This is a post-print version of:

RUBIALES D., CASTILLEJO M.A., MADRID E., BARILLI E., RISPAIL N., 2011

Legume breeding for rust resistance: lessons to learn from the model Medicago truncatula

Euphytica 180: 89-98.

DOI 10.1007/s10681-011-0367-4

The printed version can be visited at:

https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10681-011-0367-4

1	
2	I aguma breading for rust resistance. lessons to learn from the model
4	Medicago truncatula
5 6	Rubiales D. [*] , Castillejo M.A., Madrid E., Barilli E., Rispail N.
7	D. Publicles, M.A. Castillaio, E. Parilli, N. Pienail: Institute for Sustainable Agriculture, CSIC, Alemada
9	del Obispo s/n. Ando. 4080. E-14080 Córdoba. Spain. Tel: +34957499215. Eax: +34957499252. Email:
10	diego.rubiales@ias.csic.es (D. Rubiales)
11	E. Madrid: Departamento de Genética, Universidad de Córdoba, Spain
12 13 14 15 16 17	*Corresponding author. <i>E-mail address</i> : <u>diego.rubiales@ias.csic.es</u> Tel.: +34957499215; fax: +34957499252.
18 19 20	Keywords: biotechnology, breeding, resistance, legumes, Medicago truncatula
21 22 23	Abstract
24	Rusts are major biotic constraints of legumes worldwide. Breeding for rust resistance is
25	regarded as the most cost efficient method for rust control. However, in contrast to
26	common bean for which complete monogenic resistance exists and is efficiently used,
27	most of the rust resistance reactions described so far in cool season food legumes are
28	incomplete and of complex inheritance. Incomplete resistance has been described in
29	faba bean, pea, chickpea and lentil and several of their associated QTLs have been
30	mapped. However, the relatively large distance between the QTLs and their associated
31	molecular markers hampers their efficient use for MAS. Their large genome size
32	drastically hampers the development of genomic resource and limits the saturation of
33	their genetic maps. The use of model plants such as the model legume Medicago
34	truncatula may circumvent this drawback. The important genetic and genomic
35	resources and tools available for this model legume can considerably speed up the
36	discovery and validation of new genes and QTLs in resistance to legume pathogens.

- Here, the potential of *M. trunctula* as a model to study rust resistance in legumes, and to
 transfer rust resistance genes to cool season grain legumes is reviewed.
- 3

4 **Rusts of legume crops**

5 There are about 5000 species of rust that attack an extremely wide range of crops 6 worldwide. Several rust species can infect grain and forage legumes, most of them 7 belonging to the genus Uromyces, such as U. appendiculatus (Pers.) Unger on common 8 bean (Phaseolus vulgaris L.), U. ciceris-arietini Jacz. in Boyer & Jacz. on chickpea 9 (Cicer arietinum L.), U. lupinicolus Bub. on lupine (Lupinus sp.), U. pisi ([Pers.] D.C.) 10 Wint. on pea (Pisum sativum L.) and grasspea (Lathyrus sp.), U. striatus J. Schröt. on 11 alfalfa (Medicago sativa L.), U. viciae-fabae (Pers.) J. Schröt. on faba bean (Vicia faba 12 L.), lentil (Lens culinaris Medik.) and common vetch (V. sativa L.) and U. vignae 13 Barclay on cowpea (Vigna unguiculata (L.) Walp.). Rust species belonging to other 14 genera can also be major problems on legumes such as *Phakopsora pachyrhizi* Sydow 15 and P. meibomiae (Arthur) Arthur on soybean (Glycine max (L.) Merr.) or Puccinia 16 arachidis Speg. on groundnut (Arachis hypogaea L.) (Rubiales et al. 2002; Sillero et al. 17 2006; Emeran et al. 2008).

18 Breeding for rust resistance is regarded as the most cost efficient method for rust 19 control. In tropical legumes such as common bean and soybean, complete monogenic 20 resistance reactions have been described. Due to their economic importance, these 21 sources have been largely studied leading to the identification of their associated rust 22 resistance genes and closely linked markers that are readily used in marker-assisted 23 backcrossing (Faleiro et al. 2004; Miklas et al. 2006; Hyten et al. 2007; García et al. 24 2008) (Table 1). By contrast, most of the rust resistance reactions described so far in 25 cool season food legumes are incomplete. Phenotypic expression of rust resistance is usually poorly described. As a consequence of this, and of the poorly developed
genomic resources usually available in most cool season legumes, genetic basis of
resistance is, in most cases, largely unknown. Although QTL mapping studies have
been performed for most cool season legumes such as chickpea (Millán et al. 2006;
Madrid et al. 2008), faba bean (Torres et al. 2006), lentil (Muehlbauer et al. 2006) or
pea (Barilli et al. 2010), in most cases no markers are yet readily available for QTL
selection and Marker Assisted Selection (MAS) (Table 1).

8 Incomplete rate reducing resistance not based on hypersensitivity is very 9 common in cool season legumes and is often the only type of resistance available 10 (Sillero et al. 2006). Several sources of resistance against U. viciae-fabae have been 11 reported in faba bean in the last decades, being mainly of incomplete expression and not 12 based on hypersensitivity (Sillero et al. 2010). Information on the genetic basis of this 13 incomplete resistance is still scant. A number of race-specific genes has been postulated 14 causing reduced pustule size (Conner and Bernier 1982; Rashid and Bernier, 1986). 15 Mapping studies using a recombinant inbred line (RIL) population to identify QTLs and 16 to develop molecular markers useful in MAS for the non-hypersensitive resistance 17 (Torres et al. 2006), but no results are available yet. On the other hand, hypersensitive 18 resistance was recently described in faba bean germplasm (Sillero et al. 2000; Rubiales 19 and Sillero 2003). It is controlled by genes with major effects (Sillero et al. 2000). Use 20 of Bulk Segregant Analysis (BSA) allowed identifying three Random Amplified 21 Polymorphic DNA (RAPD) markers linked to resistance gene (Uvf1) (Avila et al. 22 2003). Three RAPD markers (OPD13736, OPL181032 and OPI20900) were mapped in coupling phase to the resistance gene Uvf-1. No recombinants between OPI20900 and 23 24 Uvf-1 were detected. Two additional markers (OPP021₁₇₂ and OPR07₉₃₀) were linked to 25 the gene in repulsion phase at a distance of 9.9 and 11.5 cM, respectively. The

simultaneous use of both types of markers allows their use as a codominant marker.
Different genes might be available in the different accessions displaying
hypersensitivity reported so far (Sillero et al. 2000; Sillero and Rubiales 2002; Rubiales
and Sillero 2003), but genetic analysis has so far been performed only with one of them
(Avila et al. 2003). Obviously, this preliminary work ought to be complemented with
the identification of the different genes and the associated markers before an efficient
pyramidization programme can be achieved.

8 In pea, only incomplete resistance has been described against both U. viciae-9 fabae (Chand et al. 2006) and U. pisi (Barilli et al. 2009a, b). Preliminary mapping 10 studies have yielded identification of several QTLs for resistance to U. viciae-fabae 11 (Vijayalakshmi et al. 2005) and to U. pisi (Barilli et al. 2010) but results are far for 12 being usable in MAS (Table 1). Partial resistance to U. viciae-fabae has been justified 13 as the expression of a single major gene (Ruf) (Vijayalakshmi et al. 2005). Two RAPD 14 markers, SC10-82₃₆₀ (10.8 cM) and SCRI-71₁₀₀₀ (24.5 cM), were detected flanking the 15 gene Ruf, but these markers were not close enough to allow a reliable MAS approach 16 for rust resistance (Vijayalakshmi et al. 2005). A QTL explaining 63% of the resistance 17 to U. pisi has been located in the linkage group 3. Two RAPDs markers, $OPY11_{1316}$ 18 (26.9 cM) and OPV17₁₀₇₈ (46.3 cM) showed significant association with rust resistance 19 (Table 1). These results must be validated across diverse locations and genetic 20 backgrounds before the application of MAS in pea breeding programs. Inclusion of new 21 standard markers and transformation into SCARs of the RAPDs tightly linked to the 22 detected QTLs is needed to enhance their applicability for MAS.

Similarly, only incomplete resistance was identified in chickpea against *U*. *ciceris-arietini* (Rubiales et al. 2001). A QTL explaining 81% of the resistance in adult
plants was located on linkage group 7 of the chickpea genetic map (Madrid et al. 2008).

It was hypothesized to correspond to a single gene (*Uca1/uca1*) according to the
 segregation analysis. Two STMS markers were identified that flank this resistance gene.
 In this particular case, the distance between the STMS markers and the resistance gene
 is short enough (3.9cM apart) to allow reliable MAS for rust resistance in chickpea
 (Table 1).

6 Lentil rust resistance has been reported mainly as partial resistance, although 7 some hypersensitive resistant sources have also been described (Rojas et al. 2004; 8 Negussie et al. 2005). Monogenic resistance has been described (Erskine et al. 1994) 9 and preliminary information on chromosome location and associated molecular markers 10 is being produced (Kant et al. 2004; Table 1). More recently, a sequence related 11 amplified polymorphism (SRAP) marker, F7XEM4a, has been identified at 7.9 cM 12 from the gene for resistance (Saha et al. 2010) (Table 1). The F7XEM4a marker could 13 be used for MAS but additional markers closer to the resistance gene are needed.

Resistance to rust has also been identified in *L. sativus* (Vaz Patto and Rubiales 2009) and *L. cicera* (Vaz Patto et al. 2009) germplasm but genetic studies have only recently been initiated by generation of proper mapping populations (unpublished).

17 In peanuts, genetic studies indicated that resistance to the rust fungus Puccinia 18 arachidis is complex and of polygenic nature. In this sense, Khedikar et al. (2010) 19 recently identified and located 12 QTLs associated with resistance to rust of the TAG24 20 genotype. Among them, the QTL_{rust}01 was detected in all environmental conditions 21 tested and explained up to 55.2% of the phenotypic variation. This QTL co-localized 22 with the SSR marker IPAHM103 (Khedikar et al. 2010). Using the same resistant 23 genotype, Mondal and co-workers (2008) found one RAPD marker, J71300, closely 24 associated with rust resistance. In addition, these authors exploited the natural genetic 25 variation existing in cultivated peanuts to identify three additional SSR markers PM 35

PM 50 and PM 179 associated with rust resistance (Mondal and Badigannavar, 2009).
 All these molecular markers are promising tool for future peanuts breeding against rust
 although effort should be made to reduce the still important genetic distance separating
 the rust resistance QTL and the existing molecular marker.

5 In general, the scarce genomic resources developed for cool season legumes and 6 the limited saturation of the genomic regions bearing putative QTLs makes it difficult to 7 identify the most tightly-linked markers and to determine the accurate position of QTLs 8 (Torres et al. 2006; Rubiales et al. 2009; Rispail et al. 2010). Effectiveness of MAS 9 might soon increase with the adoption of the new improvements in marker technology 10 together with the integration of comparative mapping and functional genomics. But rust 11 resistance breeding is not only slow due to the difficulty and the relatively low 12 investment on genetics, genomics and biotechnology of the legume crops, but also, and 13 mainly because of the little knowledge on the biology of the rust pathogens. 14 Comprehensive studies on host status and virulence of the various rust species are often 15 missing, and in most of the examples listed above, there is little agreement on the 16 existence of races and on their distribution. This is a major limitation for any breeding 17 programme. Also, available information on levels of resistance and on the responsible 18 mechanisms is often incomplete. Only after significant input to improve existing 19 knowledge on biology of the causal agents as well as on the plant, resistance breeding 20 will be efficiently accelerated.

Current progress in the genomic and biotechnological research will soon provide important understanding of some crucial developmental mechanisms in both the parasites and their host plants. Transcriptomic and proteomic approaches developed for model plants can be used to understand the molecular components and identify candidate genes involved in defence against rust pathogens. Traditional breeding efforts

will be greatly enhanced through collaborative approaches using functional,
 comparative and structural genomics. Molecular genetic and genomic analyses promise
 the transfer of technology from model to crop legumes.

4

5 *Medicago truncatula* as a model legume

6 The development of Arabidopsis thaliana as a unique model improved greatly our 7 understanding of complex biological processes (Jones and Dangl 2006; De Smet and 8 Jurgens 2007). However, A. thaliana is not the best suited model to study plant defence 9 mechanisms to rust. Indeed, there is no available fungus that causes a natural rust 10 disease in A. thaliana, although the A. thaliana - U. vignae system has been used to 11 characterize the nonhost signalling pathway (Mellersh and Heath 2003). Other 12 alternative species such as the legume species *Medicago truncatula* and *Lotus japonicus* 13 have been more recently developed as model to address specific issues of legumes. M. 14 truncatula (barrel medic) is an annual, self-fertile, diploid legume species that has 15 became a model for studying various aspects of legume genomics and biology (Cook 16 1999; Ané et al. 2008; Young and Udvardi 2009; Rispail et al. 2010).

17 Several germplasm collections of *M. truncatula* are available to search for 18 genetic polymorphism for particular traits which lead to the generation of several 19 genetic and cytogenetic maps instrumental for map-based cloning, genome sequencing and comparative genomics (Ané et al. 2008; Kulikova et al. 2001). In addition, M. 20 21 truncatula genome sequencing is near completion with more than 250 Mb already 22 sequenced and annotated (http://www.medicagohapmap.org/; release 3.5) and more than 23 260,000 expressed sequence tags (ESTs) are available from public DNA database (Ané 24 et al. 2008). In parallel postgenomic tools such as transcriptomic and proteomic 25 platforms as well as several reverse genetic and functional analysis approaches

including the creations of several chemical and insertional mutant collections, TILLING
 platforms, RNA interference or VIGS technologies have been developed for *M*.
 truncatula (Young and Udvardi 2009; Rispail et al. 2010).

4

5 Application of *M. truncatula* to rust resistance

6 The fact that *M. truncatula* is susceptible to alfalfa (*U. striatus*) and chickpea rusts (*U. ciceris-arietini*) (Skinner and Stuteville 1995; Stuteville et al. 2010) opens the way for 8 its use to unravel legume-rust interactions. *U. striatus* is an important disease of 9 worldwide distribution, being particularly damaging in alfalfa (*Medicago sativa*) grown 10 for seed (Koepper 1942; Leath et al. 1988). It has a broad host range comprising many 11 species from the tribes Trifolieae, Cicereae, and Vicieae, including alfalfa and annual 12 medics including barrel medic (Skinner and Stuteville 1995).

13 A range of resistance mechanisms against U. striatus are operative in M. 14 truncatula accessions. Once the fungus has successfully penetrated the stoma, and 15 formed a first haustorium, nutrients are taken from the invaded plant cell to allow 16 further intercellular growth and haustoria formation. Previous studies comparing host 17 and nonhost resistance to rust fungi have shown that nonhost resistance is typically 18 expressed before the formation of the first haustorium (Heath 1981). By contrast, R19 gene-controlled host resistance is almost invariably expressed after the formation of the 20 first haustorium, often in the form of hypersensitive death of invaded cell. Histological 21 investigations, revealed significant differences in resistance to rust among M. truncatula 22 accessions that were more evident once the stomata were penetrated by the infection 23 structures (Rubiales and Moral 2004; Kemen et al. 2005). Similarly to most rust hosts 24 (Niks and Rubiales 2002), prepenetration resistance mechanism including reduction of 25 urediospore germination and fungal development on the leaf surface in M. truncatula

are of marginal importance against *U. striatus*, at best, in reducing infection levels (Rubiales and Moral 2004). Prehaustorial resistance can also be identified in host interactions, playing a major role in the so-called partial resistance, which may be more durable than resistance controlled by *R* genes (Niks and Rubiales 2002). A significant proportion of infection units fails to form any haustoria in some *M. truncatula* genotypes. Posthaustorial resistance was clear in other genotypes (Rubiales and Moral 2004; Kemen et al. 2005).

8 *M. truncatula* is already being studied to unravel resistance to a broad number of 9 pathogens, from parasitic plants (Fernández-Aparicio et al. 2008), bacterial pathogens 10 (Vailleau et al. 2007), nematodes (Moussart et al. 2007) to fungal and oomycete 11 pathogens (O'Neill and Bauchan 2000; Yaege and Stuteville 2000; Barbetti and Allen 12 2005; Ellwood et al. 2006; Tivoli et al. 2006; Barbetti 2007; Moussart et al. 2007; Prats 13 et al. 2007). Microarray analysis have been performed to determine genes involved in 14 defence mechanisms against Erysiphe pisi (Curto et al. 2007; Foster-Hartnett et al. 15 2007), Orobanche crenata (Dita et al. 2009) or to Mycosphaerella pinodes (Fondevilla 16 et al. 2009). In addition, Affymetrix chips are also commercially available for M. 17 truncatula (http://www.affymetrix.com) and a novel generation of M. truncatula gene 18 chip complemented with 1,850 *M. sativa* transcripts will be soon available to facilitate 19 transcriptomic analysis of closely related species (Ané et al. 2008). All these 20 transcriptomic platforms will allow large improvements in our understanding of legume 21 rust interaction.

In parallel, expression of more than 1000 transcription factors (TFs) have been monitored by quantitative real-time PCR during resistance reaction to rust in *M. truncatula* (Madrid et al. 2010), in order to refine hypothesis about TFs function in defense response as well as in the regulation of cross-talk between different signaling

1 pathways. A total of 107 putative TF genes were differentially expressed between the 2 susceptible and resistant genotypes. Thirteen of these TFs are known to be relevant in 3 cellular defense. Some of the TFs are pathogenesis-related transcription factors, 4 ethylene response factor (PR-ERF), and WRKY TFs which are involved in the response 5 to biotic stress in plant (Singh et al. 2004). These data suggest that resistance could be 6 mediated both by genes that are constitutively expressed and by genes which are 7 induced/repressed when plants are inoculated. These TFs could be candidates for future 8 experiments to elucidate the genes that control this agronomically important trait. 9 However, the role they play in the interaction need to be clarified in order to completely 10 understand the pathways involved in the plant's defense against this pathogen. On the 11 other hand, taking advantage of the synteny between *Medicago* and *Cicer* (Cannon et al. 12 2006) these defense related TFs sequences were amplified in chickpea DNA. 13 Amplification analysis of the tested primers showed high transferability between both 14 *M. truncatula* and *C. arietinum*. Two of these genes were mapped on the linkage group 15 4 of the chickpea map (Madrid et al. 2010). In this linkage group two QTLs for 16 ascochyta blight resistance have been reported (Tekeoglu et al. 2002; Iruela et al. 2006). 17 These TFs could be candidates for future experiments to elucidate the genes that control 18 this agronomically important trait.

Postgenomic approaches are also being applied to tackle other pathogens. Substractive Suppression Hybridisation (SSH) libraries allowed the identification of defence genes to *Aphanomyces eusteiches* (Nyamsuren et al. 2003), or to *O. crenata* (Die et al. 2007). The range of application of proteomic approaches has been broadened to include *M. truncatula - U. striatus* (Castillejo *et al.* 2010) as well as interactions with other pathogens such as *Aphanomyces* (Colditz et al. 2004, 2005, 2007; Trapphoff et al. 2009), *E. pisi* (Curto et al. 2008) and *O. crenata* (Castillejo et al. 2009). Comparison of

the proteome between susceptible and resistant accessions of *M. truncatula* upon rust inoculation revealed significant changes in the expression pattern of several proteins (Castillejo et al. 2010). For instance, several enzymes of the energetic metabolism pathway and many stress-related proteins including the ascorbate peroxidase were expressed at higher level in the resistant genotype (Castillejo et al. 2010). Similar results have been observed in other systems studied, such as *M. truncatula–O. crenata* (Castillejo et al. 2009).

8 Efficient transfer to legume crops of the knowledge gained on the *M. truncatula* 9 – rust interaction requires the identification of the actual function of the candidate genes 10 identified by genomics and post-genomic approaches (Rispail et al. 2010). To this 11 purpose, it may be worth exploring the different chemical and insertional mutant 12 collections and the TILLING and RNAi platforms developed for *M. truncatula* that can 13 also help identifying new genes involved in *M. truncatula* resistance to rust (Rispail et 14 al. 2010).

15 Discovery of markers linked to rust resistance in M. truncatula may provide a 16 tool to identify the same characteristic in the otherwise unexplored legume crop in 17 which genomic studies are hampered by the large genome size and complex ploidy. It 18 therefore becomes critical that molecular linkage maps of legume crops include both 19 ESTs and phenotypes (including QTLs) relating to rust resistance, and that variation for 20 these phenotypes is mapped to such conserved EST markers. The nearly completed 21 genome sequences of *M. truncatula* will greatly aid in this area of research 22 (http://www.medicagohapmap.org/).

23

24 Acknowledgments

25 Support by project AGL2008-01239 is acknowledged

References

3	
4	Ané JM, Zhu H, Frugoli J (2008) Recent advances in Medicago truncatula genomics.
5	Int J Plant Genomics doi:10.1155/2008/256597.
6	Avila CM, Sillero JC, Rubiales D, Moreno MT, Torres AM (2003) Identification of
7	RAPD markers linked to the Uvf-1 gene conferring hypersensitive resistance
8	against rust (Uromyces viciae-fabae) in Vicia faba L. Theor Appl Genet 107:
9	353-358.
10	Barbetti MJ (2007) Resistance in annual Medicago spp. to Phoma medicaginis and
11	Leptosphaerulina trifolii and its relationship to induced production of a
12	phytoestrogen. Plant Dis 91:239-244.
13	Barbetti MJ and Allen JG (2005) Association of Fusarium species, with potential for
14	mycotoxicosis, on pods of annual Medicago in Western Australia. Austr J Agr
15	Res 56:279-284.
16	Barilli E, Sillero JC, Fernández-Aparicio M, Rubiales D (2009) Identification of
17	resistance to Uromyces pisi (Pers.) Wint. in Pisum spp. germplasm. Field Crops
18	Res 114:198-203.
19	Barilli E, Sillero JC, Rubiales D (2009) Characterization of resistance responses of pea
20	(Pisum spp.) against rust (Uromyces pisi). Plant Breeding 128:665-670.
21	Barilli E, Zatovic S, Rubiales D, Torres AM (2010) Mapping of quantitative trait loci
22	controlling partial resistance against rust incited by Uromyces pisi (Pers.) Wint.
23	in a Pisum fulvum L. intraspecific cross. Euphytica 175:151-159.
24	Cannon SB, Sterck L, Rombauts S, Sato S, Cheung F, Gouzy J, Wang X, Mudge J,
25	Vasdewani J, Schiex T, Spannagl M, Monaghan E, Nicholson C, Humphray SJ,

1	Schoof H, Mayer KF, Rogers J, Quetier F, Oldroyd GED, Debellé F, Cook DR,
2	Retzel EF, Roe BA, Town CD, Tabata S, Van de Peer Y, Young ND (2006)
3	Legume genome evolution viewed through the Medicago truncatula and Lotus
4	japonicus genomes. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 103:14959-14964.
5	Castillejo MA, Maldonado AM, Dumas-Gaudot E, Fernández-Aparicio M, Susin R,
6	Rubiales D, Jorrín JV (2009) Differential expression proteomics to investigate
7	responses and resistance to Orobanche crenata in Medicago truncatula. BMC
8	Genomics 10:294 doi:10.1186/1471-2164-10-294.
9	Castillejo MA, Susín R, Madrid E, Fernández-Aparicio M, Jorrín JV, Rubiales D (2010)
10	Two-dimensional gel electrophoresis-based proteomic analysis of the Medicago
11	truncatula - rust (Uromyces striatus) interaction. Ann Appl Biol 157:243-257.
12	Chand R, Srivastava CP, Singh BD, Sarode SB (2006) Identification and
13	characterization of slow rusting components in pea (Pisum sativum L.). Genet
14	Res Crop Evol 53:219-224.
15	Colditz F, Braun HP, Jacquet C, Niehaus K, Krajinski F (2005) Proteomic profiling
16	unravels insights into the molecular background underlying increased
17	Aphanomyces euteiches-tolerance of Medicago truncatula. Plant Mol Biol
18	59:387-406.
19	Colditz F, Niehaus K, Krajinski F (2007) Silencing of PR-10-like proteins in Medicago
20	truncatula results in an antagonistic induction of other PR proteins and in an
21	increased tolerance upon infection with the oomycete Aphanomyces euteiches.
22	Planta 226:57-71.
23	Colditz F, Nyamsuren O, Niehaus K, Eubel H, Braun HP, Krajinski F (2004) Proteomic
24	approach: identification of Medicago truncatula proteins induced in roots after

1	infection with the pathogenic oomycete Aphanomyces euteiches. Plant Mol Biol
2	55:109-120.
3	Conner RL, Bernier CC (1982) Host range of Uromyces viciae-fabae. Phytopathol
4	72:687-689.
5	Cook DR (1999) Medicago truncatula – a model in the making!. Curr Opin Plant Biol
6	2:301-304.
7	Correa RX, Costa MR, Good-God PI, Ragagnin VA, Faleiro FG, Moreira MA, de
8	Barros EG (2000) Sequence characterized amplified regions linked to rust
9	resistance genes in the common bean. Crop Sci 40:804-807.
10	Curto M, Gil C, Gutiérrez M, Rubiales D, Maldonado AM, Jorrín JV (2008) Medicago
11	truncatula resistance to powdery mildew (Erysiphe pisi): a proteomic study.
12	Proteómica 1:135.
13	Curto M, Ferro N, Krajinski F, Schlereth A, Udvardi M, Rubiales D (2007) Real-time
14	RT-PCR profiling of transcription factors in Medicago truncatula in response to
15	powdery mildew (Erysiphe pisi). Model Legumes Congress, 24-28 March 2007,
16	Tunis, Tunisia. P 67.
17	De Smet I, Jurgens G (2007) Patterning the axis in plants-auxin in control. Curr Opin
18	Genetics Dev 17:337-343.
19	Die JV, Dita MA, Krajinski F, González-Verdejo CI, Rubiales D, Moreno MT, Román
20	B (2007) Identification by suppression subtractive hybridization and expression
21	analysis of Medicago truncatula putative defence genes in response to
22	Orobanche crenata parasitization. Physiol Mol Plant Pathol 70:49-59.
23	Dita MA, Die JV, Román B, Krajinski F, Küster H, Moreno MT, Cubero JI, Rubiales D
24	(2009) Gene Expression Profiling of Medicago truncatula Roots in Response to
25	the Parasitic Plant Orobanche crenata. Weed Res 49:66-80.

1	Ellwood SR, Kamphuis LG, Oliver RP (2006) Identification of sources of resistance to
2	Phoma medicaginis isolates in Medicago truncatula SARDI core collection
3	accessions, and multigene differentiation of isolates. Phytopath 96:1330-1336.
4	Emeran AA, Román B, Sillero JC, Satovic Z, Rubiales D (2008) Genetic variation
5	among and within Uromyces species infecting legumes. J Phytopath 156:419-
6	424.
7	Erskine W, Tufail M, Russell A, Tyagi MC, Rahman MM, Saxena MC (1994) Current
8	and future strategies in breeding lentil for resistance to biotic and abiotic
9	stresses. Euphytica 73:127-135.
10	Faleiro F G, Ragagnin VA, Moreira MA, Barros EG (2004) Use of molecular markers
11	to accelerate the breeding of common bean lines resistant to rust and
12	anthracnose. Euphytica 138:213-218.
13	Fernández-Aparicio M, Pérez-de-Luque A, Prats E, Rubiales D (2008) Variability of
14	interactions between barrel medic (Medicago truncatula) genotypes and
15	Orobanche species. Ann Appl Biol 153:117-126.
16	Fondevilla S, Küster H, Krajinski F, Cubero JI, Rubiales D (2011) Identification of
17	genes differentially expressed in a resistant reaction to Mycospherella pinodes in
18	pea using microarray technology. BMC Genomics, accepted pending revision
19	Foster-Hartnett D, Danesh D, Penuela S, Sharopova N, Endre G, Vandenbosch KA,
20	Young ND, Samac DA (2007) Molecular and cytological responses of Medicago
21	truncatula to Erysiphe pisi. Mol Plant Pathol 8:307-319.
22	García A, Calvo ES, de Souza Kiihl SA, Harada A, Hiromoto DM, Vieira LG (2008)
23	Molecular mapping of soybean rust (Phakopsora pachyrhizi) resistance genes:
24	Discovery of a novel locus and alleles. Theor Appl Genet 117:545-553.

1	Haley SD, Miklas PN, Stavely JR, Byrum J, Kelly JD (1993) Identification of RAPD
2	markers linked to a major rust resistance gene block in common bean. Theor
3	Appl Genet 86:505-512.
4	Haley SD, Afanador LK, Miklas PN, Stavely JR, Kelly JD (1994) Heterogeneous
5	inbred populations are useful as sources of near-isogenic lines for RAPD marker
6	localization. Theor Appl Genet 88:337-342.
7	Heath MC (1981) Resistance of plants to rust infection. Phytopath 71:971-974.
8	Hyten DL, Hartman GL, Nelson RL, Frederick RD, Concibido VC, Narvel JM, Cregan
9	PB (2007) Map location of the <i>Rpp1</i> locus that confers resistance to soybean rust
10	in soybean. Crop Sci 47:837-840.
11	Iruela M, Rubio J, Barro F, Cubero JI, Millan T, Gil J (2006) Detection of two
12	quantitative trait loci for resistance to ascochyta blight in an intra-specific cross
13	of chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.): development of SCAR markers associated
14	with resistance. Theor Appl Genet 112:278-287.
15	Johnson E, Miklas PN, Stavely JR, Martinez-Cruzado JC (1995) Coupling- and
16	repulsion-phase RAPDs for marker-assisted selection of PI 181996 rust
17	resistance in common bean. Theor Appl Genet 90:659-664.
18	Jones JDG, Dangl JL (2006) The plant immune system. Nature 444:323-329.
19	Kant A, Sharma SK, Sharma R, Sharma RK, Mahopatra T (2004) Identification of
20	RAPD and AFLP markers linked with rust resistance in lentil. Crop Improv
21	31:1-10.
22	Kelly JD, Gepts P, Miklas PN, Coyne DP (2003) Tagging and mapping of genes and
23	QTL and molecular-marker assisted selection for traits of economic importance
24	in bean and cowpea. Field Crops Res 82:135-154.

1	Kemen E, Hahn M, Mendgen K, Struck C (2005) Different resistance mechanisms of
2	Medicago truncatula ecotypes against the rust fungus Uromyces striatus.
3	Phytopath 95:153-157.
4	Khedikar YP, Gowda MVC, Sarvamangala C, Patgar KV, Upadhyaya HD, Varshney
5	RK (2010). A QTL study on late leaf spot and rust revealed one major QTL for
6	molecular breeding for rust resistance in groundnut (Arachis hypogaea L.).
7	Theor Appl Genet 121: 971-984.
8	Koepper JM (1942) Relative resistance of alfalfa species and varieties to rust caused by
9	Uromyces striatus. Phytopath 32:1048-1057.
10	Kulikova O, Gualtieri G, Geurts R, Kim DJ, Cook DR, Huguet T, de Jong JH, Fransz
11	PF, Bisseling T (2001) Integration of the FISH pachytene and genetic maps of
12	Medicago truncatula. Plant J 27:49-58.
13	Li GJ, Liu YH, Ehlers JD, Zhu ZJ, Wu XH, Wang BG, Lu ZF (2007) Identification of
14	an AFLP fragment linked to rust resistance in asparagus bean and its conversion
15	to a SCAR marker. Hortscience 42:1153-1156.
16	Limpens E, Ramos J, Franken C, Raz V, Compaan B, Franssen H, Bisseling T, Geurts
17	R (2004) RNA interference in Agrobacterium rhizogenes-transformed roots of
18	Arabidopsis and Medicago truncatula. J Exp Bot 55:983-992.
19	Madrid E, Gil J, Rubiales D, Krajinski F, Schlereth A, Millán T (2010) Transcription
20	factor profiling leading to the identification of putative transcription factors
21	involved in the Medicago truncatula - Uromyces striatus interaction. Theor Appl
22	Genet 121: 1311-1321.
23	Madrid E, Rubiales D, Moral A, Moreno MT, Millán T, Gil J, Rubio J (2008)
24	Mechanism and molecular markers associated with rust resistance in a chickpea

2

interspecific cross (*Cicer arietinum* x *Cicer reticulatum*). Europ J Plant Pathol 121:43-53.

3 Mellersh DG, Heath MC (2003) An investigation into the involvement of defense 4 signaling pathways in components of nonhost resistance of Arabidopsis thaliana to rust fungi also reveals a model system for studying rust fungal compatibility. 5 6 Mol Plant-Microbe Interact 16:398-404. 7 Mienie CMS, Liebenberg MM, Pretorius ZA, Miklas PN (2005) SCAR markers linked 8 to the common bean rust resistance gene Ur-13. Theor Appl Genet 111:972-979. 9 Miklas PN, Stavely JR, Kelly JD (1993) Identification and potential use of a molecular 10 marker for rust resistance in common bean. Theor Appl Genet 85:745-749. Miklas PN, Kelly JD, Beebe SE, Blair MW (2006) Common bean breeding for 11 12 resistance against biotic and abiotic stresses: From classical to MAS breeding. 13 Euphytica 147:105-131. 14 Millán T, Clarke HJ, Siddique KHM, Buhariwalla HK, Gaur PM, Kumar J, Gil J, Kahl 15 G, Winter P (2006) Chickpea molecular breeding: New tools and concepts. 16 Euphytica 147:81-103. 17 Mondal S, Badigannavar AM, Murty GSS (2008) RAPD markers linked to a rust 18 resistance gene in cultivated groundnut (Arachis hypogaea L.). Euphytica 19 159:233-239. 20 Moussart A, Onfroy C, Lesne A, Esquibet M, Grenier E, Tivoli B (2007) Host status 21 and reaction of Medicago truncatula accessions to infection by three major 22 pathogens of pea (Pisum sativum) and alfalfa (Medicago sativa). Eur J Plant 23 Pathol 117:57-69.

1	Muehlbauer FJ, Cho S, Sarker A, McPhee KE, Coyne CJ, Rajesh PN, Ford R (2006)
2	Application of biotechnology in breeding lentil for resistance to biotic and
3	abiotic stress. Euphytica 147:149-165.
4	Negussie T, Pretorius ZA, Bender CM (2005) Components of rust resistance in lentil.
5	Euphytica 142:55-64.
6	Niks RE, Rubiales D (2002) Detection of potentially durable resistance mechanisms in
7	plants to specialised fungal pathogens. Euphytica 124:201-216.
8	Nyamsuren O, Colditz F, Rosendahl S, Tamasloukht M, Bekel T, Meyer F, Küster H,
9	Franken P, Krajinski F (2003) Transcriptional profiling of Medicago truncatula
10	roots after infection with Aphanomyces euteiches (oomycota) identifies novel
11	genes upregulated during this pathogenic interaction. Physiol Mol Plant Pathol
12	63:17-26.
13	O'Neill NR, Bauchan GR (2000) Sources of resistance to anthracnose in the annual
14	Medicago core collection. Plant Dis 84:261-267.
15	Park SO, Coyne DP, Bokosi JM, Steadman JR (1999) Molecular markers linked to
16	genes for specific rust resistance and indeterminate growth habit in common
17	bean. Euphytica 105:133-141.
18	Park SO, Coyne DP, Steadman JR, Skroch PW (2003) Mapping of the Ur-7 gene for
19	specific resistance to rust in common bean. Crop Sci 43:1470-1476.
20	Park SO, Coyne DP, Steadman JR, Crosby KM, Brick MA (2004) RAPD and SCAR
21	markers linked to the Ur-6 andean gene controlling specific rust resistance in
22	common bean. Crop Sci 44:1799-1807.
23	Prats E, Llamas MJ, Rubiales D (2007) Characterisation of resistance mechanisms to
24	Erysiphe pisi in Medicago truncatula. Phytopath 97:1049-1053.

1	Rashid KY, Bernier CC (1986) The genetics of resistance in Vicia faba to two races of
2	Uromyces viciae-fabae from Manitoba. Can J Plant Pathol 8:317-322.
3	Rispail N, Kaló P, Kiss GB, Ellis THN, Gallardo K, Thompson RD, Prats E, Larrainzar
4	E, Ladrera R, González EM, Arrese-Igor C, Ferguson BJ, Gresshoff PM,
5	Rubiales D (2010) Model Legumes to contribute to Faba bean breeding. Field
6	Crops Res 115:253-269.
7	Rojas MM, Sillero JC, Moreno MT, Cubero JI, Rubiales D (2004) Resistance to rust in
8	a germplasm collection of Lens culinaris L. In: AEP (Ed.). Conference
9	Handbook of the 5 th European Conference on Grain Legumes with the 2004
10	ICLGG, Dijon, France. Pp. 335.
11	Rubiales D, Emeran AA, Sillero JC (2002) Rusts on legumes in Europe and North
12	Africa. Grain Legumes 37:8-9.
13	Rubiales D, Fernández-Aparicio M, Moral A, Barilli E, Sillero JC, Fondevilla S (2009)
14	Disease resistance in pea (Pisum sativum L.) types for autumn sowings in
15	Mediterranean environments. Czech J Genetics Plant Breed 45:135-142.
16	Rubiales D, Moral A (2004) Prehaustorial resistance against alfalfa rust (Uromyces
17	striatus) in Medicago truncatula. Eur J Plant Pathol 110:239-243.
18	Rubiales D, Moreno I, Moreno MT, Sillero JC (2001) Identification of partial resistance
19	to chickpea rust (Uromyces ciceris-arietini). Proc. 4th European Conference on
20	grain legumes. Cracow, Poland. pp. 194-195.
21	Rubiales D, Sillero JC (2003) Uromyces viciae-fabae haustorium formation in
22	susceptible and resistant faba bean lines. Eur J Plant Pathol 109:71-73.
23	Saha GC, Sarker A, Chen W, Vandemark GJ, Muehlbauer FJ (2010) Identification of
24	markers associated with genes for rust resistance in Lens culinaris Medik.
25	Euphytica 175:261-265.

1	Sillero JC, Fondevilla S, Davidson J, Vaz Patto MC, Warkentin TD, Thomas J, Rubiales
2	D (2006) Screening techniques and sources of resistance to rusts and mildews in
3	grain legumes. Euphytica 147:255-272.
4	Sillero JC, Moreno MT, Rubiales D (2000) Characterization of new sources of resistance
5	to Uromyces viciae-fabae in a germplasm collection of Vicia faba. Plant Pathol
6	49:389-395.
7	Sillero JC, Rubiales D (2002) Histological characterization of the resistance to Uromyces
8	viciae-fabae in faba bean. Phytopath 92:294-299.
9	Sillero JC, Villegas-Fernández AM, Thomas J, Rojas-Molina MM, Emeran AA,
10	Fernández-Aparicio M, Rubiales D (2010) Faba bean breeding for disease
11	resistance. Field Crops Res 115:297-307.
12	Silva DC, Yamanaka N, Brogin RL, Arias CA, Nepomuceno AL, Di Mauro AO, Pereira
13	SS, Nogueira LM, Passianotto AL, Abdelnoor RV (2008) Molecular mapping of
14	two loci that confer resistance to Asian rust in soybean. Theor Appl Genet
15	117:57-63.
16	Singh KB, Foley RC, Oñate-Sánchez L (2004) Transcription factors in plant defense and
17	stress responses. Curr Opin Plant Biol 5:430-436.
18	Skinner DZ, Stuteville DL (1995) Host range expansion of the alfalfa rust pathogen.
19	Plant Dis 79:456-460.
20	Stutevile DL, Graves WL, Dixon LJ, Castlebury LA, Minnis AM (2010) Uromyces
21	ciceris-arietini, the cause of chickpea rust: new hosts in the Trifolieae, Fabaceae.
22	Plant Dis 94: 293-297.
23	Tadege M, Wen J, He J, Tu H, Kwak Y, Eschstruth A, Cayrel A, Endre G, Zhao PX,
24	Chabaud M, Ratet P, Mysore KS (2008) Large-scale insertional mutagenesis

using the Tnt1 retrotransposon in the model legume *Medicago truncatula*. Plant
 J 54:335-347.

3 Tekeoglu M, PN RajeshPN, Muehlbauer FJ (2002) Integration of sequence tagged 4 microsatellite sites to the chickpea genetic map. Theor Appl Genet 105:847-854. 5 Tivoli B, Baranger A, Sivasithamparam K, Barbetti MJ (2006) Annual Medicago: from 6 a model crop challenged by a spectrum of necrotrophic pathogens to a model 7 plant to explore the nature of disease resistance. Ann Bot 98:1117-1128. 8 Torres AM, Román B, Avila C, Satovic Z, Rubiales D, Sillero JC, Cubero JI, Moreno 9 MT (2006) Faba bean breeding for resistance against biotic stresses: towards 10 application of marker technology. Euphytica 147:67-80. 11 Trapphoff T, Beutner C, Niehaus K, Colditz F (2009) Induction of distinct defense-12 associated protein patterns in Aphanomyces euteiches (Oomycota)-elicited and -13 inoculated Medicago truncatula cell-suspension cultures: a proteome and 14 phosphoproteome approach. Mol Plant Microbe Inter 22:421-36. 15 Vailleau F, Sartorel E, Jardinaud MF, Chardon F, Genin S, Huguet T, Gentzbittel L, 16 Petitprez M (2007) Characterization of the interaction between the bacterial wilt 17 pathogen Ralstonia solanacearum and the model legume plant Medicago 18 truncatula. Mol Plant Microbe Inter 20:159-167. 19 Vaz Patto MC, Fernandez-Aparicio M, Moral A, Rubiales D (2009) Pre and 20 posthaustorial resistance to rusts in Lathyrus cicera L. Euphytica 165:27-34. 21 Vaz Patto MC, Rubiales D (2009) Identification and characterization of partial 22 resistance to rust in a germplasm collection of Lathyrus sativus. Plant Breeding 23 128:495-500.

1	Vijayalakshmi S, Yadav K, Kushwaha C, Sarode SB, Srivastava CP, Chand R, Singh
2	BD (2005) Identification of RAPD markers linked to the rust (Uromyces fabae)
3	resistance gene in pea (Pisum sativum). Euphytica 144:265-274.
4	Yaege JR, Stuteville DL (2000) Reactions in the annual Medicago core germ plasm
5	collection to two isolates of Peronospora trifoliorum from alfalfa. Plant Dis
6	84:521-524.
7	Young ND, Udvardi M (2009) Translating Medicago truncatula genomics to crop
8	legumes. Curr Opin Plant Biol 12:193-201.
9	

Rust species	Legume species	Gene(s)/QTL	Associated Markers	Marker type	Linkage group	References
		Ur3	OK14 ₆₂₀	RAPD	B11	Haley et al. 1994
		Ur4	OA14 ₁₁₀₀	RAPD	B6	Miklas et al. 1993
		Ur5	OI19 ₄₆₀	RAPD	B4	Haley et al. 1993
		Ur-6	SOBC06.308	SCAR	B11	Park et al. 2004
		Ur7	OAD12.550 and OAF17.900	RAPD	B11	Park et al. 2003
Uromyces appendiculatus	Phaseolus vulgaris	Ur9	OA4.1050	RAPD	B1	Park et al. 1999
		Ur11	OAC20 ₄₉₀	RAPD	B11	Johnson et al. 1998
		Ur12			B7	Kelly et al. 2003
		Ur13	KB126 and KB4 Hha I	SCAR and CA	B8	Mienie et al. 2005
		Ur-Dorado			B4	Kelly et al. 2003
		or Dorado			B11	Miklas et al. 2006
		Ur-Ouro Negro	SCARBA08 and SCARF10	SCAR	B4	Correa et al. 2000
	Vicia faba	Uvf-1	OPI20 ₉₀₀	RAPD		Avila et al., 2003
		Dut	SC10.02 and SCDI 71			Viiovolokshmi ot al

F7XEM4a

OPX-15760 and OPX-171075

 OPY11_{1316} and OPV17_{1078}

SRAP

RAPD

RAPD

LG-3

LG-3

1 **<u>Table 1.</u>** List of QTLs identified in legumes against rust diseases.

Lens culinaris

Pisum fulvum

Up1

Uromyces pisi

Cicer arietinum	Uca1/uca1	TA18 and TA180	STMS	LG-7	Madrid et al. 2008
Vigna unguiculata	Rr1	ABRS _{AAG/CTG98}	SCAR		Li <i>et al.</i> 2007
	QTL _{rust} 01	IPAHM103 and pPGSseq19D	6 SSR	LG-6	Khedikar <i>et al.</i> 2010
	QTL _{rust} 02	PM436 and Lec-1	SSR	LG-1	Khedikar et al. 2010
	QTL _{rust} 03	TC11A04 and IPAHM524	SSR	LG-2	Khedikar et al. 2010
	QTL _{rust} 04	TC1B02 and TC9F04	SSR	LG-3	Khedikar et al. 2010
	QTL _{rust} 05	TC4E09 and IPAHM121	SSR	LG-7	Khedikar et al. 2010
	QTL _{rust} 06	pPGSseq13E6 and PM3	SSR	LG-8	Khedikar et al. 2010
Arachis hypogaea	QTL _{rust} 07	pPGSseq19G7 and TC2C07	SSR	LG-8	Khedikar et al. 2010
	QTL _{rust} 08	TC2G05 and TC9H09	SSR	LG-9	Khedikar et al. 2010
	QTL _{rust} 09	GM624 and TC4G10	SSR	LG-9	Khedikar et al. 2010
	QTL _{rust} 10	PM434 and TC4F02	SSR	LG-8	Khedikar et al. 2010
	QTL _{rust} 11	TC9H09 and GM624	SSR	LG-9	Khedikar et al. 2010
	QTL _{rust} 12	PM377 and TC1A01	SSR	LG-10	Khedikar et al. 2010
		J7 ₁₃₀₀	RAPD		Mondal et al. 2008
	Rpp1	Sct 187 and Sat 064	SSR	LG-G	Hyten <i>et al.</i> 2007
	Rpp2	Sat_255 and Satt620	SSR	LG-J	Silva et al. 2008
Glycine max	Rpp3	Satt460 and Sat_263	SSR	LG-C2	Hyten et al. 2009
-	Rpp4 Rpp5	Satt288 and AF162283	SSR	LG-G	Silva et al. 2008 Garcia et al. 2008
	Cicer arietinum Vigna unguiculata Arachis hypogaea Glycine max	Cicer arietinum Uca1/uca1 Vigna unguiculata Rr1 QTLrus01 QTLrus01 QTLrus03 QTLrus03 QTLrus04 QTLrus03 QTLrus05 QTLrus06 QTLrus06 QTLrus07 QTLrus108 QTLrus108 QTLrus109 QTLrus110 QTLrus11 QTLrus12 Glycine max Rpp1 Rpp3 Rpp4 Rpp5	Cicer arietinum Uca1/uca1 TA18 and TA180 Vigna unguiculata $Rr1$ ABRS _{AAG/CTG98} QTL _{rust} 01 IPAHM103 and pPGSseq19D QTL _{rust} 02 PM436 and Lec-1 QTL _{rust} 03 TC11A04 and IPAHM524 QTL _{rust} 04 TC1B02 and TC9F04 QTL _{rust} 05 TC4E09 and IPAHM121 QTL _{rust} 07 pPGSseq19G7 and TC2C07 QTL _{rust} 09 GM624 and TC4F02 QTL _{rust} 10 PM434 and TC4F02 QTL _{rust} 11 TC9H09 and GM624 QTL _{rust} 12 PM377 and TC1A01 J7 ₁₃₀₀ J7 ₁₃₀₀	Cicer arietinumUca1/uca1TA18 and TA180STMSVigna unguiculata $Rr1$ ABRS AAGICTG98SCARQTL_rust01IPAHM103 and pPGSseq19D6 SSR QTL_rust02PM436 and Lec-1SSR QTL SSR QTL_rust03Arachis hypogaeaQTL_rust01IPAHM103 and pPGSseq19D6 SSR QTL_rust02SSR QTLA SSR QTL QTL Rust05SSR QTL SSR QTL PGSseq19D6Arachis hypogaeaQTL_rust06pPGSseq13E6 and PM3 PGSseq19G5 and TC9H09SSR SSR QTL QTL RUST06Arachis hypogaeaQTL_rust07 QTL_rust08pPGSseq19G7 and TC2C07 SSR QTL QTL 	$ \begin{array}{ccc} Cicer arietinum & Uca1/uca1 & TA18 and TA180 & STMS & LG-7 \\ \hline \\ Vigna unguiculata & Rr1 & ABRS_{AAGICTG98} & SCAR & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & $

2

3

Saha *et al.* 2010 Kant *et al.* 2004

Barilli et al. 2010