not in the central area. Significant differences in the level of disease occurred between 19 cultivars. These differences were consistent from year to year and from site to site. No cultivar was immune to PM infection, but high levels of partial resistance were recorded. (Zayed and Abou-Zaid, 2002) evaluated 10 flax genotypes to powdery mildew for four years. They stated that, non of the tested genotypes showed satisfactory levels of resistance to the disease. However, cultivar Giza 7, line 366/2/1/2 and line 5 were the least susceptible genotypes. These genotypes showed superiority in some agronomic traits compared with the other genotypes. Many significant correlations were observed among agronomic traits as well as technological traits each year. On the other hand, very few significant correlations were observed between disease intensity variables (DI and DS) and agronomic or technological traits.

(Jyoti-Singh, 2004) found that, a total of 4965 linseed germplasm were filed evaluated for resistance to alternaria blight (*Alternaria lini*) and powdery mildew (*Oidium lini*) during the 1991 to 1997 in India. 28 were resistant to both alternaria blight and powdery mildew diseases; 9 were resistant to alternaria blight and moderately resistant to powdery mildew, 51 were resistant to powdery mildew and moderately resistant to alternaria blight; 194 were moderately resistant to both diseases and 54 were moderately resistant to powdery mildew and moderately susceptible to alternaria blight.

J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 33 (4), April, 2008

The objectives of the present study were to (1) estimate heritability of powdery mildew (PM) resistance when DI or DS were used as criteria for evaluating resistance, (2) assess resistance to PM of 12 flax genotypes, and (3) determine relationship between disease intensity (DI and DS) ratings and agronomic traits under field conditions.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Experiments were conducted over two growing seasons at EL-Gemmeiza Agricultural Research station in 2005/2006 and 2006/2007. Experiments consisted of a randomized complete blocks design of 4 replicates. Plots were 2 x 3 m (6 m²). Seeds of each genotype were sown by hand at the rate of 70 g/plot. Planting dates were 20 November in first season and 15 November in second season. All cultural practices usually used in flax production were followed. Disease incidence (DI) and disease severity (DS) were related visually on 15 to 30 April in each season. (DI) was measured as percentage of infected plants in a random sample of 100 plants/plot. (DS) was measured as percentage of infected leaves/ plant in a random samples of 10 plants/plot (Nutter *et al.*, 1991).

At full maturity, 10 plants were taken at random from each plot and observations were recorded on individual plants for each of the following agronomic traits :

A- Straw yield and its related characters :

- 1- Total plant high (cm) : plant height from the cotyledonary node to the apical bud of each plant.
- 2- Technical stem length (cm) : the length of the main stem from the cotyledonary node to the first or lowest branching point.
- 3- Number of fruit branches : total number of fruit branches of plant.
- 4- Straw yield/plant (g) : weight of the mature air dried straw per plant after removing the capsules.
- 5- Straw yield/feddan (ton) : estimated based on the area of whole plot.
- 6- Stem diameter (cm).

B- Seed yield and its related characters :

- 1- Number of capsules per plant : number of harvested capsules per plant.
- 2- Number of seeds per capsule : number of harvested seeds per capsule.
- 3- Seed yield per plant (g) : weight of harvested seeds per plant.
- 4- Seed yield per feddan (kg) : estimated based on the area of the whole plot.

Zayed, S. M. E. et al.

Genetic parameters :

1- Heritability in the broad sense (h²) was calculated according to the following formula :

Genotypic variance (σ^2 g) ------X 100 (Hanson *et al.*, 1956).

Phenotypic variance (σ^2 ph)

Where $\sigma^2 g = (\sigma^2 e + r \sigma^2 g) - \sigma^2 e] / r$ $\sigma^2 ph = [\sigma^2 e + r \sigma^2 g] / r$

2- Genetic advance expected from selection (GA) was calculated according to the following formula :

$$(\sigma^2 g / \sigma^2 ph) K x (\sigma^2 ph)^{1/2}$$

Where K = 2.06 at 5 % selection intensity (Miller et al., 1958).

Statistical analysis of the data :

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed on agronomic traits, and disease intensity variables to determine genotype effects. Mean comparisons for variables were made among genotypes by using least significant difference (LSD). ANOVA and correlation analysis were performed by a computerized program (MSTAT-C).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The present study was conducted in 2005/2006 and 2006/2007 growing seasons (hereafter referred to as years 2005 and 2006, respectively to evaluate the relative resistance of 12 flax genotypes to PM and the effect of the disease on agronomic traits.

Genotype component of variance of DI was significant (P = 0.02) in 2005 and very highly significant (P = 0.000) in 2006 (Table 1), while that of DS was non-significant in 2005 (P = 0.12) and very highly significant (P = 0.000) in 2006. In addition, the genotype component of variance of DI was associated with high heritability and with high genetic advance expected from selection (Table 2). DS, on the other hand, was associated with high heritability and high genetic advance only in 2006. Taken together, these results suggest that considerable progress in breeding for PM resistance could be expected in current breeding program if DI is used as criteria for evaluating resistance. In addition, from practical point of view, DI is more appropriate than DS for evaluating resistance because it is more precise and more easily acquired (Rouse *et al.*, 1981), which would greatly facililate the selection process.

Table (1) : Form and expected mean squares for analysis of variance of powdery mildew intensity data from flax genotypes screened for relative resistance under field conditions in EL-Gemmeiza.

	Source of		Disea	se incid	lence	Disea	ase sev	erity	Expected
Season	variation	D.F.	MS	F.	D∖f	MS	F.	D∖f	mean
	variation		WI.5.	value	F 21	WI.5.	value	F 21	square ^a
	Replications	3	24.500	0.1241		376.253	1.0520	0.3826	$\sigma^2 e + g \sigma^2 r$
2005/2006	Genotypes	11	522.106	2.6438	0.0152	600.620	1.6794	0.1223	$\sigma^2 e$ + r $\sigma^2 g$
	Error	33	197.485			357.698			σ²e
	Replications	3	38.688	0.6154		13.258	0.3533		$\sigma^2 e$ + g $\sigma^2 r$
2006/2007	Genotypes	11	840.566	13.3701	0.000	827.375	22.0462	0.000	$\sigma^2 e + r \sigma^2 g$
	Error	33	62.869			37.529			$\sigma^2 e$

 $a^{a} \sigma^{2}e$, $\sigma^{2}r$ and $\sigma^{2}g$ are variances due to experimental error, replications and genotypes; g and r, respectively are No. of genotypes and No. of replications.

Table (2) : Genetic variance (GV), phenotypic variance (PV), heritability in the broad sense, (h²) and genetic advance expected from selection (GA) for powdery mildew intensity variables of flax genotypes screened for relative resistance under filed conditions in EL-Gemmeiza.

Season	Di	sease ir	ncidend	e	Disease severity					
Coucon	GV	PV	h²	GA	GV	PV	h ²	GA		
2005/2006	81.16	130.53	62.18	14.63	a					
2006/2007	194.92	210.14	92.52	27.63	197.46	206.84	95.47	28.28		

^aThe parameters were not calculated because of the lack of genetic variation among the tested genotypes.

Natural conditions and levels of inoculum each year resulted in high levels of flax PM on most of the tested genotypes and all the 12 genotypes under evaluation were symptomatic (Table 3). Significant differences in DI occurred among the genotypes; however, some of these differences were inconsistent from year to year, which may indicate the occurrence of genotype X environment interaction. For example, the difference in DI between Sakha 1 and Sakha 2 was nonsignificant in 2005; however in 2006 Sakha 2 sustained statistically significant higher DI than Sakha 1. The difference in DI between line 402/1 and line 424/2/12/1 in 2005 was nonsignificant, while it was significant in 2006. This variation in DI could be due to environmental conditions and the physiological races of the pathogen, which may differ from one year to another (Leath et al., 1991). The results of the present study led us to conclude that most of the tested genotypes did not have satisfactory levels of PM resistance. Moreover, the PM resistance, which was expressed by some of the genotypes, was environmentally sensitive. For example, Sakha 2 was resistant in 2005, while it was

susceptible in 2006. line 424/2/12/1 was resistant in 2006 and susceptible in 2005.

	2005/2	2006	2006/	2007
Genotype	Disease	Disease	Disease	Disease
	incidence	severity	incidence	severity
Giza 7	53.75ª A	87.23 A	43.00 BC	72.49 BC
Giza 8	44.00 A-C	70.74 AB	55.50 A	84.64 A
Sakha 1	28.00 B-D	58.49 AB	19.00 E	80.41 AB
Sakha 2	16.00 D	79.37 AB	59.50 A	78.24 A-C
Line 1	37.00 A-D	47.89 B	39.00 BC	42.99 F
Line 3	22.50 CD	69.22 AB	23.50 E	70.64 C
Line 5	44.00 A-C	63.24 AB	49.50 AB	60.49 D
Line 420/153/9/2	38.00 A-D	73.43 AB	42.25 BC	75.49 A-C
Line 420/140/5/10	40.75 A-C	61.80 AB	36.50 CD	57.73 DE
Line 42/140/5/11	22.00 CD	56.58 AB	26.50 DE	54.74 DE
Line 402/1	47.00 AB	52.46 B	50.50 AB	49.79 EF
Line 424/2/12/1	34.00 A-D	48.81 B	15.50 E	45.29 F

Table (3) : Powd	lery mildew i	nter	nsity variable of	twelve	genot	ypes und	ler
field	conditions	in	EL-Gemmeiza	Agric.	Res.	Station	in
2005	/2006 and 20	06/2	2007 growing se	easons.			

 $^{\rm a}$ Means followed by the same letter (S) are not significantly different (P \leq 0.05) according to Duncan's multiple range test.

In general, Sakha1, line 3 and line 42/140/5/11 were promising for controlling PM because they showed high level of resistance and their resistance was environmentally stable. In addition, they showed superiority in some agronomic traits (Tables 4 and 5).

No significant correlations were observed between disease intensity variables and agronomic traits and all the significant correlations were observed only among the agronomic traits (Tables 6 and 7). This lack of correlation between disease intensity variables and agronomic traits implies that selection for PM resistance would not necessarrily lead to an improvement in agronomic traits and vice versa. In other words, this lack of correlation may complicate flax breeding programs, which aim to the development of PM-resistant cultivars with superior agronomic traits.

4-5

Table	(6):	Correlatio	on coeffici	ient	for	agro	nomic	traits	and	disease	Э
		intensity	variables	of	12	flax	genot	ypes	infecte	ed with	ı
		nowdery i	mildew und	der f	ield	condi	itions i	n 2005	/2006		

		powd	ery m	ildew	unde	r field	cond	litions	s in 20	05/20	06.	
	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6	X7	X8	X9	X10	X11	X12
X1		.082 ^a	364	542	284	370	377	.318	226	.092	213	398
X2			162	209	029	.133	.381	.266	.298	251	096	327
X3				.891**	.160	.025	020	136	.473	027	.026	202
X4					094	.128	113	220	.349	129	.015	242
X5						.189	149	.277	.512	.198	.052	062
X6							.339	.371	.536	.365	.691*	.469
X7								.623*	.471	.647*	.355	.293
X8									.537	.509	.202	.594*
X9										.366	.400	.119
X10											.566	.264
X11												.484
X12												
^a Linea	r corre	lation o	coeffici	ent is s	ignifica	ant at P	< 0.05	(*).				
X1 = Dis	sease in	cidence		X2 =	Disease	severity	/	X3	= Total	plant he	eight (cm	1)
X4 = 10 X7 = No	cnnical	stem ier de/canei	igtn (cm مان) X3 = 1 X8 - 1	NO. Of fr Stom die	uit bran	cnes/pia cm)	int X6 Ya	= NO. 0	r capsui vield/n	es/plant	
X10 = S	eed viel	d/plant (a)	X11 =	: Straw v	vield/fed	. (ton)	X1	2 = See	d vield/fe	ed. (ka)	
			J/				· · · /					
Tabla	(7)	. .			- 44: - : -				:- 4		المام	
Table	(7)	Cori	elatio	n co	efficie	ent fo	r agr	onom	ic tra	its a	nd di	sease
Table	(7)	Cori	elatio sity v	on co /ariab	efficie les c	ent fo of 12	r agr flax	onom gen	ic tra otype	aits a s inf	nd di ected	sease with
Table	(7)	Cori intens powd	relatio sity N ery m	on co /ariab ildew	efficie les c unde	ent fo of 12 er field	r agr flax cond	onom gen litions	ic tra otype s in 20	aits a s inf 06/20	nd di ected 07.	sease with
Table	(7) : X1	Cori intens powd X2	relatio sity N ery m X3	on co /ariab ildew X4	efficie les c unde X5	ent fo of 12 rfield X6	r agr flax cond x7	onom gen litions X8	ic tra otype in 20 x9	aits a s inf 06/20 X10	nd di ected 07. X11	sease with
Table _{X1}	(7) : X1	Corr intens powd X2	relationsity N ery m X3 218	on co variab ildew X4 255	efficie les c unde x5 .410	ent fo of 12 r field X6 .107	r agr flax cond x7 319	onom gen litions X8 313	ic tra otype in 20 x9 .038	nits a s inf 06/20 X10 .237	nd di ected 07. X11 094	sease with <u>X12</u>
Table X1 X2	(7) : X1	Corr intens powd X2 .281	relatio sity v ery m X3 218 063	n co variab ildew X4 255 017	efficie les c unde x5 .410 184	ent fo of 12 r field .107 543	r agr flax cond x7 319 537	onom gen litions X8 313 442	ic tra otype in 20 x9 .038 089	nits a s inf 06/20 X10 .237 370	nd di ected 07. X11 094 144	sease with X12 152 015
Table X1 X2 X3	(7) : X1	Corr intens powd X2 .281	relationsity N ery m X3 218 063	n co variab ildew X4 255 017 .904**	efficie les c unde X5 .410 184 129	ent fo of 12 r field .107 543 393	r agr flax cond X7 319 537 172	onom gen litions X8 313 442 .328	ic tra otype in 20 x9 .038 089 .002	nits a s inf 06/20 X10 .237 370 605*	nd di ected 07. X11 094 144 .025	sease with <u>X12</u> 152 015 236
Table X1 X2 X3 X4	(7) : X1	Corr intens powd X2 .281	relationsity w ery m X3 218 063	on co variab ildew X4 255 017 .904**	efficie les c unde X5 .410 184 129 329	ent fo of 12 r field .107 543 393 504	r agr flax cond X7 319 537 172 381	onom gen litions X8 313 442 .328 .176	ic tra otype in 20 X9 .038 089 .002 235	nits a s inf 06/20 X10 .237 370 605* 692*	nd di ected 07. X11 094 144 .025 015	sease with <u>X12</u> 152 015 236 211
X1 X2 X3 X4 X5	(7) : X1	Corr intens powd X2 .281	relatio sity v ery m X3 218 063	on co variab ildew X4 255 017 .904**	efficie les c unde X5 .410 184 129 329	ent fo of 12 r field .107 543 393 504 .790**	r agr flax cond X7 319 537 172 381 .510	onom gen litions X8 313 442 .328 .176 226	ic tra otype in 20 X9 .038 089 .002 235 .476	nits a s inf 06/20 X10 .237 370 605* 692* .636*	nd di ected 07. X11 094 144 .025 015 273	sease with <u>X12</u> 152 015 236 211 193
X1 X2 X3 X4 X5 X6	(7) : 	Corr intens powd X2 .281	relationsity Normal Action Strain Str	n co variab ildew X4 255 017 .904**	efficie les c unde X5 .410 184 129 329	ent fo of 12 r field .107 543 393 504 .790**	r agr flax cond x7 319 537 172 381 .510 .750**	onom gen litions 313 442 .328 .176 226 .010	ic tra otype in 20 x9 .038 089 .002 235 .476 .379	nits a s inf 06/20 x10 .237 370 605* 692* .636* .779**	nd di ected 07. X11 094 144 .025 015 273 367	x12 152 015 236 211 193 .159
X1 X2 X3 X4 X5 X6 X7	(7) : 	Corrintens powd X2 .281	relatio sity v ery m 218 063	n co /ariab ildew 24 255 017 .904**	efficie les c unde X5 .410 184 129 329	ent fo of 12 r field .107 543 393 504 .790**	r agr flax cond x7 319 537 172 381 .510 .750**	onom gen litions 313 442 .328 .176 226 .010 .303	ic tra otype in 20 x9 .038 089 .002 235 .476 .379 .208	hits a s inf 06/20 237 370 605* 692* .636* .779** .456	nd di ected 07. X11 094 144 .025 015 273 367 340	x12 • .152 • .015 • .236 • .211 • .193 .159 .132
X1 X2 X3 X4 X5 X6 X7 X8	(7) : 	Corr intens powd x2 .281	relatio sity v ery m X3 218 063	n co variab ildew X4 255 017 .904**	efficie les c unde X5 .410 184 129 329	ent fo of 12 r field X6 .107 543 393 504 .790**	r agr flax cond x7 319 537 172 381 .510 .750**	onom gen litions X8 313 442 .328 .176 226 .010 .303	ic tra otype in 20 x9 .038 089 .002 235 .476 .379 .208 .231	hits a s inf 06/20 X10 .237 370 605* 692* .636* .779** .456 .050	nd di ected 07. X11 094 144 .025 015 273 340 .013	sease with <u>X12</u> 152 015 236 211 193 .159 .132 206
Table X1 X2 X3 X4 X5 X6 X7 X8 X9	(7) : x1	Corr intens powd x2 .281	relatio sity v ery m X3 218 063	n co variab ildew X4 255 017 .904**	efficie les c unde x5 .410 184 129 329	ent fo of 12 r field X6 .107 543 393 504 .790**	r agr flax cond X7 319 537 172 381 .510 .750**	onom gen litions x8 313 442 .328 .176 226 .010 .303	ic tra otype in 20 x9 .038 089 .002 235 .476 .379 .208 .231	hits a s inf 06/20 X10 .237 370 605* 692* .636* .779** .456 .050 .598*	nd di ected 07. X11 094 144 .025 015 273 340 .013 .282	sease with <u>X12</u> 152 015 236 211 193 .159 .132 206 .049
X1 X2 X3 X4 X5 X6 X7 X8 X9 X10	(7) : <u>X1</u>	Corr inten: powd x2 .281	relatio sity v ery m x3 218 063	n co variab ildew X4 255 017 .904**	efficie les c unde x5 .410 184 129 329	ent fo of 12 r field <u>X6</u> .107 543 393 504 .790**	r agr flax cond x7 319 537 172 381 .510 .750**	onom gen litions 313 442 .328 .176 226 .010 .303	ic tra otype in 20 x9 .038 089 .002 235 .476 .379 .208 .231	its a s inf 06/20 X10 .237 370 605* 692* .636* .779** .456 .050 .598*	nd di ected 07. X11 094 144 .025 073 273 340 .013 .282 040	x12 152 015 236 211 193 .159 .132 206 .049 .050
Table X1 X2 X3 X4 X5 X6 X7 X8 X9 X10 X11	(7) : 	Corr intens powd X2 .281	relatio sity v ery m x3 218 063	n co variab ildew X4 255 017 .904**	efficie les c unde x5 .410 184 129 329	ent fo of 12 r field .107 543 504 .790**	r agr flax cond x7 319 537 172 381 .510 .750**	onom gen litions 313 442 .328 .176 226 .010 .303	ic tra otype in 20 x9 .038 089 .002 235 .476 .379 .208 .231	hits a s inf 06/20 X10 .237 370 605* 692* .636* .779** .456 .050 .598*	nd di ected 07. X11 094 144 .025 073 340 .013 .282 040	x12 152 015 236 211 193 .159 .132 206 .049 .050 .883**
Table X1 X2 X3 X4 X5 X6 X7 X8 X9 X10 X11 X12	(7) : 	Corr intens powd X2 .281	relatio sity v ery m x3 218 063	n co variab ildew X4 255 017 .904**	efficie les c unde x5 .410 184 129 329	ent fo of 12 r field .107 543 504 .790**	r agr flax cond x7 319 537 172 381 .510 .750**	onom gen litions 313 442 .328 .176 226 .010 .303	ic tra otype in 20 x9 .038 089 .002 235 .476 .379 .208 .231	hits a s inf 06/20 X10 .237 370 605* 692* .636* .779** .456 .050 .598*	nd di ected 07. X11 094 144 .025 015 273 340 .013 .282 040	x12 152 015 236 211 193 .159 .132 206 .049 .050 .883**
Table X1 X2 X3 X4 X5 X6 X7 X8 X9 X10 X11 X12 ^a Linea	(7) : 	E Corr intens powd X2 .281	elatio sity v ery m x3 218 063	ent is s	efficie les c unde x5 .410 184 129 329	ent fo of 12 r field .107 543 393 504 .790**	r agr flax cond x7 319 537 172 381 .510 .750**	onom gen litions 313 442 .328 .176 226 .010 .303	ic tra otype in 20 x9 .038 .038 .002 235 .476 .379 .208 .231	its a s inf 06/20 ×10 .237 370 605* 692* .636* .779** .456 .050 .598* (**).	nd di ected 07. X11 094 144 .025 015 273 340 .013 .282 040	sease with 7.152 236 211 193 .159 .132 206 .049 .050 .883**
Table X1 X2 X3 X4 X5 X6 X7 X8 X9 X10 X11 X12 ^a Linea X1 = Dis	(7) : X1	elation of cidence	relatio sity w ery w 2.218 218 063	ent is s	efficie les c unde x5 .410 184 129 329 ignifica Disease	ent fo of 12 r field .107 543 393 504 .790**	r agr flax cond x7 319 537 172 381 .510 .750**	onom gen litions ×8 313 442 .328 .176 226 .010 .303 (*) or F x3	ic tra otype in 20 x9 .038 .089 .002 235 .476 .379 .208 .231 	tits a s inf 06/20 ×10 .237 .370 .605* .692* .636* .779** .456 .050 .598* (**). plant he	nd di ected 07. ×11 094 144 .025 015 273 340 .013 .282 040	sease with 2.152 2.015 2.236 2.211 2.193 .159 .132 2.206 .049 .050 .883**

X7 = No. of seeds/capsule

X10 = Seed yield/plant (g)

X8 = Stem diameter (cm) X11 = Straw yield/fed. (ton)

X9 = Straw yield/plant (g) X12 = Seed yield/fed. (kg)

REFERENCES

- Aly, A.A.; A.Z.A. Ashour; E.A.F. EL-Kady and M.A. Mostafa (1994). Effectiveness of fungicides for control of powdery mildew of flax and effect of the disease on yield and yield components. J. Agric. Sci., Mansoura Univ., 19: 4383-4393.
- Aly, A.A.; S.H. Mostafa and M.T.M. Mansour (2001). Effect of powdery mildew disease on yield and yield components of some flax lines. J. Agric. Sci., Mansoura Univ., 26: 7711-7725.
- Ashry, N.A.; Mansour, M.T.M.; Aly, A.A.; Zayed, S.M.E. (2002). Genetic studies on powdery mildew resistance of flax, yield and some yield components. Egyptian J. of Agricultural Research, 80(4): 1525-1537.

- Basandrai, D.A.K. Basandrai; S.G. Sethi and S. Bhater (1994). Evaluation of flax (*Linum usitatissimum*) genotypes for multiple disease resistance. Indian J. Agric. Sci., 64:704-707.
- Hanson, J.H.; H.F. Robenson and R.E. Comstock (1956). Biometrical studies of yield in gegregation populations of Korean Lesbedeza. Agron. J., 48: 268-272.
- Jyoti-Singh (2004). Field evaluation of linseed, *Linum usitatisimum* L. germplasm resistance to alternaria blight and powdery mildew diseases. Journal of Oilseeds Research; 21(1): 208-209.
- Kar-AK and Lenka-D (1998). Occurrence of alternaria blight and powdery mildew of linseed genotypes in Orissa. Plant Disease Research, 13(2): 160-161.
- Leath,S.P.L.Bruckner and J.P.Wilson(1991).Reaction of winter oat germplasm to an epidemic of oat powdery mildew.Plant Dis.,75:807-809.
- Mahto, J.L.; U. Choudhary and S.N. Singh (1995). Stability and genetic divergence in linseed (*Linum usitatissimum* L.) under rainfall situation. Indian J. of Agric. Sci., 65: 602-604.
- Mansour, M.T.M. (1998). Pathological studies on powdery mildew of flax in A.R.E. Ph.D. Thesis, Zagazig Univ., Moshtohor, 148 p.
- Miller, P.A.; J.C. Williams, H.F. Robinson and R.F. Comstock (1958). Estimates of genotypic and environmental variance and covariances in upland cotton and their implications in selection. Agron.J., 50: 126-131.
- Nutter, F.W.; Jr. P.S. Teng and F.M. Shoks (1991). Disease assessment terms and concept. Plant Disease, 75: 1187-1188.
- Pandey, R.N. and D.P. Misra (1993). Assessment of yield loss due to powdery mildew of linseed. Indian Botanical Reports, 11: 62-64.
- Pearce, W.L.; D.A. Van Sanford and D.E. Hersham (1996). Partial resistance to powdery mildew in soft winter wheat. Plant Disease, 80: 1359-1362.
- Perryan, A. and B. Fitt (2000). Effects of diseases on the growth and yield of spring linseed (*Linum usitatissimum*), 1988-1998. Annals Appl. Biol., 136(3): 197-207.
- Prasad, R.; M. Rai and S.A. Kerkhi (1988). Resistance of linseed (*Linum usitatissimum*) germplasm to rust (*Melamposora lini*) and powdery mildew (*Oidium lini*). Indian J. Agric. Sci., 58: 548-549.
- Rouse, D.I.; D.R. Mackenzie; R.R. Nelson and V.J. Elliott (1981). Distribution of wheat powdery mildew incidence in field plots and relationship to disease severity. Phytopathology, 71: 1015-1020.
- Sinha, J.N.; A.P. Singh; K. Pawan and P. Kumar (1993). Reaction of linseed germplasm to rust (*Melampsora lini*) and powdery mildew (*Oidium lini*). J. Appl. Biol., 3: 80-82.
- Tomas, J.E.; D.M. Kenyon; E.F. Wedgwood; A. Barrow; S. Cook; C.M. Knott; M.A. Lainsbury and K. Walker (1999). Resistance to powdery mildew (*Oidium lini*) in cultivars of winter and spring linseed. Aspects of Appl. Biol., 56: 169-172.
- Zayed, S.M.E. and T.A. Abou-Zaid (2002). Susceptibility of some flax genotypes to powdery mildew and effect of the disease on yield and yield components. J. Agric. Sci., Mansoura Univ., 27(5): 3073-3087.

قابلية بعض التراكيب الوراثية للكتان للإصابة بالبياض الدقيقى وتأثير المرض على المحصول ومكوناته شوقي محمد المتولي زايد ' ، طه عبد المنعم أبوزيد ' و معوض رجب عمر ' معهد بحوث أمراض النبات – مركز البحوث الزراعية – الجيزة - مصر ' معهد بحوث المحاصيل الحقلية – مركز البحوث الزراعية – الجيزة – مصر

أجريت دراسة حقلية لمدة عامين بمحطة البحوث الزراعية بالجميزة وذلك لتقييم ١٢ تركيب وراثى من حيث قيمة معامل التوريث لصفة مقاومة مرض البياض الدقيقى في الكتان عند إستعمال حدوث المرض وشدة المرض كمعايير لتقييم درجة المقاومة. ومن حيث قابلية هذه التراكيب الوراثية للإصابة بمرض البياض الدقيقى. ولدراسة تأثير المرض على المحصول ومكوناته. إستعمل حدوث المرض وشدة المرض كمعايير لتقييم قابلية هذه التراكيب الوراثية للإصابة بالمرض. أظهرت الدراسة إرتفاع قيمة معامل التوريث لصفة التراكيب الوراثية للإصابة بالمرض. أظهرت الدراسة إرتفاع قيمة معامل التوريث لصفة حدوث المرض وكذلك إرتفاع مستوى التحسين الوراثى المتوقع من الإنتخاب بإستخدام صفة المقاومة المرض. كما أظهرت الدراسة أن أغلب التراكيب الوراثية لا تمتلك درجة مقبولة من المقاومة المرض. كما أظهرت الدراسة أن أغلب التراكيب الوراثية لا تمتلك درجة مقبولة من المقاومة للمرض ، السلالة 21/11/11 والسلالة 7 والصنف سخا 7 كانت أقل التراكيب الوراثية قابلية للإصابة بالمرض كما أظهرت هذه التراكيب تفوقاً على التراكيب الوراثية المواثية المرض إلى الموض كما أظهرت المرت هذه التراكيب توقا على التراكيب الوراثية الموراثية المرض ما المورة كله التوراتي المتوقع من الإنتخاب بوراثيا وراثيا المواثية التراكيب وحدوث المرض وكناك إرتفاع مستوى التحسين الوراثي المتوقع من الإنتخاب بوراتيا الكيب المقاومة المرض المالية المرض كما أظهرت هذه التراكيب تفوقاً على التراكيب الوراثية الوراثية قابلية للإصابة بالمرض كما أظهرت هذه التراكيب تفوقاً على التراكيب الوراثية الوراثية قابلية للإصابة المرض كما أظهرت ها منه وجود العديد من الإرتباطات المعنوية بين الموات المحصولية إلا أن الإرتباطات كانت غائبة بين المتغيرات الدالة على كثافة المرض (حدوث وشدة المرض) والصفات المحصولية.

Та	ble	(4)	:Agronomic	traits	of twelve	genotypes	infected	with	powdery	mildew	under	field	conditions	in	EL-
_			Gemmeiza	Agric.	Res. statio	on in 2005/2	006 grow	ing se	eason.						
														-	-

Genotype	Total length (cm)	Technical length (cm)	No. of apical branches per plant	No. of capsules per plant	No. of seeds per capsule	Stem diameter (cm)	Straw yield per plant (g)	Seed yield per plant (g)	Straw yield per feddan (ton)	Seed yield per feddan (kg)
Giza 7	88.38 B	74.18 B	12.13 A	9.25 A	6.60 A	2.47 A	1.17 A	0.39 AB	2.28 CD	833.8 CD
Giza 8	95.45 AB	79.63 AB	11.13 A	7.70 A	6.28 AC	2.28 A	1.13 A	0.28 AB	3.10 BCD	844.0 CD
Sakha 1	94.93 AB	79.15 AB	13.90 A	10.68 A	5.83 AC	2.43 A	1.33 A	0.34 AB	3.88 ABC	948.0 BD
Sakha 2	98.22 AB	83.63 AB	12.50 A	8.33 A	5.98 AC	2.06 A	1.26 A	0.41 AB	3.20 BCD	821.5 CD
Line 1	91.28 AB	80.15 AB	9.38 A	7.20 A	5.30 C	2.05 A	0.93 A	0.20 B	3.00 BCD	876.0 BD
Line 3	97.18 AB	83.57 AB	12.82 A	9.30 A	6.58 AB	2.54 A	1.56 A	0.46 AB	5.14 A	1248.0 A
Line 5	97.97 AB	81.50 AB	13.27 A	8.70 A	6.18 AC	2.64 A	1.35 A	0.40 AB	2.54 BD	972.0 BC
Line 420/153/9/2	98.65 AB	85.70 A	10.40 A	7.90 A	6.53 AC	2.46 A	1.47 A	0.34 AB	2.92 BD	656.0 D
Line 420/140/5/10	104.70 A	85.70 A	12.75 A	7.70 A	6.05 AC	2.16 A	1.39 A	0.30 AB	3.20 BD	742.0 CD
Line 42/140/5/11	101.6 AB	87.65 A	11.90 A	8.55 A	5.53 AC	2.22 A	1.20 A	0.24 AB	1.80 D	681.0 CD
Line 402/1	96.97 AB	81.75 AB	10.32 A	7.13 A	6.48 AC	2.36 A	1.17 A	0.53 A	4.20 AB	1140.0 AB
Line 424/2/12/1	95.07 AB	80.15 AB	14.45 A	10.00 A	5.35 BC	2.26 A	1.34 A	0.35 AB	2.92 BD	720.0 CD
Table (5): Agronomi Gemmeiza	ic traits o Agric. Res	of twelve s. station i	genotype in 2006/20	es infecte 007 growi	ed with pendong seasor	owdery n 1.	nildew ur	nder field	conditio	ns in EL·

Genotype	Total length (cm)	Technical length (cm)	No. of apical branches per plant	No. of capsules per plant	No. of seeds per capsule	Stem diameter (cm)	Straw yield per plant (g)	Seed yield per plant (g)	Straw yield per feddan (ton)	Seed yield per feddan (kg)
Giza 7	69.03 BD	57.97 AC	14.00 A	9.45 A	6.08 AB	1.83 A	0.94 A	0.45 A	1.99 BC	727.5 CD
Giza 8	65.72 CD	48.58 D	12.80 A	9.18 A	6.18 AB	2.17 A	1.16 A	0.48 A	2.83 BC	795.0 CD

Zayed, S. M. E. et al.

Sakha 1	72.65 BC	62.10 AB	8.88 A	6.00 A	5.48 AB	1.87 A	0.80 A	0.30 A	3.26 AC	955.0 AC
Sakha 2	75.07 AB	65.82 A	10.93 A	7.33 A	5.05 B	1.99 A	0.97 A	0.33 A	3.04 AC	778.8 CD
Line 1	63.88 D	51.72 CD	12.02 A	11.32 A	5.98 AB	2.07 A	1.22 A	0.60 A	2.71 BC	861.3 B-D
Line 3	69.65 B-D	55.63 B-D	12.65 A	9.50 A	6.03 AB	2.11 A	1.54 A	0.51 A	4.73 A	1194.0 A
Line 5	70.07 B-D	55.55 B-D	16.30 A	11.82 A	6.13 AB	2.08 A	1.26 A	0.55 A	2.18 BC	611.3 D
Line 420/153/9/2	74.20 B	61.38 AB	14.32 A	9.50 A	5.78 AB	2.20 A	1.50 A	0.55 A	2.63 BC	625.0 D
Line 420/140/5/10	81.60 A	65.55 A	13.20 A	7.95 A	5.93 AB	2.21 A	1.33 A	0.36 A	3.03 AC	727.5 CD
Line 42/140/5/11	72.40 BC	58.42 AC	16.13 A	13.50 A	6.88 A	2.04 A	1.19 A	0.48 A	1.68 C	665.0 CD
Line 402/1	71.88 BC	57.70 AC	15.58 A	11.07 A	6.23 AB	2.08 A	1.11 A	0.54 A	3.81 AB	1121.0 AB
Line 424/2/12/1	75.85 AB	63.97 AB	9.45 A	8.73 A	6.40 AB	2.66 A	0.99 A	0.40 A	2.54 BC	700.0 CD