

Molecular Research To Evaluate Glyphosate Resistance Mechanisms in Palmer Amaranth



**Colorado State University
USDA-ARS
Fort Collins, CO**

Collaborative Research Group




Phil Westra



Jan Leach



Dale Shaner



Scott Nissen



Sarah Ward



Stephen Chisholm



John McKay



**Stanley Culpepper, Ted Webster,
Tim Grey, William Vencill – Univ. of Georgia**



**Chris Preston
Univ. of Adelaide**



Pat Tranel - IL




Larry Steckel-TN



Alan York-NC



WE have 4,000 square feet of high quality greenhouse space





PA female flowers





PA male flowers

Assumptions

- Metabolism of glyphosate is not occurring
- No difference in uptake, absorption or translocation out of leaf (Culpepper, 2006)
- Focus of our research: target-site basis



Research Approaches

- Molecular research on possible resistance mechanisms
 - Molecular tools: RT-PCR, cloning, sequencing
 - Shikimate assay
- Genetic basis
 - Gene action and copy number
- Pollen-mediated transfer of resistance trait to other *Amaranthus* species

Shikimate Assay

- Glyphosate inhibits EPSPS and is competitive with PEP for binding
- When susceptible plant leaf discs are treated with glyphosate
 - Shikimate accumulates
- When resistant Palmer amaranth leaf discs are treated with glyphosate
 - Shikimate does not accumulate
 - Does not necessarily mean that EPSPS in resistant plants is not sensitive to inhibition


Shikimate Assay Methods

Shaner et al. 2005


- Micro-titer plate assay
- Wells have range of glyphosate concentrations, typically 0 to 500 μM
- We use formulated glyphosate
- Buffer can be water only, ammonium phosphate, or MES
- Leaf discs are incubated under light for 16 hours
 - Can use sucrose with no light
- Use two or three reps per plant
- Sample young, expanding leaves
- Use 0 μM as background
- Establish shikimate standard curve in the same buffer
- Measure absorbance at OD 380
- Calculate ng shikimate per μL that have accumulated above the background level

Leaf Disc Assay






Shikimate Assay - Theory



Change in OD 380 absorbance



Susceptible


Resistant

μM glyphosate


Assay Questions

- MES, ammonium phosphate, or water
 - Does buffer influence shikimate accumulation
- Sucrose and light
 - Can you run the assay without light incubation


Shikimate Accumulation in MES and
Ammonium Phosphate Buffers, 0.5% Sucrose,
Light Incubation 16 hours, 50 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ Ampicillin
Glyphosate: 0, 15.6, 31.3, 62.5, 125, 250, 1000, 10,000 μM
Run #1



Run #2



- More shikimate accumulates in susceptible and resistant plants with ammonium phosphate
- Overall results are similar with both buffers – resistant can be distinguished from susceptible



Pros and Cons

- Non-destructive
- Has utility for screening plants from the field
- Fast, easy, reliable
- Can use sucrose and avoid light requirement
- Dose-dependent response
- We have used it to phenotype plants for crossing
- Theoretically it should work across species
- In reality, you have to try it to see how a species responds
- Difficult to compare a dose from assay to a field application rate

Resistance Mechanism

- Initial hypothesis: Single amino acid change in EPSPS in resistant plants
- Methods
 - Extract RNA from resistant and susceptible plants
 - Make cDNA using Reverse Transcriptase
 - Design primers based on known *Amaranthus* and *Arabidopsis* sequences
 - Amplify gene, clone, and sequence

Approach:

Align sequences...

Arabidopsis	GGTGCTGATGTTGAATGTACTCTTGGCACTAACTGCCCTCCTGTTTCGTGTCAACGCTAAT	720
Amaranthus	GGTTCAGATGTTGACTGTTTTCTTGGCACAAATTGCCCTCCTGTTTCGGGTCAATGCTAAA	357
	*** * ***** ** ***** ** ***** ***** *****	
Arabidopsis	GGTGGCCTTCCTGGTGGAAAGGTGAAGCTTTCTGGATCTATTAGTAGTCAGTACTTGACC	780
Amaranthus	GGAGGCCTTCCAGGGGGCAAGGTCAAGCTCTCTGGATCGGTTAGTAGCCAATATTTAAC	417
	** ***** ** ** ***** ***** ***** ***** ** ** ** *	

...design primers flanking conserved region

• amplified fragment contains Pro of interest



A. palmeri



Extract
RNA



Make cDNA w/
reverse
transcriptase

R and S



Extract
DNA




Test primers
by PCR
(or RT-PCR)



EPSPS Gene Structure

- 8 exons, 7 introns



Exon:

Transcribed and

Intron: Transcribed

but not translated



Candidate mutation in plant EPSPS – Proline 106


Species with P106 change: goosegrass in Malaysia, rigid ryegrass in Australia, and Italian ryegrass in Chile

3-D threading of Palmer
sequence on crystallized
E. coli structure 2AA9

Arg/Lys

PEP &
Glyphosate
binding

UCSF Chimera




Sequencing Conclusion

- One mutation found in Palmer amaranth resistant EPSPS
 - From arginine to lysine
- This mutation is not likely responsible
 - Occurs on outside of enzyme
 - Located in a highly variable region within a highly conserved enzyme
 - Some susceptible species have lysine at the same position

Expression Level

- Over-expressing EPSPS conferred glyphosate tolerance in transgenic plants (Klee 1987)
- EPSPS is under transcriptional regulation in plants
 - Existing mechanism to up-regulate transcription
 - Resistant plants could either have increased transcription, or reduced negative regulation of EPSPS
- Hypothesis: Resistant plants exhibit higher levels of EPSPS transcript than susceptible
- Method: Semi-quantitative RT-PCR from cDNA
 - Not as good as quantitative real time PCR
 - Good way to start


EPSPS:18S rRNA Ratio




Glyphosate Uptake and Desorption

- Glyphosate must translocate to its site of action in the chloroplast
- Hypothesis: Resistant plants may have reduced glyphosate concentration in chloroplasts by
 - Sequestering glyphosate in vacuole
 - Pumping out of chloroplast
 - Pumping out of cytoplasm into apoplast
- Do resistant and susceptible plants uptake ^{14}C glyphosate equally in leaf disc assay?


Possible Cellular Mechanisms



Glyphosate Uptake in Georgia Palmer Amaranth
Leaf Discs Over Time
Experiment #2




Shikimate Accumulation in Georgia Palmer amaranth
Leaf Discs Over Time
Experiment #2



- **Glyphosate taken up into R and S leaf discs**
- **Shikimate accumulates in S, but not in R at 250 µM**

- Agrees with previous work in Georgia
- Leaf disc assay works well for measuring uptake
- Difficult to determine whether chloroplast uptake is different using this method

Shikimate Accumulation in 10 mM Ammonium Phosphate
Buffer, 0.5% Sucrose, 50 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ Ampicillin, Range of DMSO
Concentrations, Light Incubation 16 hours



DMSO does not appear to release glyphosate from vacuole to make it available for EPSPS inhibition and cause shikimate accumulation in resistant plants

Resistance Mechanisms Summary

- A mutation in EPSPS is unlikely to be the mechanism
- Some data to support that increased levels of EPSPS transcript are involved in mechanism
 - More experiments planned
- Uptake of ^{14}C in leaf discs similar
 - Inconclusive as to whether cellular localization is different
 - More experiments planned

Proposed Mechanism


- Resistant plants produce more EPSPS
 - More pre-EPSPS and mature EPSPS is available to bind glyphosate in cytoplasm and chloroplast
- Resistant plants may have a mechanism to exclude glyphosate from the chloroplast, reducing the concentration of glyphosate at the target site
- Combination of exclusion and increased EPSPS permits shikimate pathway function

Planned Experiments

- Measure EPSPS transcription and shikimate accumulation following foliar glyphosate application
 - Resistant, Susceptible, Heterozygous F1
 - Segregating F2 population
 - Determine whether increased EPSPS level is associated with resistance
- Quantify glyphosate concentration in the chloroplasts of R and S plants
 - Methods still to be determined, will involve isolating chloroplasts

Genetics Research

- Diallel using resistant and susceptible as male and female parents
 - F1, backcross and F2 populations
- Crosses made by bagging female flowers and hand-pollinating
- At least two different plants for each cross




Segregating Population – Use to determine gene number and action

Crossing Technique



F₁ data indicate gene is partially dominant



**Species: Powell amaranth, spiny amaranth,
waterhemp, redroot pigweed, smooth pigweed**

Hand Crosses

**Putative hybrids
with spiny
amaranth, Powell
amaranth, and
smooth pigweed**

Field Study

Year 1

Year 2

Screening seeds

**Putative hybrids
identified using foliar
glyphosate screen**

**Using PCR markers
to verify**

Gene Flow Study - 2006 & 2007




Methods

- Species used:
 - Waterhemp (2)
 - Smooth pigweed (2)
 - Spiny amaranth
 - Redroot pigweed
 - Powell amaranth (2)
 - Palmer amaranth (2)
- Seed sources: USDA-GRIN, Ames, IA; Kansas State U.; U. of Georgia








**Resistant Palmer
amaranth males**


Harvest







Average Seeds Per Plant



High throughput screening – over 10,000 seeds screened per plant from gene flow study
Example: Seeds from susceptible Palmer amaranth in study



Putative Hybrids

Palmer/Powell




Spiny Amaranth

Palmer/Spiny



Change in OD 380 Absorbance



Conclusions

- Glyphosate resistance in GA Palmer amaranth appears to be due to complex and not yet fully understood mechanism(s)
- This project has provided excellent graduate student training
- This research may help in evaluating future cases of new glyphosate resistant weeds
- We thank Monsanto for their support of this research project