## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE BEARING ON THE PLEIOTROPIC ACTION OF AM-1 AND AM-2

Marx, G. A. NYS Agricultural Experiment Station, Geneva, NY USA

Past reports (1, 2) pointed to a direct (pleiotropic) relationship between the genes am-1 or am-2 and one or the other of two associated seed disorders. The association was interpreted as pleiotropy rather than linkage, even though some am-1 or am-2 plants and lines do not express the seed disorder. The explanation offered was that the seed disorder fails to manifest in the presence of one or more genes that counteract one aspect (the seed disorder) but not the other aspect (flower color inhibition) of gene action. The gene b\_ was suggested as playing a role in the scheme.

To investigate the matter further, crosses were made between a wild-type line (A, B, Am-1, Am-2, F/Fs) and several A/A lines with white flowers (due to am-1 or am-2 or both) but not showing a seed disorder. The results of one of these crosses are considered here (Table 1). It is evident from the segregation pattern: (i) that the white-flowered parent carried only one flower color inhibitor gene; (ii) that the gene in question was  $\underline{am-2}$  (distinguished by the nature of the seed disorder found in F2; (iii) that since b\_ segregated in F2, b was present but masked in the white-flowered parent; and (iv) that some but not all the white-flowered F2 plants showed a seed disorder. Further, the relative number of white-flowered segregants with and without seed disorder could be explained by assuming the segregation of a recessive gene pair that blocked the pleiotropic action of am-2. The b gene was a likely candidate in that role.

		having normal seeds. erved/Expected er of F <sub>2</sub> plants	F <sub>2</sub> phenotype	
Population	Obs.	Exp. (9:3:3:1)	Flower color	Seed
B280-819-829	196	186.2	Wild-type	Norma
	63	62.1	Pink	Norma
	56	62.1	White	sd-21
	16	20.7	White	Norma
	$\frac{16}{331}$	331.1		

Table 1. Number of plants with indicated phenotypes in the Fo of a cross

 $\frac{1}{3}$  sd-2 indicates a seed disorder of a type typically associated with the presence of am-2 and marked by self-colored olive green seeds, many of which show various degrees of degeneration.

Ih< F2 results also implied that if b/b serves as the block, then some of the white-flowered segregants with the seed disorder (presumably B/-) should, when progeny tested, segregate for plants without the seed disorder because some am-2/am-2 segregants were bound to be B/b (am-2 and b apparently are not lmked). This prediction was tested by growing 20 F3 progenies from selected white-flowered F2 plants. Two pink-flowered (b/b Am-2/-) F2 plants were also progeny tested.

Each F3 progeny consisted of 12 plants. This is not enough to identify all potentially heterozygous (B/b) entries but sufficient to detect heterozygosity in most progenies and therefore to test the validity of the hypothesis. The results of the FT analysis are given in Table 2. Of 12 plants that showed

## PNL Volume 13 1981

seed disorder in F2, ten segregated for plants with normal seed (i.e. without seed disorder) in F3, giving a combined ratio of 87 segregants with and 32 segregants without seed disorder ( $X^{2}[3:1]=0.227$ ). In three of the F3 progenies, all 12 plants exhibited the seed disorder and therefore possibly were homozygous B/B. Seven of the F2 plants tested were without the seed disorder in the field. All 12 plants in each of the corresponding F3 progenies were again without the seed disorder. Presumably, therefore, all seven progenies were b/b\_. The two b/b\_  $\frac{Am-2}{-}$  F, plants produced F3 progenies that were entirely free of the seed disorder, including three  $\frac{am-2}{2}$  plants that segregated in one of the b entries.

Table 2. Progeny test results of 21 F, plants derived from the cross  $\underline{A \ Am-2} \ \underline{B} \times \underline{A} \ \underline{am-2} \ \underline{b}$ . Each  $F_3^2$  progeny consisted of 12 seeds from from an individual  $F_2$  plant.

F <sub>2</sub> Phenotype		F3 Phenotype				
		Flower	Seed	3		
Flower	Seed	color	Normal	sd-2	Presumed F <sub>2</sub> genotype	
White	Normal	White	12	0	<u>A am-2 B/B</u>	
11	11	11	12	0		
11	11	11	12	0		
11	11	11	12	0		
11	11 J	51017 H 183	12	0		
11			12	0		
11	sd-2		3	9	A am-2 B/b	
11	11		5	7	in analysis in the	
11	F1	11	2	10		
11			6	6		
1.1		11	2	10		
11		H	2	9		
11	11	11	2	10		
11	11		2	10		
11.		11	3	9		
11		- 11	5	7		
11		11	õ	12	<u>A am-2 b/b</u>	
11		11	0	12		
			0	12		
Pink	Normal	All Pink	0 8 <u>1</u> /	0	A Am-2/am-2 b/b	
11		Pink:3 Whi		0		

In a different but related experiment, it was shown that, after selfing a line heterozygous for A (A/a) but homozygous for  $\underline{am-1}$ , all the A/- segregants showed the seed disorder which is associated with  $\underline{am-1}$  and all the a/a segregants had normal seed. This same behavior was noted in three successive generations, F4, F<sub>s</sub>, and F<sub>s</sub>. Thus a\_ is epistatic to  $\underline{am-1}$  both in terms of flower color and seed disorder. It seems therefore that A and B are required for the seed disorders associated with  $\underline{am-1}$  and  $\underline{am-2}$  to become phenotypically manifest. Once A and B are present, then the specific type of seed disorder that is expressed depends on whether  $\underline{am-1}$  or  $\underline{am-2}$  or both are present (2). A seemingly complex pattern of dominance and interaction (epistasis) emerges from all this, a situation perhaps made clearer by the following scheme:

A	В	Am-1	Am-2	Flower	Seed
+	+	+	+	Wild-type	Normal
+	+	+	-	White	sd-2
+	+		+	White	sd-1
+	+	-		White	sd-2
+	-	+	+	Pink	Normal
+	-	+	-	White	Normal
+	-	- 11	+	White	Normal
+	-	-		White	Norma1
-	+	+	+ 1		
-	+	+	- )		
-	+	_	+ /		
-	+	-	(	White	Normal
-	-	+	+ /		
-	-	+	- \		
-		-	+ )		
-		-	- ]		

Many of my earlier, unreported, observations which initially defied explanation have now begun to make sense in the light of this proposed scheme. I have reason to believe that still another gene may interact with  $\underline{am-1}$ and  $\underline{am-2}$  to override the seed disorder phase of gene action but the analysis is not yet complete.

Marx, G. A. PNL 7:28-29. 1975.
Marx, G. A. PNL 10:38-40. 1978.