



INTERNATIONAL
SUNFLOWER ASSOCIATION
ISA

Proceedings

18th International Sunflower Conference

MAR DEL PLATA & BALCARCE - ARGENTINA

February 27 - March 1 / 2012


ASAGIR
ASOCIACION ARGENTINA DE GIRASOL

ISA Board

Carlos FEOLI, Argentina - President
André POUZET, France - CEO
Nikolai BOCHKARYOV, Russia
Maria JOITA-PACUREANU, Romania
Johan POTGIETER, South Africa
Gerald SEILER, USA
Dragan SKORIC, Serbia
Gian Paolo VANNOZZI, Italy
Felicity VEAR, France
Leonardo VELASCO, Spain
Yalcin KAYA, Turkey

ASAGIR Board

PRESIDENT

Ricardo Negri, Capelle Hnos

VICE PRESIDENT

Orlando Vellaz, Advanta Semillas

SECOND VICE PRESIDENT

Guillermo Pozzi

SECRETARY

Juan Carlos Arana, OMHSA

TREASURE

Ramiro Costa, Bolsa de Cereales

PRO SECRETARY

Carlos Sosa, Pannar SA

PRO TREASURE

Fernando Cozzi, Cargill SA

Norma Huguet

Luis Arias, Cazenave y Asociados

Alicia Rupel, Bolsa de Cereales de Bahía Blanca

José María Dodds, Nidera Semillas

Marcelo Morini, ArgenSun

Armando Casalins, Federación de Acopiadores

Antonio Hall

Raúl Tomás, SRA

Santiago Sanchez, AGD

Horacio Urpi

Hernán Busch, Banco de Galicia

Jorge Harguindeguy, AACREA

Local Organizing Committee

Antonio Hall (President) *

Carlos Feoli (ISA President) *

Ezequiel Fonseca *

Archibaldo Salvador *

José Dodds *

Pablo Paoloni

Norma Huguet

Florencia Bedacarratz

Ramiro Costa

Carlos Sosa

Facundo Quiroz

Javier Mallo

Daniel Alvarez

Daniel Funaro

Mariano Martín Sposaro

Jorge Moutous

Marcelo Morini

Arnaldo Vázquez

Marisa Della Maddalena

Maria Carolina Alegre

* Executive Committee

International Steering Committee

Dr. Antonio Hall (Argentina)

Dr. Ruth Heinz (Argentina)

Dr. Luis Aguirrezabal (Argentina)

Dr. Loren Rieseberg (Canada)

Dr. Leonardo Velasco (Spain)

Dr. Felicity Vear (France)

Program Committee

Dr. Luis Aguirrezábal (co-chair)

Dr. Miguel Cantamutto (co-chair)

Dr. Antonio Hall

Dr. Ruth Heinz

Dr. Carlos Sala

Dr. Abelardo De La Vega

Ms. Amelia Romano

Dr. Mónica Poverene

Mr. Guillermo Pozzi

Dr. Pablo Calviño

Dr. Alberto Escande

Dr. María Eugenia Bazzalo

Dr. Andrés Zambelli

Dr. Sergio Alemano

Foreword

The International Sunflower Association (ISA) and the Argentine Sunflower Association (ASAGIR) are pleased to present this guide to the 18th International Sunflower Conference.

At the time the main objectives for the meeting were defined, organizers aimed to provide a forum for the international sunflower research community with interest in any aspect of science and technology relating to the crop (in its oil-seed and confectionery variants) that would allow all involved to:

- Update knowledge in all fields of sunflower research since the previous conference held at Córdoba, Spain, June 2008;
- Review recent technological advances in sunflower production and identify knowledge gaps that require attention;
- Analyze the status and expectations for current and prospective demands for sunflower products;
- Provide a venue for workshops and special-interest meetings focusing on unresolved research, market, and production issues;
- Provide new generations with an opportunity to interact with global leaders in sunflower research.

The local Program Committee, with the help of the International Steering Committee, has developed a program covering the whole spectrum of relevant topics from genes and genomics through to field agronomy, crop protection, and industry and market issues. The program comprises 14 plenary and 13 invited presentations, 14 short oral presentations, an exhibition of 160 posters that can be visited during each of the first three days of the meeting. In addition, there will be three associated workshops (Bird Damage, Breeding, International Sunflower Genome Initiative), a special-interest presentation of the Global Crop Diversity Trust, and facilities will be available on request for small groups who wish to discuss business or scientific topics.

On the last day of the meeting, the Conference Field Day will be held at the joint INTA-Universidad de Mar del Plata facility in Balcarce. This time the traditional Conference demonstration plots of hybrids from International Sunflower Association member countries and from the host country will be complemented by a broad range of demonstrations of production and management techniques, as well as demonstrations of research techniques in current use by Argentine sunflower research teams.

This Conference has been made possible by the work of many people, by the support of sponsors from both the public and the private sector (sponsors are recognized on the back covers of this guide) and last, but certainly by no means least, those responsible for the lectures, short oral presentations, posters, associated workshops and special interest meetings, and field and laboratory demonstrations that make up the rich and varied bill of fare for this Conference, as reflected in this guide. The Organizing Committee extends their heartfelt thanks to all these individuals and organizations.

ISA and ASAGIR trust that this guide will enable all attendees to have an interesting and fruitful 18th International Sunflower Conference.

Welcome

It has been 27 years since the 11th International Sunflower Conference was held in Mar del Plata, Argentina, March 10-13, 1985. Since then, very many things have changed in the world of sunflower science, technology, and crop production and management. As the global sunflower community reconvenes once again in the same city, its members will have the opportunity to review progress in the last four years, which has been substantial in many areas.

Mar del Plata, a vibrant city located by the sea, with a fishing port, good restaurants, an unusually good choice of golf courses, and kilometers of sandy beaches, together with Balcarce, provide excellent venues for the Conference lectures and Field Day, and will allow attendees to appreciate a unique combination of seas, hills and Pampas. It is a great pleasure for the Organizing Committee to be able to host attendees to this meeting, which we hope will be both enjoyable and fruitful.

Welcome to Argentina, to Mar del Plata and Balcarce, and to the 18th International Sunflower Conference.

Screening perennial *Helianthus* species for powdery mildew

Boško Dedić, Sreten Terzić, Jovanka Atlagić, Dragana Miladinović, Jelena Mrđa, Sonja Tančić, Vladimir Miklič

Institute of Field and Vegetable Crops, Maksima Gorkog 30, 21000 Novi Sad, Serbia,
bosko.dedic@ifvcns.ns.ac.rs

ABSTRACT

- Powdery mildew (*Erysiphe cichoracearum*) has been reported as a potential constraint for sunflower growing in regions with warm climate. Severity of disease varies depending on the sunflower genotype. Aim of this research was to determine response of wild *Helianthus* species grown in IFVC wild species collection to powdery mildew, as there are not many references on the reaction of wild sunflowers to this disease.
- Disease severity was recorded in naturally infected field during four year period. Total of 23 *Helianthus* spp. (333 accessions) were included in the survey.
- Reaction to powdery mildew varied among years and species with the highest occurrence of disease in 2011. There was significant difference in disease occurrence among accessions of the same species. During 4-year survey period, powdery mildew was not recorded in 6, 10 and 6 accessions of *H. decapetalus*, *H. divaricatus*, and *H. laevigatus*, respectively. Moreover, complete absence of disease was registered in another 10 species represented by one or two accessions. Accessions of other surveyed species differed in susceptibility and percentage of susceptible ones varied between 50% for *H. giganteus* and 89% for *H. tuberosus*.
- In conclusion, significant difference in reaction of tested perennial *Helianthus* species to powdery mildew was found. This difference was also observed among accessions of some of the tested species. However, in some species all tested accessions were resistant to powdery mildew.
- This research will contribute to the knowledge on reaction of wild perennial sunflower species to powdery mildew and their more extensive use in cultivated sunflower breeding for resistance to this disease.

Key words: *Helianthus* spp. - powdery mildew – resistance

INTRODUCTION

Powdery mildew is commonly found in majority of countries with sunflower crop production (Acimovic, 1998). Three fungal species are identified from diseased sunflower leaves and *Erisiphe cichoracearum* is most commonly found (Gulya et al., 1997). Strains of *E. cichoracearum* from various hosts differ in ability for cross infection (Yearwood, 1957; Kolte, 1985). Moreover, it was reported by Zeller and Levy (1995) that this fungal species is a complex of morphologically similar, but host-limited forms. Identification of pathogen is now easier using an effective technique based on ITS sequence analysis which have been developed for easy detection and differentiation of *E. cichoracearum* and *Sphaeroteca fuliginea* (Chen et al., 2008). Two other species *Leveillula compositarum* and *Sphaeroteca fuliginea* are creating similar symptoms as *E. cichoracearum* does, although they have somewhat limited geographical range (Gulya et al., 1997).

Damage due to disease is more likely to happen in tropical rather than in temperate regions. Development of disease is enhanced by dry and warm weather. Recently, severe occurrence of sunflower powdery mildew has been reported in India (Dinesh et al., 2010).

Wild sunflower species are used as a source of resistance genes for control of fungal diseases such as downey mildew or sunflower rust. Differences in susceptibility of accessions of wild sunflowers to biotic stress are extensively exploited in breeding programs. Differences in resistance to powdery mildew are also observed among species from the genus *Helianthus*. Resistance to *E. cichoracearum* has been found in 14 perennial and 2 annual species (Salman et al., 1982). Moreover, resistance to this pathogen was found in some accessions of *H. tuberosus*, *H. praecox*, *H. bolanderi* and *H. praecox* (Acimovic, 1998). Resistance found in annual *H. debilis* subsp. *debilis* was described as incompletely dominant and transferred into *H. annuus* (Jan and Chandler, 1985).

The objective of this study is to determine variability of perennial wild sunflower species in susceptibility to *E. cichoracearum*.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Tested plant material included 23 perennial species from genus *Helianthus* with total of 333 accessions that are part of IFVCNS wild sunflower species collection (Table 1).

The plants of each accession were grown in small plots, 0.8 m width and 3.6 m in length, with nylon bedding to prevent uncontrolled spread via underground parts. Presence of powdery mildew on plants under natural infection was evaluated in four consecutive years, in period 2008-2011. Depending on the accession, 7 to 10 plants, were evaluated for disease severity using scale 0-3 (0 – no infection; 1 – a few colonies of *E. cichoracearum* (less than 10% of leaf area) on the bottom leaves; 2 – colonies covering 11-50% of the leaf area; 3 – colonies covering more than 50% of the leaf area)(Saliman et al., 1982). Disease index was calculated for each accession averaging disease severity ratings. The screening was done in physiological maturity or after flowering for late-flowering accessions. Based on disease index, which is calculated by averaging ratings of disease, accessions were grouped as resistant (R; index 0-1) or susceptible (S; index > 1).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Extensive appearance of powdery mildew was not detected only in 2009. Therefore, data from that year were excluded. First appearance of the disease during other three years was noticed in the second half of vegetation period and disease incidence was high enough for making distinction in susceptibility among accessions.

Resistance was detected in 124 accessions which makes a third of all tested accessions. Each of 23 species had at least one resistant accession (Table 2). In all tested accessions of *H. decapetalus*, *H. divaricatus*, and *H. laevigatus* powdery mildew was not recorded. Furthermore, there was no occurrence of disease in accessions of *H. californicus*, *H. eggertii*, *H. glaucophyllus*, *H. laetiflorus*, *H. microcephalus*, *H. multiflorus*, *H. resinosus*, *H. salicifolius*, *H. silphioides* and *H. smithii*. Saliman et al. (1982) reported, in conditions of natural infection, the same results for species *H. californicus*, *H. decapetalus*, *H. microcephalus* and *H. smithii*. In contrast to our results, Saliman et al (1982) have found species of *H. glaucophyllus*, *H. salicifolius* and *H. eggertii* highly susceptible. In our work there was complete absence of powdery mildew symptoms on the plants of these three species.

Table 1. Resistance of perennial *Helianthus* species expressed by number of resistant accessions

| Species | Number of tested accessions | Number of resistant accessions | Percentage of resistant accessions |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <i>H. californicus</i> | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| <i>H. decapetalus</i> | 6 | 6 | 100 |
| <i>H. divaricatus</i> | 10 | 10 | 100 |
| <i>H. eggertii</i> | 2 | 2 | 100 |
| <i>H. giganteus</i> | 16 | 8 | 50.0 |
| <i>H. glaucophyllus</i> | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| <i>H. grosseserratus</i> | 31 | 15 | 48.4 |
| <i>H. hirsutus</i> | 4 | 2 | 50.0 |
| <i>H. laetiflorus</i> | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| <i>H. laevigatus</i> | 6 | 6 | 100 |
| <i>H. maximilliani</i> | 35 | 18 | 51.4 |
| <i>H. microcephalus</i> | 2 | 2 | 100 |
| <i>H. mollis</i> | 8 | 3 | 37.5 |
| <i>H. multiflorus</i> | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| <i>H. nutalii</i> | 23 | 13 | 56.5 |
| <i>H. pauciflorus</i> | 5 | 3 | 60.0 |
| <i>H. resinosus</i> | 2 | 2 | 100 |
| <i>H. rigidus</i> | 9 | 3 | 33.3 |
| <i>H. salicifolius</i> | 2 | 2 | 100 |
| <i>H. silphoides</i> | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| <i>H. smithii</i> | 2 | 2 | 100 |
| <i>H. strumosus</i> | 21 | 6 | 28.6 |
| <i>H. tuberosus</i> | 144 | 16 | 11.1 |

Table 2. List of accessions which were resistant to powdery mildew based on three-year observation in field under natural infection

| IFVCNS number | PI | Disease index | IFVCNS number | IP | Disease index | IFVCNS number | IP | Disease index |
|------------------------|--------|---------------|------------------------|--------|---------------|------------------------|--------|---------------|
| <i>H. californicus</i> | | | 2081 | 547197 | 0 | 1962 | 531043 | 0 |
| 772 | - | 0 | 2094 | 547201 | 0 | 292 | - | 0 |
| <i>H. decapetalus</i> | | | <i>H. hirsutus</i> | | | 239 | - | 0.2 |
| B | - | 0 | 1536 | 468738 | 0 | 1514 | 468795 | 0 |
| 1882 | 503258 | 0 | 2092 | 547204 | 0 | 1989 | 531049 | 0 |
| 1922 | 503246 | 0 | <i>H. laetiflorus</i> | | | <i>H. pauciflorus</i> | | |
| 1926 | 503248 | 0.1 | 655 | 435710 | 0 | 2228 | - | 0 |
| 1884 | 503240 | 0 | <i>H. laevigatus</i> | | | 2207 | - | 0 |
| 1887 | 503242 | 0 | 1618 | 468740 | 0 | 2099 | 586909 | 0 |
| <i>H. divaricatus</i> | | | 1871 | 503226 | 0 | <i>H. resinosus</i> | | |
| 1948 | 503216 | 0 | 1874 | 503227 | 0 | 1597 | - | 0 |
| 1876 | 503210 | 0 | 1875 | 503228 | 0 | 1545 | 468879 | 0 |
| 1955 | 503217 | 0 | 1620 | 468742 | 0 | <i>H. rigidus</i> | | |
| 1881 | 503211 | 0 | 1619 | 468741 | 0 | 1696 | - | 0 |
| 1885 | 503212 | 0 | <i>H. maximilliani</i> | | | 1911 | 503234 | 0 |
| 1873 | 503209 | 0 | 34 | - | 0 | 1 | - | |
| 830 | 435675 | 0 | m | - | 0 | <i>H. salicifolius</i> | | |
| 2056 | 547171 | 0 | 33-001 | - | 0 | X | - | 0 |
| 2082 | 547173 | 0 | 41 | - | 0 | 241 | 435872 | 0 |
| 2085 | 547174 | 0 | 2031 | - | 0 | <i>H. silphoides</i> | | |
| <i>H. eggertii</i> | | | 2049 | - | 0.4 | 1539 | 468886 | 0 |
| 1626 | 2029 | 0 | 2087 | 547208 | 0 | <i>H. smithii</i> | | |
| X | - | 0 | 2219 | 586897 | 0 | 1603 | 468889 | 0 |
| <i>H. giganteus</i> | | | 2224 | 586900 | 0 | hn 2 1600 | - | 0 |
| 1616 | 468718 | 0 | 2234 | 586904 | 0 | <i>H. strumosus</i> | | |
| 1890 | 503221 | 0 | 2097 | 586891 | 0.3 | 1941 | 503253 | 0 |
| 1897 | 503223 | 0 | 2115 | 586894 | 0 | 2019 | 547212 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------|-----|-------------------------|--------|-----|---------------------|--------|-----|
| 2016 | 547178 | 0 | 2222 | 586899 | 0 | 1927 | 503249 | 0 |
| 2017 | 547179 | 0 | 2221 | 586898 | 0 | x-2 | - | 0 |
| 2018 | 547180 | 0.3 | 2226 | - | 0 | 2095 | 547226 | 0 |
| 2020 | 547181 | 0 | 2230 | 586902 | 0 | 1953 | 503259 | 0 |
| 2029 | 547184 | 0 | <i>H. microcephalus</i> | | | 2042 | 547216 | 0 |
| <i>H. glaucophyllus</i> | | | 1827 | 503231 | 0 | 2068 | 547221 | 0 |
| 1604 | 468721 | 0 | 1585 | 468752 | 0 | <i>H. tuberosus</i> | | |
| <i>H. grosseserratus</i> | | | <i>H. mollis</i> | | | 1698 | - | 0 |
| 2212 | 586890 | 0 | 1298 | 468759 | 0 | 1700 | - | 0.5 |
| 1690 | - | 0 | 361 | 435758 | 0 | 1699 | - | 0 |
| 1543 | 468726 | 0 | x | - | 0 | 15 | - | 0.2 |
| 1687 | - | 0 | <i>H. multiflorus</i> | | | 1959 | 503283 | 0 |
| 1685 | - | 0 | MUL RU | - | 0 | 8 | - | 0 |
| 2039 | 547193 | 0 | <i>H. nutalii</i> | | | 1704 | - | 0 |
| 2022 | 547185 | 0.2 | 2153 | - | 0 | 1628 | 468897 | 0 |
| 2025 | 547186 | 0 | 2133 | 597917 | 0 | Ns 2 | - | 0.2 |
| 2026 | 547187 | 0 | 1986 | 531045 | 0 | 2066 | 547241 | 0.2 |
| 2027 | 547188 | 0.3 | 1987 | 531047 | 0.3 | 2067 | 547242 | 0 |
| 2043 | 547195 | 0 | 1996 | 531050 | 0 | 2080 | 547247 | 0.1 |
| 2032 | 547190 | 0 | 1997 | 531051 | 0.2 | 2024 | 547227 | 0 |
| 2028 | 547189 | 0 | 2000 | 531053 | 0 | | | |
| 2091 | 547200 | 0* | 2001 | 531054 | 0 | | | |

* Results continues from the top of the next column

The species with the greatest number of susceptible accessions (128 or 88.9%) was *H. tuberosus*. Powdery mildew attack can be moderately severe in this species and there is a considerable genetic variation in resistance the gene pool (Kays and Nottingham, 2007). McCarter (1993) found three resistant *H. tuberosus* lines out of 36 tested which is in concordance to our results.

Resistance to powdery mildew is found in other *Helianthus* species with percentage of resistant accessions ranging from 28.6% for *H. strumosus* to 56.5% for *H. nutalii* (Table 1). Jan et al. (2008) reported differential reaction of *H. grosseserratus* and *H. maximilliani* similar to findings in our research. In addition to four previously mentioned species the ones with both resistant and susceptible accessions were *H. giganteus*, *H. hirsutus*, *H. mollis*, *H. pauciflorus* and *H. rigidus*. However, other researchers found *H. nutalii* and *H. grosseserratus* to be highly susceptible to powdery mildew in both field and greenhouse while *H. rigidus* had the symptoms of powdery mildew only after inoculation in the greenhouse (Saliman et al, 1982).

Colonies of *E. cichoracearum* on leaves were not recorded for majority of resistant accessions although they were planted in proximity to susceptible ones. Only small number of *H. tuberosus*, *H. nutalii*, *H. maximilliani*, *H. grosseserratus*, *H. giganteus* and *H. decapetalus* accessions had plants with limited area with symptoms of powdery mildew which explains low values of disease index (Table 2).

Accessions of tested wild sunflower species clearly differed in reaction to *E. cichoracearum*. For some tested species all accessions were found resistant while others have a certain number of susceptible accessions. None of examined species was completely susceptible. Future research should be focused on testing of accessions that were resistant in field under natural infection, using artificial inoculation in field and greenhouse.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The paper is a part of the research work on the project 31025, financed by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Serbia.

REFERENCES

- Acimovic, M. 1998. Bolesti suncokreta. Feljton, Novi Sad, Serbia.
- Chen, R. S., Chu, C., Cheng, C. W., Chen, W. Y., and J. G. Tsay. 2008. Differentiation of two powdery mildews of sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*) by a PCR-mediated method based on ITS sequences. *Eur. J. Plant. Pathol.* 121: 1-8
- Dinesh, B. M., Kulkarni, S., Harlapur, S. I., Benagi, V. I., and C. P. Mallapur. 2010. Prevalence of powdery mildew in sunflower growing areas in northtrn Karnataka. *Karnataka J. Agric. Sci.* 23: 521-523.
- Gulya, T., Rashid, K. Y., and S. Masirevic. 1997. Sunflower Diseases. p. In: A.A. Schneiter (ed.), *Sunflower Production and Technology. Agronomy Monograph 35.* ASA, CSSA and SSSA, Madison, WI, USA.
- Jan, C. C., and J. M. Chandler. 1985. Transfer of powdery mildew resistance from *Helianthus debilis* Nutt. into cultivated sunflower (*H. annuus* L.). *Crop. Sci.* 25: 664-666
- Jan, C. C., Seiler, J. G., Gulya, J. T., and F. Jiuhan. 2008. Sunflower germplasm development utilizing wild *Helianthus* species. p. 29-43. In: *Proc. 17th Int. Sunfl. Conf., Cordoba, Spain. Int. Sunfl. Assoc., Paris, France*
- Kays, J. S., and F. N. Nottingham. 2007. *Biology and Chemistry of Jerusalem Artichoke.* CRC Press, New York, USA
- Kolte, S. J. 1984. *Diseases of Annual Edible Oilseed Crops. Volume 3.* CRC Press, Inc. Boca Raton, Florida, USA
- McCarter, S.M. 1993. Reactions of Jerusalem artichoke genotypes to two rust and powdery mildew. *Plant Dis.* 77: 242-245
- Saliman, M., Yang, S. M., and L. Wilson. 1982. Reaction of *Helianthus* species to *Erisiphe cichoracearum*. *Plant Disease* 66: 572-573
- Zeller, K. A., and M. Levy. 1995. Intraspecies differentiation in the powdery mildew *Erisiphe cichoracearum* determined with rDNA RFLPs. *Molecular Ecology* 4: 277-284
- Yearwood, C. E. 1957. Powdery Mildews. *Botanical Review* 23: 235-301