# PERFORMANCE AND MOLECULAR ANALYSIS OF POTATO LINES DEVELOPED FROM GAMMA RAYS AND EMS APPLICATIONS A. H. Annon<sup>1</sup> I. J. Abdulrasool<sup>1</sup>

Assist. Lecturer

. Abauiraso Prof.

<sup>1</sup>Dept. of Horticulture and Landscape Gardening, Coll. Agric. Engin. Sci., University of Baghdad Ali.annon1984@gmail.com eiman\_jaber@yahoo.com

#### ABSTRACT

An experiment was conducted in a greenhouse - research station B - College of Agricultural Engineering Sciences, University of Baghdad, during the fall season of 2018 with the aim of propagating and initially studying the field performance of 18 and 20 potential potato lines derived from Rivera and Arizona cv. after *in vitro* exposure of nodal segments to different dosages of gamma rays (0, 10, 20, and 30 Gray) and EMS (0, 10, 20, and 30 mM). Each control cultivar and their derived lines were independently cultured in plastic bags according to the RCBD, with three replications. The results showed that the highest plant height and number of leaves were obtained from Arizona derived lines which gave 60.11 cm and 25.30 leaves.plant<sup>-1</sup> in lines 207 and 222, respectively when compared with their control that gave 38.11 cm and 13.67 leaves.plant<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. Minitubers diameter, weight, and plant yield were in its highest values in Arizona derived lines 551, 551, and 459 which gave 35.73 mm.minituber<sup>-1</sup>, 33.13 g. minituber<sup>-1</sup>, and 133.8 g.plant<sup>-1</sup>, respectively compared to their control that gave 25.35 mm.minituber, 16.8 g.minituber, and 78.57 g.plant<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. The resulted lines were analyzed at the molecular level utilizing the inter simple sequence repeats (ISSR) markers and revealed that lines 69, 10, 68, 102, and 7 were the much distanced from its derived Rivera cultivar and gave 40.7%, 37.1%, 36.8%, 33.3%, and 30.0%, respectively while lines 551, 261, 474, and 254 were the much genetically distanced from their derived cultivar Arizona with genetic distances of 24.1%, 22.6%, 18.8%, and 17.6%, respectively.

Key words: *Solanum tuberosum* L., Mutagenesis, Minitubers, Genetic distance, ISSR Part of Ph.D. dissertation of the 1<sup>st</sup> author

عنون وعبد الرسول

مجلة العلوم الزراعية العراقية -2020 :51 (5):1336-1329

الاداء الحقلي والتحليل الجزيئي لخطوط البطاطا المستنبطة من المعاملة باشعة كاما و EMS علي هاني عنون<sup>1</sup> مدرس مساعد أقسم البستنة وهندسة الحدائق / كلية علوم الهندسة الزراعية / جامعة بغداد

المستخلص

نفذت التجرية في بيت محمي عند المحطة البحثية (B) التابعة لكلية علوم الهندسة الزراعية / جامعة بغداد للموسم الخريفي 2018 لغرض الاكثار و الدراسة الاولية للاداء الحقلي ل 18 و20 طافر محتمل مشتقة من صنفين من البطاطا هما اريزونا وريفيرا بعد تعريض عقدها مختبريا الى جرعات مختلفة من اشعة كاما (0 و 10 و 20 و 30 غري) والاثيل ميثان سلفونيت (0 و 10 و 20 و 30 ملي عقدها مختبريا الى جرعات مختلفة من اشعة كاما (0 و 10 و 20 و 30 غري) والاثيل ميثان سلفونيت (0 و 10 و 20 و 30 مولر). تم زراعة كل صنف مع خطوطه المستنبطة بصورة مستقلة في اكباس بلاستيكية وفق تصميم القطاعات العشوائية الكاملة بثلاث مولر). تم زراعة كل صنف مع خطوطه المستنبطة بصورة مستقلة في اكباس بلاستيكية وفق تصميم القطاعات العشوائية الكاملة بثلاث مكررات. اظهرت النتائج ان اعلى ارتفاع للنبات واكثر عدد اوراق تم الحصول عليها من النباتات المشتقة من الصنف اريزونا اذ بلغت ورقة.نبات<sup>-1</sup> للخطين 201 و 22 بالتتابع عند مقارنتها مع صنف المقارنة التي اعطت 11.81 سم و 36.00 ورقة نبات<sup>-1</sup> للخطين 201 و 22 بالتتابع عند مقارنتها مع صنف المقارنة التي اعطت 38.11 منه و 36.00 وقفي نبات<sup>-1</sup> للخطين 201 و 222 بالتتابع عند مقارنتها مع صنف المقارنة التي اعطت 38.11 مستنبطة ورقة.نبات<sup>-1</sup> المنطين ووزن الدرينات والحاصل للنبات الواحد كانت عند اعلى قيمها في الخطوط المستنبطة من الصنف اريزونا اذ بلغت. ورقة أو 36.12 مع درينة<sup>-1</sup> و 36.13 مع مدينة<sup>-1</sup> و 36.11 مع منابت<sup>-1</sup> النظوط 165 و 57 و 29 بالتتابع من الصنف اريزونا اذ بلغت المستنبطة ورقة أو 71 غم درينة<sup>-1</sup> و 78.51 غم دنبات<sup>-1</sup> النظوط 165 و 57 و 29 بالتتابع عند مقارنته بصنف المقارنة الذي اعطى 35.51 ملم درينة<sup>-1</sup> و 78.51 و 78.57 غم دنبات<sup>-1</sup> النظوط 165 و 57 و 20 و 20 و 20 من الصنف المستوى الخريفي المعتربة و 35.51 ملم درينة<sup>-1</sup> و 78.51 و 78.57 غم درينة<sup>-1</sup> و 78.57 مع دنبات<sup>-1</sup> الخطوط المنتخبة من الصنف اريزونا اذ بلغن تالذي النوبي الخلوي الذي الحلينية (78.51 و 78.50 و 78.57 و 78.57) مع درينة<sup>1</sup> و 78.51 و 78.57 في دول و 20 و 78 في دول و 20 و 78.50 و 78.50 و 78.50 و 78.50 و 78.50 و 78.50 و 78.50% و 79.50% و 79.50% و 79.50% و 78.50% و 79.50% و

الكلمات المفتاحية: .Solanum tuberosum L، التطفير، الدرينات، البعد الوراشي، ISSR

البحث مستل من اطروحة دكتوراه للباحث الاول

\*Received:13/9/2019, Accepted:31/12/2019

# INTRODUCTION

Potato (Solanum tuberosum L.) is one of the four major staple food including wheat, rice and corn and plays a vital role in the food security. international Therefore, improving its field performance against several biotic and abiotic stresses is crucial to elevate crop yield's potential. Mutagenesis aims at the disruption or alternation of genes and can be considered a valuable tool of genetic variations that attract plant breeders. characterizations phenotypic Many that contribute to the domestication and improvement of plant species resulted from human selection for novel traits driven from structural and regulatory genes (19). Simakove et al. (21) tested the effectiveness of multiple backcrossing scheme towards the development of commercial potato varieties. They found high efficiency of tolerant genes introgression in terms of resistance to alternaria, heat, and drought stresses. Many studies have shown the significant effect of induced mutation on plants improvement. Chepkoech et al. (8) were able to induce mutation in potato by exposing potato tubers of three commercial varieties to different dosages of gamma rays. They found that the heritability rates of four agronomical traits including plant height, shoot number, tuber number, and tuber weight were high and gave 62.51%, 52.70%, 64.30%, and 63.43%, respectively which indicates the successful induction of mutation with a high chance for the improved traits to be displayed in the future generation. Ulukapi et al. (25) noticed that high dosage of gamma rays significantly decreased some eggplant growth parameters including plant height (13.58 cm) and shoot fresh weight (1705 g.plant<sup>-1</sup>) compared to their control which gave 20.41 cm and 3.021 g.plant<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. A single potato mutant with high yield potential was produced by Morshad (16) after they subjected potato callus to different types of chemical mutagens. He was able to produce 1941 variants from the applied treatments but only 331 survived under acclimatization and further 37.16% were able to survive the field condition. True potato seeds (TPS) were treated with Ethyl methanesulfonate (EMS) for different durations to induce mutation by Somalraju et al. (23) in order to develop pre-breeding germplasm. The abnormality percentage of the produced plants was 6.25% ranged from twisted stem, chlorotic and crinkle leaves, purple leaf tip, bushy growth, and slim stem. Although EMS-treated plants tend to produce more tubers per plant but no significant differences were observed between treated and untreated plants in this term. Likewise, no significant differences were noticed in tuber's weight between treated and untreated plants in spite of the higher tuber's weight exhibited in the EMS-treated plants. Khierallah and Jawad (13) Subjected 8 potato varieties to different concentrations of NaCl and found that salinity tolerance significantly differentiated among the investigated genotypes. Taking all together, the aim of this study was to produce sufficient amount of tubers for future propagation in addition to examine some agronomical characteristics of two potato cultivars grown in the greenhouse after their exposure to different levels of gamma rays and EMS.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS Lines development

Nodal segments from both cultivars were *in vitro* subjected within four dosages of Gamma rays at 0, 10, 20, and 30 Gray and immersed in 4 concentrations of EMS at 0, 10, 20, and 30 mM for two hours to develop potential lines. The total number of plantlets yielded from the developmental treatments were 800 came from (50 nodes \* 4 dosages \* 2 cultivars \* 2 mutagens). The produced lines were further participated in a series of selection criteria to eliminate the ones that exhibit high mortality rates and growth abnormality.

# Lines acclimatization

The selected lines were acclimatized prior to their transfer to the field. The acclimatization process was held at the Date Palm Research Unit labs / College of Agricultural Engineering Sciences / University of Baghdad for approximately one month. Plantlets were collected from the test tubes, washed thoroughly with tab water to remove the remaining growth medium, and treated with Beltanol fungicide (Fitoagricola.Co) at 1 ml.l<sup>-1</sup>. Afterwards; plantlets were cultured in presterilized peatmoss in 100 ml pots and kept in the incubator at 25°C for two weeks. For the first week, plantlets were watered with half strength MS salts three times a day and for the second week, plantlets were watered with a solution contained balanced N, P, K, and trace elements twice a day. Subsequently, potted plantlets were transfer to the lath house for further hardening for three weeks prior to their final transfer to the greenhouse.

# Lines field trial

Acclimatized plantlets were transferred to 15 kg plastic bags contained 1:3 (peatmoss:soil) mixture and grown in the greenhouse for 100 days to obtain sufficient line tubers. The greenhouse location was at the Research College Station В of Agricultural Engineering Sciences - University of Baghdad. Plants were transferred to the greenhouse in the 5<sup>th</sup> of October, 2018 where all field managements were regularly performed to ensure meeting the crop growing requirements. Potential mutagenic lines and their control cultivars were randomly distributed within each replication in which Arizona and their derived lines accounted for 21 lines while Rivera and their derived lines accounted for 19 lines with 12 plastic bags for each line that represents the experimental unit. The experiment was designed independently for each cultivar and its derived lines according to the Randomized Completely Block Design (RCBD) with three replications and means were compared according to the Least Significant Differences (LSD) test at 5% level of significance. Data collection from a pool sample of 6 randomly selected plants per experimental unit was in regard to: Plant  $(\text{cm.plant}^{-1}),$ number height of stems (stems.plant<sup>-1</sup>), number of leaves (leaves.plant<sup>-1</sup>) <sup>1</sup>), shoot dry weight percentage (SDW%), plant yield (g.plant<sup>-1</sup>), minituber average weight (g,minituber<sup>-1</sup>), minitubers number (minitubers.plant<sup>-1</sup>), and minitubers diameter (mm.minituber<sup>-1</sup>).

# DNA extraction and molecular analysis

Potato genomic DNA was extracted following the protocol established by Chaudhry et al. (6). Five inter-simple sequence repeats (ISSR) primers were obtained following the publications of Bornet et al. (5) and Mahgoub et al. (14). Genetic distances were calculated according to the following equation:

Genetic distance = 1 - ((2nxy) / (nx+ny))

where (nxy) represents the number of bands sharing the same molecular size while nx represents the total number of band in exhibition A and ny represents the total number of band in exhibition B. The output data were analyzed using the SPSS program to obtain proximity matrix (18).

# **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS:**

Three hundred explants from each cultivar (control excluded) were exposed to different dosages of gamma rays and EMS but only 18 lines from Rivera (6%) and 20 lines from Arizona (6.6%) survived the mutagenesis treatments in which their designated names are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Designated names of the survivedexplants from both Rivera (R) and Arizona

(A) nodal segments exposed to different

| dosages of gamma rays and EMS |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
|-------------------------------|--|

| uosages of gainina rays and EMB |                      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Naming                          | Treatments           |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (1 - 50)                        | R , 10 Gy Gamma      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (51 - 100)                      | R , 20 Gy Gamma      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (101 - 150)                     | R , 30 Gy Gamma      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (151 - 200)                     | A , 10 Gy Gamma      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (201 - 250)                     | A, 20 Gy Gamma       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (251 - 300)                     | A , 30 Gy Gamma      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (301 - 350)                     | R, 10 mM EMS         |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (351 - 400)                     | <b>R</b> , 20 mM EMS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (401 - 450)                     | R, 30 mM EMS         |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (451 - 500)                     | A, 10 mM EMS         |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (501 - 550)                     | A, 20 mM EMS         |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (551 - 600)                     | A, 30 mM EMS         |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Vegetative characteristics of generated lines Results in Table 2 show that 12 and 6 lines derived from Rivera and Arizona cultivars, respectively were significantly higher in plant height when compared with their controls in which their values ranged between 53.33 -37.89 cm in lines 102 and 373, respectively when compared to Rivera cultivar that gave 30.22. Moreover, the significant values of Arizona derived lines were in between lines 207 and 170 which gave 60.11 - 44.22 cm, respectively when compared with their control that gave 38.11 cm. As for the number of stems, it was observed that two lines derived from Rivera cultivar and designated as 68 and 69 gave significant increases in the number of stems which gave 4.22 and 2.88 stems.plant<sup>-1</sup>, respectively when compared with the control that gave 1.33 stems.plant<sup>-1</sup>. Furthermore, 3 lines derived from Arizona cultivar showed significant increases in the number of stems in which their values were 1.77, 1.67, and 1.67

stems.plant<sup>-1</sup> in lines 222, 254, and 180, respectively when compared with the control that gave 1.22 stems.plant<sup>-1</sup>. The Rivera and Arizona derived lines also showed significant increases in the number of leaves where 9 and 4 lines from Rivera and Arizona, respectively were significantly higher than their control counterparts where the significant values in Rivera derived lines ranged 24.33 – 15.0 leaf.plant<sup>-1</sup> in lines 68 and 360, respectively when compared to their control that gave 11.56 leaf.plant<sup>-1</sup>. The significant values of

Arizona derived lines were between lines 254 and 222 and gave 25.11 - 17.33 leaf.plant<sup>-1</sup>, respectively when compared with their control that gave 13.67 leaf.plant<sup>-1</sup>. Interestingly, we noticed that the highest values of SDW% were obtained from the control genotypes. For Rivera derived lines, no significant differences were observed between line 69 and its control which gave 22.30% while the lowest value was recorded in line 313 that gave 10.43% when compared with the control that gave 24.85%.

| Table 2. Field traits represented by some vegetative characteristics of developed lines as a |
|--|
| result of gamma rays and EMS exposure at different levels. SDW%= shoot dry weight            |
| nercentage   |

| percentage          |              |                 |        |                       |                     |              |                |        |       |  |  |  |
|---------------------|--------------|-----------------|--------|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------|----------------|--------|-------|--|--|--|
|                     | Rive         | era derived lii | nes    | Arizona derived lines |                     |              |                |        |       |  |  |  |
| Line#               | Plant height | Stem #          | Leaf # | SDW%                  | Line#               | Plant height | Stem #         | Leaf # | SDW%  |  |  |  |
|                     | Cm           |                 |        |                       |                     | Cm           |                |        |       |  |  |  |
|                     | Gamn         | na developed    | lines  | Gamma developed lines |                     |              |                |        |       |  |  |  |
| 4                   | 46.89        | 1.33            | 19.44  | 13.59                 | 153                 | 41.33        | 1.44           | 13.89  | 20.16 |  |  |  |
| 7                   | 46.67        | 1.33            | 17.33  | 14.53                 | 154                 | 35.11        | 1.11           | 11.78  | 10.78 |  |  |  |
| 9                   | 40.78        | 1.56            | 14.22  | 12.78                 | 162                 | 39.00        | 1.44           | 13.44  | 14.71 |  |  |  |
| 10                  | 41.22        | 1.22            | 13.67  | 11.35                 | 165                 | 43.33        | 1.56           | 14.11  | 16.71 |  |  |  |
| 68                  | 24.78        | 4.22            | 24.33  | 19.90                 | 166                 | 40.33        | 1.56           | 14.00  | 16.06 |  |  |  |
| 69                  | 24.44        | 2.89            | 17.00  | 22.30                 | 170                 | 44.22        | 1.56           | 14.22  | 23.16 |  |  |  |
| 77                  | 40.67        | 1.33            | 14.44  | 12.38                 | 180                 | 43.67        | 1.67           | 15.00  | 22.89 |  |  |  |
| 102                 | 53.33        | 1.67            | 18.44  | 17.60                 | 205                 | 54.44        | 1.33           | 22.33  | 18.22 |  |  |  |
| 114                 | 27.78        | 1.56            | 11.33  | 17.20                 | 207                 | 60.11        | 1.22           | 16.22  | 23.06 |  |  |  |
| 115                 | 23.56        | 1.89            | 13.33  | 10.68                 | 209                 | 39.44        | 1.22           | 13.11  | 14.08 |  |  |  |
|                     | EMS          | 5 developed li  | nes    |                       | 222                 | 39.11        | 1.78           | 17.33  | 25.30 |  |  |  |
| 305                 | 29.00        | 1.44            | 10.11  | 18.10                 | 254                 | 45.33        | 1.67           | 25.11  | 23.11 |  |  |  |
| 313                 | 47.00        | 1.00            | 15.56  | 10.43                 | 257                 | 49.11        | 1.33           | 14.56  | 15.01 |  |  |  |
| 321                 | 52.78        | 1.33            | 17.67  | 13.66                 | 261                 | 42.44        | 1.44           | 21.56  | 25.24 |  |  |  |
| 334                 | 30.67        | 1.56            | 12.00  | 18.31                 | 262                 | 34.33        | 1.56           | 13.11  | 20.14 |  |  |  |
| 349                 | 45.22        | 1.11            | 13.78  | 13.81                 | 270                 | 42.33        | 1.33           | 13.67  | 23.15 |  |  |  |
| 360                 | 38.56        | 1.11            | 15.00  | 15.39                 |                     | EMS          | 6 developed li | nes    |       |  |  |  |
| 373                 | 37.89        | 1.67            | 15.44  | 14.03                 | 459                 | 48.22        | 1.22           | 14.00  | 23.95 |  |  |  |
| 423                 | 39.89        | 1.22            | 13.89  | 14.24                 | 463                 | 37.44        | 1.33           | 13.44  | 23.05 |  |  |  |
| R                   | 30.22        | 1.33            | 11.56  | 24.85                 | 474                 | 37.56        | 1.33           | 13.11  | 24.96 |  |  |  |
|                     |              |                 |        |                       | 551                 | 40.00        | 1.33           | 13.11  | 25.20 |  |  |  |
|                     |              |                 |        |                       | Α                   | 38.11        | 1.22           | 13.67  | 26.57 |  |  |  |
| LSD <sub>0.05</sub> | 6.52         | 0.64            | 3.21   | 3.17                  | LSD <sub>0.05</sub> | 5.85         | 0.42           | 3.24   | 3.78  |  |  |  |

Nevertheless, 11 Arizona derived lines did not exhibit significant differences in this term. These results were in agreement with the findings of other researchers (1, 9, 17) that mutagenesis treatment of potatoes showed a significant effect in increasing plant height, number of stems, and number of shoots of produced lines. The exhibited reduction in the SDW% can be attributed to elevated water retention in the generated lines compared to their control as a result of some morphological and physiological modifications in mutants body including changes in the cuticle barrier layer (7) or controlling the stomatal conductance (15) in addition to reducing the rate of transpiration (26).

was obtained from line 68 which gave 5.11 minituber.plant<sup>-1</sup> though it did not significantly

g.minituber<sup>-1</sup>.

**Lines Yield characteristics** 

The results in Table 3 show that, in the term of

minituber weight, 5 Rivera derived lines did

not significantly differ from the control and

gave a values fallen between 17.18 - 14.60

g,minituber<sup>-1</sup> in lines 360 and 423, respectively compared to the control that gave 17.21

Nevertheless,

derived lines were significantly higher in

minituber weight with the values between 33.13 - 21.80 g.minituber<sup>-1</sup> in lines 551 and

number of minitubers in Rivera derived lines

differ from the control that gave 4.88

10

Arizona

minituber.plant<sup>-1</sup>; however, most lines were significantly lower than the control in this term. On the other hand, all Arizona derived lines were lower than the control in the term of the number of minitubers although 3 lines recorded non-significant differences with the values of 4.28, 4.22, and 4.22 minituber.plant<sup>-1</sup> in lines 153, 207, and 474, respectively compared to the control that gave 4.67 minituber.plant<sup>-1</sup>.

| Table 3. Field traits represented by some yield characteristics of developed lines as a result of |
|---|
| gamma rays and EMS exposure at different levels   |

|                     |           | Į                     | gamma rays a                |                          | posure              |           |                       |                             |             |  |  |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|--|--|
|                     |           | Rivera deriv          | ved lines                   | Arizona derived lines    |                     |           |                       |                             |             |  |  |
| Line#               | Minituber | Minituber             | Minituber                   | Yield.plant <sup>-</sup> | Line#               | Minituber | Minituber             | Minituber                   | Yield.plant |  |  |
|                     | weight    | #.plant <sup>-1</sup> | diameter.plant <sup>-</sup> | Ĩ                        |                     | weight    | #.plant <sup>-1</sup> | diameter.plant <sup>-</sup> | Ī           |  |  |
|                     | Ğ         | -                     | 1                           | G                        |                     | G         | _                     | 1                           | G           |  |  |
|                     |           |                       | Mm                          |                          |                     |           |                       | Mm                          |             |  |  |
|                     | (         | Gamma devel           | oped lines                  |                          |                     |           | Gamma devel           | oped lines                  |             |  |  |
| 4                   | 14.65     | 3.22                  | 23.55                       | 47.25                    | 153                 | 15.81     | 4.28                  | 26.03                       | 67.65       |  |  |
| 7                   | 12.07     | 3.78                  | 22.08                       | 45.50                    | 154                 | 21.80     | 2.28                  | 22.31                       | 29.08       |  |  |
| 9                   | 13.35     | 3.00                  | 22.23                       | 39.69                    | 162                 | 15.61     | 2.50                  | 22.81                       | 38.92       |  |  |
| 10                  | 10.09     | 3.06                  | 21.27                       | 30.71                    | 165                 | 18.65     | 3.06                  | 25.03                       | 57.00       |  |  |
| 68                  | 12.99     | 5.11                  | 22.79                       | 66.34                    | 166                 | 18.68     | 2.78                  | 25.84                       | 51.84       |  |  |
| 69                  | 11.04     | 4.89                  | 20.52                       | 53.51                    | 170                 | 22.96     | 4.00                  | 27.78                       | 91.78       |  |  |
| 77                  | 10.21     | 3.94                  | 20.63                       | 39.92                    | 180                 | 22.61     | 3.22                  | 27.31                       | 72.97       |  |  |
| 102                 | 13.31     | 4.00                  | 23.59                       | 52.74                    | 205                 | 19.34     | 2.83                  | 24.60                       | 54.73       |  |  |
| 114                 | 15.53     | 3.22                  | 23.34                       | 49.91                    | 207                 | 30.08     | 4.22                  | 33.98                       | 127.0       |  |  |
| 115                 | 8.19      | 2.56                  | 20.16                       | 20.72                    | 209                 | 10.95     | 2.67                  | 22.93                       | 28.06       |  |  |
|                     |           | EMS develo            | ped lines                   |                          | 222                 | 22.83     | 3.83                  | 27.86                       | 87.32       |  |  |
| 305                 | 13.09     | 3.28                  | 23.04                       | 42.91                    | 254                 | 24.17     | 3.78                  | 27.40                       | 91.53       |  |  |
| 313                 | 8.55      | 2.28                  | 18.33                       | 19.32                    | 257                 | 16.16     | 2.33                  | 24.07                       | 37.64       |  |  |
| 321                 | 9.65      | 3.88                  | 22.05                       | 36.95                    | 261                 | 32.89     | 3.83                  | 33.73                       | 125.9       |  |  |
| 334                 | 16.54     | 3.33                  | 24.64                       | 55.05                    | 262                 | 16.36     | 3.11                  | 23.77                       | 50.41       |  |  |
| 349                 | 8.96      | 3.67                  | 20.43                       | 32.99                    | 270                 | 23.35     | 3.00                  | 30.41                       | 70.07       |  |  |
| 360                 | 17.18     | 2.61                  | 23.00                       | 44.89                    |                     |           | EMS develo            | ped lines                   |             |  |  |
| 373                 | 12.40     | 2.78                  | 21.44                       | 33.23                    | 459                 | 32.55     | 4.11                  | 32.90                       | 133.8       |  |  |
| 423                 | 14.60     | 2.56                  | 23.51                       | 36.70                    | 463                 | 17.66     | 3.67                  | 26.95                       | 64.76       |  |  |
| R                   | 17.21     | 4.88                  | 25.65                       | 82.91                    | 474                 | 19.36     | 4.22                  | 27.37                       | 81.49       |  |  |
|                     |           |                       |                             |                          | 551                 | 33.13     | 3.17                  | 35.73                       | 104.2       |  |  |
|                     |           |                       |                             |                          | Α                   | 16.80     | 4.67                  | 25.35                       | 78.57       |  |  |
| LSD <sub>0.05</sub> | 2.98      | 0.70                  | 1.69                        | 11.26                    | LSD <sub>0.05</sub> | 2.70      | 0.52                  | 1.44                        | 13.04       |  |  |

The results in Table 3 show that most of the Rivera derived lines were significantly lower in minituber diameter with an exception in line 334 that gave 24.64 mm.minituber<sup>-1</sup> and did not significantly differ when compared with the control which gave 25.65 mm.minituber<sup>-1</sup>. On the contrast, 10 Arizona derived lines were significantly higher than the control in the term of minituber diameter in which the significant values were between 35.73 - 26.95 minituber.plant<sup>-1</sup> in lines 551 and 463, respectively when compared to the control that gave 25.35 mm.minituber<sup>-1</sup>. As for the plant yield, the results were correlated with the previous yield traits and showed that all Rivera derived lines were significantly lower than the control with the lowest value of 19.32 g.plant<sup>-1</sup> in line 313 when compared with the control that gave 82.91 g.plant<sup>-1</sup>. However, 5 Arizona derived lines were significantly higher in the term of plant yield with the significant values ranged 133.8 - 91.78 g.plant<sup>-1</sup> in lines 459 and 170, respectively when compared with the

control that gave 78.57 g.plant<sup>-1</sup>. Similar findings were reported by (2, 11) when they found that the genotypes used in their experiments had a significant effect on the yield traits which proven that the selection of suitable genotypes for mutation studies is crucial for plant improvement programs where some genotypes are more applicable for induced mutation comparing with others. Gamma rays have a biological effect on the plant cell which based on its interaction with particular molecules especially water and in result produce free radicals (12). These produced radicals can damage or modify the physical and molecular structure of the cell and therefore differentially affect plant morphology, physiology, anatomy, and biochemistry depending on the used dosages of mutagens (3). According to the morphological and vield characteristics obtained in our results, it was noticed that the two cultivars used in our study varied in their response to mutagensis applications which are in consistence with many other previous reports (2, 4, 10).

### Molecular analysis of developed lines

The highest genetic distances between Rivera derived lines and their control were observed in lines 69, 10, 68, 102, and 7 as presented in Table 4 and gave 40.7%, 37.1%, 36.8%, 33.3%, and 30.0%, respectively while the lowest was recorded between Rivera cultivar and line 4 which gave 18.8%. Moreover, the results in Table 5 show that the highest genetic distances between Arizona derived lines and their control were in lines 551, 261, 474, and 254 which gave 24.1%, 22.6%, 18.8%, and 17.6%, respectively while the lowest was noticed in line 153 and gave 5.9%. The ISSR markers are very useful molecular tool for **Table 4. Genetic distance values among Rive** 

genetic discrimination among mutants. It was considered reliable, relatively very inexpensive, and gave similar results when repeated (20, 24). The results were similar to the findings of Sobieh et al. (22) when they applied different gamma ray dosages on potato and found that the highest genetic distance was 39.9% while the lowest was 3.3%. We noticed that genotypes can play a vital role in responding to different types of mutagens where Rivera showed to be more genetically affected than Arizona in this manner. This was also reported by Bado et al. (4) when they irradiated 6 potato genotypes with gamma rays and found that genotypes had a significant effect on the irradiation sensitivity.

| able 4. Genetic distance values among Rivera cultivar and its derivative lines resulted from | n |
|--|---|
| gamma rays and EMS exposure at Different levels. R=Rivera                                    |   |

| gamma rays and ENIS exposure at Different levels. K-Kivera |       |        |        |         |         |        |         |         |        |          |        |          |         |       |      |
|--|-------|--------|--------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|--------|----------|--------|----------|---------|-------|------|
| Lines  | R     | 4      | 114    | 68      | 69      | 7      | 102     | 77      | 10     | 9        | 305    | 349      | 334     | 321   | 373  |
| R  | .000  | .188   | .257   | .368    | .407    | .300   | .333    | .250    | .371   | .333     | .257   | .257     | .250    | .250  | .273 |
| 4  |       | .000   | .135   | .200    | .241    | .190   | .200    | .059    | .189   | .200     | .135   | .135     | .118    | .118  | .143 |
| 114  |       |        | .000   | .116    | .313    | .111   | .211    | .189    | .200   | .105     | .200   | .150     | .189    | .189  | .211 |
| 68   |       |        |        | .000    | .371    | .125   | .220    | .150    | .116   | .171     | .256   | .209     | .200    | .200  | .220 |
| 69   |       |        |        |         | .000    | .351   | .200    | .241    | .250   | .267     | .250   | .250     | .172    | .172  | .200 |
| 7  |       |        |        |         |         | .000   | .209    | .190    | .156   | .209     | .156   | .156     | .190    | .190  | .209 |
| 102  |       |        |        |         |         |        | .000    | .143    | .105   | .167     | .158   | .158     | .086    | .086  | .111 |
| 77   |       |        |        |         |         |        |         | .000    | .135   | .200     | .135   | .135     | .059    | .059  | .086 |
| 10   |       |        |        |         |         |        |         |         | .000   | .263     | .200   | .150     | .135    | .135  | .158 |
| 9  |       |        |        |         |         |        |         |         |        | .000     | .263   | .263     | .200    | .200  | .222 |
| 305  |       |        |        |         |         |        |         |         |        |          | .000   | .050     | .081    | .081  | .053 |
| 349  |       |        |        |         |         |        |         |         |        |          |        | .000     | .081    | .081  | .053 |
| 334  |       |        |        |         |         |        |         |         |        |          |        |          | .000    | .000  | .029 |
| 321  |       |        |        |         |         |        |         |         |        |          |        |          |         | .000  | .029 |
| 373  |       |        |        |         |         |        |         |         |        |          |        |          |         |       | .000 |
| Tabl   | • 5 C | enetic | dictor | neo val | 1106 91 | nong / | \ rizon | a culti | vor or | nd ite d | Joriva | tivo lii | 106 r06 | hotle | from |

 Table 5. Genetic distance values among Arizona cultivar and its derivative lines resulted from

 gamma rays and EMS exposure at Different levels

 A=Arizona

| gamma rays and EMS exposure at Different levels. A–Arizona |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Lines  | Α    | 153  | 165  | 180  | 222  | 270  | 207  | 254  | 170  | 262  | 261  | 459  | 474  | 463  | 551  |
| Α  | .000 | .059 | .091 | .152 | .158 | .152 | .161 | .176 | .125 | .125 | .226 | .125 | .188 | .152 | .241 |
| 153  |      | .000 | .086 | .143 | .200 | .200 | .212 | .222 | .176 | .176 | .273 | .176 | .235 | .200 | .290 |
| 165  |      |      | .000 | .176 | .179 | .176 | .125 | .143 | .152 | .091 | .250 | .152 | .212 | .176 | .267 |
| 180  |      |      |      | .000 | .179 | .176 | .313 | .200 | .273 | .273 | .313 | .273 | .273 | .294 | .333 |
| 222  |      |      |      |      | .000 | .128 | .243 | .150 | .211 | .158 | .243 | .158 | .211 | .179 | .314 |
| 270  |      |      |      |      |      | .000 | .125 | .086 | .152 | .212 | .250 | .212 | .273 | .235 | .267 |
| 207  |      |      |      |      |      |      | .000 | .091 | .097 | .161 | .200 | .226 | .290 | .250 | .214 |
| 254  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | .000 | .118 | .176 | .212 | .235 | .294 | .257 | .226 |
| 170  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | .000 | .125 | .097 | .125 | .188 | .152 | .103 |
| 262  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | .000 | .161 | .063 | .125 | .091 | .241 |
| 261  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | .000 | .097 | .097 | .125 | .143 |
| 459  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | .000 | .063 | .030 | .172 |
| 474  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | .000 | .030 | .241 |
| 463  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | .000 | .200 |
| 551  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | .000 |

# REFERENCES

1. Afrasiab, H. and J. Iqbal. 2012. Genetic analysis of somaclonal variants and induced mutants of potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.) cv. Diamant using RAPD markers. Pak. J. Bot. 44(1): 215-220

2. Al-Safadi, B. and M. Arabi. 2007. *In vitro* induction, isolation, and selection of potato mutants tolerant to salinity. Advances in Horticultural Science. 20(5): 127-132

3. Ashraf, M., A. Cheema, M. Rashid, and Z. Qamar. 2003. Effect of  $\gamma$ -rays on M1

generation in basmati rice. Pak J Bot, (35): 791-795

4. Bado, S., M.A. Rafiri, K. El-Achouri, E. Sapey, S. Niele, A.M.A. Ghanim, B.P. Forster, and M. Laimer. 2016. *In vitro* methods for mutation induction in potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.). African Journal of Biotechnology. 15(39): 2132-2145

5. Bornet, B., F. Goraguer, G. Joly, and M. Branchard. 2002. Genetic diversity in European and Argentinian cultivated potatoes (*Solanum tuberosum* subsp. tuberosum) detected by inter-simple sequence repeats (ISSRs). Genome. 45(3): 481-484

6. Chaudhry, B., A. Yasmin, T. Husnain, and S. Riazuddin. 1999. Mini-scale genomic DNA extraction from cotton. Plant Molecular Biology Reporter. 17(3): 280-280

7. Chen, G., M. Sagi, S. Weining, T. Krugman, T. Fahima, A.B. Korol, and E. Nevo. 2004. Wild barley *eibi1* mutation identifies a gene essential for leaf water conservation. Planta. 219(4): 684-693

8. Chepkoech, E., M.G. Kinyua, O. Kiplagat, J. Ochuodho, S. Kimno, and L. Boit. 2018. Assessment of Genetic Variability Estimates of Selected Traits in Irish Potato Mutants. Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology

9. Das, A., S. Gosal, J. Sidhu, and H. Dhaliwal. 2000. Induction of mutations for heat tolerance in potato by using *in vitro* culture and radiation. Euphytica. 114(3): 205-209

10. Feltran, J., L. Lemos, and V. RL. 2004. Technological quality and utilization of potato tubers. Sci Agric. 6(61): 598-603

11. Hamideldin, N. and O. Hussien. 2013. Morphological, physiological and molecular changes in *Solanum tuberosum* L. in response to pre-sowing tuber irradiation by gamma rays. American Journal of Food Science and Technology. 1(3): 36-41

12. Kavacs, E. and A. Keresztes. 2002. Effect of gamma and UV-B/C radiation on plant cell. Micron, (33): pp: 199-210.

13. Khierallah, H. and H. Jawad. 2018. Evaluation response of eight potato cultivars *in vitro* growth under salt stress condition. Iraqi Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 48(6 B): 1612-1623 14. Mahgoub, H., G. Eisa, and M. Youssef. 2015. Molecular, biochemical and anatomical analysis of some potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.) cultivars growing in Egypt. Journal of Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology. 13(1): 39-49

15. Moon, K.-B., D.-J. Ahn, J.-S. Park, W.Y. Jung, H.S. Cho, H.-R. Kim, J.-H. Jeon, Y.-i. Park, and H.-S. Kim. 2018. Transcriptome profiling and characterization of drought-tolerant potato plant (*Solanum tuberosum* L.). Molecules and Cells. 41(11): 979

16. Morshad, M.N. 2014. *In vitro* Regeneration Potentiality of Potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.) Cultivars Under Different Chemical Mutagens. Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding, Bangladesh Agricultural University

17. Mtawj, W. 2017. *In vitro* Induction and Chemical Mutagenesis for Salt Tolerance Mutants Isolation in Potato (Cv. Mafrona), in Department of Horticulture. University of Tishreen: Faculty of Agriculture

18. Nei, M. and W. Lei. 1979. Mathematical model for studying genetic vartiation in terms of restriction endonucleases Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 76: 5269-52737

19. Olsen, K.M. and J.F. Wendel. 2013. A bountiful harvest: genomic insights into crop domestication phenotypes. Annual Review of Plant Biology. 64: 47-70

20. Semagn, K., Å. Bjørnstad, and M. Ndjiondjop. 2006. An overview of molecular marker methods for plants. African Journal of Biotechnology. 5(25).

21. Simakove, E., B. Anisimov, A. Mityushkin, and A. Zhuravlev. 2018. Results of new trends of potato breeding programs developed in Russia. The Iraqi Journal of Agricultural Science. 49(4): 592.

22. Sobieh, S.S., A. El-Fiki, Z.M. Adam, T.R. Mohamed, and A.S. Awad. 2018. Molecular diversity and phenotypic responses of two *in vitro Solanum tuberosum* varieties by physical mutagen. Caryologia. 71(4): 289-297

23. Somalraju, A., K. Ghose, D. Main, B. Bizimungu, and B. Fofana. 2018. Development of pre-breeding diploid potato germplasm displaying wide phenotypic variations as induced by ethyl methane sulfonate mutagenesis. Canadian Journal of Plant Science. 99(2): 138-151

24. Taheri, S., T.L. Abdullah, Z. Ahmad, and N.A.P. Abdullah. 2014. Effect of acute gamma irradiation on Curcuma alismatifolia varieties and detection of DNA polymorphism through SSR marker. BioMed Research International. 2014 25. Ulukapi, K., B. Ozdemir, and A.N. Onus. 2015. Determination of proper gamma radiation dose in mutation breeding in eggplant (*Solanum melongena* L.). Adv. Environ. Agric. Sci: 149-153

26. Wang, Y., X. Chen, and C.B. Xiang. 2007. Stomatal density and bio-water saving. Journal of Integrative Plant Biology. 49(10): 1435-1444.