

## Genetic Transformation of Rice: Problems, Progress and Prospects

Saroj Kumar Sah\*, Amandeep Kaur, Gurwinder Kaur and Gurvinder Singh Cheema

School of Agricultural Biotechnology, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana 141 004, Punjab, India

### Abstract

Plant genetic engineering has become one of the most important molecular tools in the modern molecular breeding of crops. Now a days, production of transgenic plants is a routine process in some crop species. Transgenes are delivered into plants to confer novel traits such as improving nutritional qualities, resistance to pests. It is possible to insert genes from plants at evolutionary distant from the host plant, as well as from fungi, viruses, bacteria and even animals. Genetic transformation requires penetration of the transgene through the plant cell wall, facilitated by biological or physical methods. Over the last few decades, a significant progress has been made in the development of new and efficient transformation methods. Despite a variety of available DNA delivery methods, *Agrobacterium* and Biolistic mediated transformation remain two predominantly applied approaches. The objective of this article is to review the currently used methods for genetic plant transformation, their biological requirements and critical parameters.

**Keywords:** Genetic transformation rice; *Agrobacterium*; Biolistic transformation.

### Introduction

Cereals are the most important source of calories to humans since rice, wheat and maize provide 23%, 17% and 10% calories globally [1]. Rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) is a well-known economical cereal, because it is a staple food included in the diet and most important source of food for more than half of the population. It has been reported that more than 90 per cent of the world's rice is grown and consumed in Asia, where it is a major source of income to rural people [2,3]. Adoption of green revolution varieties led to a drastic change in rice production. Between 1996 and 2011, the population of the low-income countries grew by 110 per cent, but rice production increased by 180 percent only from 257 million tons in 1996 to 718 million tons in 2011. Despite these advances in rice production, still 800 million people is not getting food every day. It is estimated to increase up to 25 per cent of rice production by the year 2030 [1]. This additional rice must be produced from good lands without opening up more fragile lands for rice cultivation. Agriculture production is decreasing due to biotic and abiotic stresses. The major abiotic stresses worldwide which cause threat to food security are high salinity, drought, submergence and cold [4-8]. Among these abiotic stresses, salinity is one of the major factors restricting productivity of crop plant worldwide [9]. Area under salt stress is increasing due to certain factors like climate change, rise in sea levels, excess irrigation without proper drainage in islands and underlying rocks rich in harmful salts. If current scenario will continue, 50 per cent of present cultivated land will be lost for agriculture by 2050 [10]. Therefore, abiotic stresses are one of the main concerns to fulfill the required food demand [11]. Rendering the problem will entail development of rice varieties, which have higher yields, excellent grain quality, and resistance to biotic and abiotic stresses.

Many breeding programs have been conducted to increase the environmental stress tolerance, pest and disease resistance to the crop. Although conventional breeding programs such as Conventional hybridization, hybrid breeding, wide hybridization and ideotype breeding have developed some rice varieties in addition to several lines have been released in the Philippines, Bangladesh and India [12] but the success rate of conventional breeding is not sufficient [12,13] to meet the requirements. So there is a need to develop rice varieties that can withstand high levels of salt, drought and water stress with optimal yield levels.

Therefore, it is of utmost important to augment the productivity of rice to cope with the increased threat of population boom which is expected to reach 9.1 billion by 2050. To combat these issues, various methods of conventional breeding programs have been deployed, albeit with little progress. In this aspect, genetic transformation can be integral tool in breeding strategies. It permits access to an unlimited gene pool through the transfer of desirable genes [14]. The development of plant transformation techniques during the past decades has made it possible to improve crop plants by introduction of cloned genes. The two most critical steps to be the master for transformation of plants are to transfer of foreign DNA into the plant cell and regeneration of plants from transformed cells [15]. The callus induction and regeneration in tissue culture of rice depend upon different factors like genotype, type of explants and media supplement like basal salts, organic component and growth regulator [16-19]. Development of genetically engineered plants with enhanced tolerance to abiotic and biotic stresses is the important challenges in plant biotechnology research. Rice transformation is a major goal in cereal biotechnology, because rice is world's most important food crop and it is also known as model of cereal genomics [20].

In early 1980s, genetic transformation of crop plants i.e. based on recombinant DNA technology was started and this offered an advantage of transferring novel genes across taxonomic boundaries unlike conventional breeding [3]. Genetic engineering has been used as a prominent tool for rice improvement. Although gene transformation in *japonica* rice is performed routinely in several laboratories, but the system in *indica* rice is more complicated [15]. Until now, the number of copies of a gene(s) inserted and chromosomal locations of the integrated genes are not controllable, the expression of the introduced

\*Corresponding author: Saroj Kumar Sah, School of Agricultural Biotechnology, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana 141 004, Punjab, India, Tel: +91-9779569724; E-mail: [saroj-biotec@pau.edu](mailto:saroj-biotec@pau.edu)

Received November 06, 2014; Accepted December 11, 2014; Published December 14, 2014

Citation: Sah SK, Kaur A, Kaur G, Cheema GS (2014) Genetic Transformation of Rice: Problems, Progress and Prospects. J Rice Res 3: 132. doi:10.4172/2375-4338.1000132

Copyright: © 2014 Sah SK, et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

genes varies among individual transformants. Therefore, a relatively large number of transgenic plants must be developed in order to select desirable transformants as well as to study the expression of introduced genes [21].

The most commonly used method for transformation are Biolistic approach and *Agrobacterium* mediated transformation. This review will summarise various gene delivery methods applied to improve rice traits. Subsequent molecular analysis of the transgenic rice will also be discussed. Additionally, it will consider the future prospects of transgenic researches on the crop.

## Genetic Transformation

### Purpose of genetic transformation

Main purpose of genetic transformation is to generate plants with useful phenotypes i.e. unachievable by conventional plant breeding, to correct faults in cultivars more efficiently than conventional breeding and to allow the commercial value of improved plant lines to be captured by those investing in the research more fully than is possible under intellectual property laws governing conventionally bred plants. Some reasons for genetic modifications are yield improvement, more resistant to disease and pest resistance, herbicides tolerance, better nutritional value, increased shelf life, better climatic survival by increasing tolerance to drought, flood or frosty conditions to allow the use of previously inhospitable land, higher crop yields, reduced farm costs, increased farm profit and improvement in health and environment..

### Biological requirements for transformation

The essential requirements in a gene transfer system for production of transgenic plants are availability of a target tissue including cells competent for plant regeneration, a method to introduce DNA into those re-generable cells and a procedure to select and to re-generate transformed plants at a satisfactory frequency.

### Methods of Genetic Transformation

#### *Agrobacterium* mediated genetic transformation

The soil pathogen *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* has been extensively studied since 1907, when it was identified as the causative agent of crown gall disease [22-24] Braun initially proposed the *Agrobacterium* as a source of a 'tumor inducing principle', possibly DNA, that permanently transformed plant cells from a state of quiescence to active cell division.

*A. tumefaciens* is a soil dwelling bacteria that naturally infect dicots and causes tumorous growth resulting in crown gall disease. Tumor formation results from incorporation of T-DNA (transfer DNA), a part of small independent DNA molecule outside the bacterial genome called Ti (tumor inducing) plasmid. Phenolic compounds exuded from plant wounds that stimulate the expression of *vir* genes, located on Ti plasmid and responsible for its excision, transfer and integration into plant genome. The natural capability of *Agrobacterium* was manipulated in plant transformation by replacing the genes causing tumorous growth by genes of interest [25]. However, *Agrobacterium* has a natural tendency to infect dicot plants, whereas, monocots including wheat were considered recalcitrant to *Agrobacterium* transformation. Therefore, most of the *Agrobacterium*-mediated transformation procedures were established for dicots, whereas, monocots including important cereals such as wheat, rice and maize lagged behind for a considerable time

[26-28]. Low frequency of T-DNA transfer into the target genome was the major limitation. Nonetheless improvements of co-cultivation conditions, use of acetosyringone, selection and regeneration methods for transformed tissues and incorporation of super binary vectors have helped in extending the host range of *Agrobacterium* to several monocots including important cereals.

*Agrobacterium* approach is the most popular method to deliver genes to plant cells because of its clean insertion, low-copy number of the inserted genes, easy to handle, higher efficiency, more predictable pattern of foreign DNA integration. Studies on *A. tumefaciens* provided the basis that has made this soil bacterium as dominant customer for plant transformation.

**Critical parameters to increase the efficiency of *Agrobacterium*-mediated genetic transformation are:** Concentration of *Agrobacterium* broth (in terms of OD), time of inoculation, time of co-cultivation, concentration of acetosyringone.

Optical density of *Agrobacterium* culture must be in the range of 0.4 to 1.00. During the *Agrobacterium* infection, OD<sub>600</sub> of the bacterial suspension must be adjusted within 1.0 because high concentrations of bacteria caused serious injury to callus thus lowering the transformation efficiency.

Co-cultivation duration (5-25min), exposure the explants to 0.4 OD *Agrobacterium* for 10 min was found to be optimum.

Co-cultivation period should be between 2 to 5 days. Co-cultivation for 2 days showed better infection without browning or *Agrobacterium* overgrowth.

Co-cultivation with filter paper increased transformation frequency because the filter paper prevented overgrowth of bacteria. In co-cultivation medium, use of cysteine reduces browning of the calli, and Acetosyringone as well as glucose to induce the *vir* gene activity. Concentration of acetosyringone should be between 100-150  $\mu$ M. But higher concentration of acetosyringone (200  $\mu$ M) in co-cultivation media resulted in lower frequency of regeneration likely due to necrotic effect of acetosyringone.

#### Biolistic Process (Particle Bombardment) mediated genetic transformation

Biolistic transformation was initially invented in 1987 by American Geneticist, Associate Professor John C. Sanford from Cornell University where he and his colleagues showed that small micro projectiles could be delivered into a cell without killing it. In this approach (Also called gene gun or particle bombardment), microscopic particles coated with the DNA fragment representing the desired gene are shot into the plant cells using a special device called gene gun. The key principle behind the gun is to accelerate particles by explosion. A small portion of the DNA which enters the cells becomes incorporated into the chromosomes of the plant cell. The gene gun technique helps to overcome some of the deficiencies of *Agrobacterium* method such as bacterial contamination, low-efficiency of transfer to cereal crops, and inconsistency of results. The tungsten was first used or DNA coating later on it was replaced by gold particles because tungsten could be oxidized easily and it was potentially harmful to the cell.

It has many advantages than other techniques like rapid gene transfer, efficient, non-specific to tissue, complex cloning strategies with no biological constraints or host limitations and simultaneous multiple gene transfer. There are no intrinsic vector requirements

so transgenes of any size and arrangement can be introduced, and multiple gene co-transformation is straightforward. It has bigger advantage that the delivered DNA can be manipulated to influence the quality and structure of the resultant transgene loci. This approach can be used for transfer of more than one gene simultaneously in a host plant. As many as 14 genes have been co-introduced in rice by this approach [29]. Nowadays, particle bombardment is the most efficient way to achieve plastid transformation in plants and is the only method

so far used to achieve mitochondrial transformation [30]. A genotype independent method for rice transformation was originally reported by Christou et al. [31] and it has been widely used throughout the world. Researchers at the International Rice Research Institute, Philippines, have used particle bombardment successfully to transform over 20 different cultivars adapted to different eco-geographic conditions. These cultivars have been transformed with a range of agronomically important genes like *psy*, *crt1*, *cry*, *ferritin*, *FRO2*, *Xa21*, *Bt*, *Chitinase*,

| Genotype  | Explants                             | Promoters       | Strain   | Plasmid   | Transgene  | Marker gene   | Transformation Efficiency  | Transgenic Analysis  | References                  |
|---|--------------------------------------|-----------------|----------|---|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Ratna (IET411)  | Seeds                                | 35S             | LBA4404  | pCAMBIA1301   | hpt  | Kanamycin<br>GUS  | 47%  | PCR Analysis   | Basu et al. [33]            |
| IRGA424   | Seeds                                | Mpi<br>ubi      | LBA4404  | pX2.H.C1mpi<br>Cry1Bgene<br>pC1300.ubi<br>Cry1B.nos | Cry1Aa<br>Cry1B  | GFP<br>hph  | 86.4%  | PCR Analysis   | Pinto et al. [34]           |
| IR36  | Mature seeds                         | 35S             | EHA105AL | pCAMBL 1301   | hpt  | Uid A   | 98% callus<br>induction  | PCR Analysis   | Krishnan et al. [35]        |
| Indica rice   | Mature seeds                         | 35S             | LBA4404  | pKhg4   | Cry1 Ac  | Hygromycin<br>resistance<br>gene  | -  | -  | Guruprasad et al. [36]      |
| IR64<br>Swarna<br>CSR10<br>PB1                          | Mature dry<br>seeds                  | 35S             | LBA4404  | pCAMBL<br>A1304                                     | Glyoxylase 1<br>(Bigly1)   | nptII<br>hptII<br>uidA<br>GFP   | Approximately<br>45%   | PCR Analysis   | Sahoo et al. [37]           |
| Bg 250  | Mature seeds                         | 35S             | GV3101   | pCAMBL<br>1303                                      | hptIV  | Hygromycin<br>GUS   | 20%  | GUS Analysis   | Ratnayaka et al. [38]       |
| Pusa Basmati 1  | Mature seeds                         | 35S             | LBA4404  | pCAMBIA 1301  | Am-SOD   | Kanamycin<br>resistance<br>genes<br>Hygromycin<br>resistance<br>genes   | Very good  | PCR Analysis<br>Southern blotting                                | Sarangi et al. [39]         |
| Kalizira<br>Radhunipagol<br>Tulsimala<br>Pusa basmati-1 | Mature embryo<br>with endosperm      | 35S             | EHA105   | pIG121-Hm   | Uid<br>hpt   | nptII   | 40-75%   | GUS assay  | Hossain et al. [40]         |
| Heugnam—byeo<br>Daesanbyeo                              | Scutellum of<br>mature rice<br>seeds | OsCc1<br>35S    | LBA4404  | pMJC-GB<br>pMJC-GH                                  | Isoflavone<br>synthase 2<br>Chalcone<br>reductase                        | bar<br>hpt  | 12.8%<br>(Hygromycin<br>At Callus<br>proliferation<br>stage<br>And<br>Phosphinothricin<br>At Shoot<br>regeneration<br>stage)<br>100% (for vice<br>versa) | RT-PCR   | Sohn et al. [41]            |
| HKR-46<br>HKR-126                                       | Seeds                                | EHA105          |          | pCAMBIA 1301  | Uid<br>Hygromycin<br>resistance gene<br>Carbenicillin<br>resistance gene | Hygromycin<br>resistance<br>gene<br>Carbenicillin<br>resistance<br>gene | 28.9%- 44.4%   | GUS Assay  | Saharan et al. [42]         |
| Taipei 309  | Mature zygotic<br>embryos            | Glutelin<br>35S | LBA4404  | pAGt1Fe<br>pAGt1Me                                  | Ferritin (pte)<br>Metallathionein-<br>like (rgMT)<br>Phytase (phyA)      | hptII<br>hptIV  |  | Western blot<br>Northern blot                                    | Lucca et al. [43]           |
| Senia<br>Tebre<br>Bahia                                 | Mature seeds                         |                 | LBA4404  | pTOK233   | GUS gene   | hpt<br>npt  | 5% (Tebra)<br>3% (Bahia,<br>Senia)   | Southern blot  | Pons et al. [44]            |
| Taipei 309<br>Pusa basmati 1<br>Tinawen                 | EC                                   |                 | LBA4404  | pTOK233   |  | hpt   |  | 16-31%(Taipei309)<br>12-21%(Pusa<br>basmati1)<br>10-19%(Tinawen) | Azhakanandam<br>et al. [45] |

|   |  |                   |                          |  |                            |                      |   |                              |                                     |
|---|--|-------------------|--------------------------|--|----------------------------|----------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Basmati 122<br>Tulsi<br>Vaidehi   | EC   |                   | LBA4404<br>A281          | pNO1   |                            | hpt                  | 4.3-5.5%  |                              | Datta et al. [46]                   |
| Jarah<br>Amaroo   | EC   |                   | EHA101<br>AGLO<br>AGL1   | p1G121-Hm<br>pTO134<br>pWBVec10a<br>pBS360<br>Pbs366 |                            | Hpt<br>bar           | >10%(Jarah)<br>2.8%(Amaroo)   |                              | Upadhaya et al. [47]                |
| DS20, OMCS96,<br>OMCS97, IR72,<br>IR64  | Mature seeds   | 35S<br>Ubiquitin  | LBA4404                  | PSBbarB-<br>Ubicore<br>And<br>Psb35L-Hyg-<br>L-Gus   | barB<br>Cre<br>Hyg<br>gusA | Nos                  | 1.78-13.33%   | Southern blot                | Hoa et al. [48]                     |
| R321  | SM   |                   | A2260                    | pGTGUSBAR  |                            | bar                  | 15-30% for PPT<br>resistant calluses                                |                              | Enriquez-<br>Obregon et al.<br>[49] |
| Pusa basmati  | EC   |                   | LBA4404                  | pTOK233  |                            | hpt                  | 25%   |                              | Mohanty et al.<br>[50]              |
| Seven elite lines<br>including koshihikari  | EC   |                   | EHA101                   | P1G12Hm<br>pGFPKH                                    |                            | hpt                  | 25-34%  |                              | Hashizume et al.<br>[51]            |
| Tapei 309   | EC<br>SDS  |                   | LBA4404                  | pTOK233  |                            | hpt                  | 2.3-3.6%  |                              | Khanna and<br>Raina [52]            |
| IR64<br>Karnal local  | EC<br>SDS  |                   | AGL1                     | pCAMIAI301   |                            | hpt                  | 2.3-3.6%  |                              | Khanna and<br>Raina [52]            |
| Nipponbare<br>Zhong8215<br>ZAU16<br>91RM<br>T8340<br>Pin92-528<br>T90502<br>Kaybonnet | Mature<br>Or Immature<br>embryos   | LBA4404<br>EHA105 | 35S<br>Bp10<br>Ubiquitin | PkUB<br>pKUC<br>pKSB<br>pKBB                         | Cri 1Ab<br>Cry1Ac          | GUS                  | 52-100%   | DNA and RNA blot<br>Analysis | Cheng et al.<br>[53]                |
| E-yi105<br>E-Wan5ZSWG<br>Pusa basmati<br>Tapei 309                                    | EC   |                   |                          | pTOK233  |                            | Hpt                  | 13.5% (Pusa<br>basmati)<br>9.1-13% (E-<br>yi105 and<br>E-Wan5ZSWG)  |                              | Zhang et al. [54]                   |
|   | PCIE   |                   | LBA4404                  | pTOK233<br>pBin93SQGusint<br>p1G12Hm                 |                            | hpt                  | A few events  |                              | Uze et al. [55]                     |
| Nipponbare<br>Kitaake   | Mature<br>seeds  |                   | EHA101                   | Nopaline<br>synthetase<br>Pubi-1                     | EHA101                     | PIG121Hm<br>pSMABuba | Hygromycin<br>resistance<br>gene<br>bialaphos<br>resistance<br>gene |                              | Toki et al. [56]                    |
| Basmati 370<br>Basmati 385  | Calli derived<br>from scutella   | 35S               | EHA101                   |  |                            | hpt<br>gus           | Hygromycin  |                              | Rashid et al.<br>[57]               |
| Tapei 309   | Calli derived<br>from scutella   | 35S               | LBA4404<br>EHA101        |  |                            | Hpt<br>gus           | Hygromycin  |                              | Deng et al. [58]                    |
| Gulfmont<br>Jefferson<br>Radon  | Immature<br>embryos  | 35S               | LBA4404                  |  |                            | Hpt<br>gus           | Hygromycin  |                              | Aldemita and<br>Hodges [59]         |
| TCS10<br>IR72<br>Maybelle   | Isolated<br>shoot apices   | Actin 1           | EHA101                   |  |                            | bar                  | PPT   |                              | Park et al. [60]                    |
| Radon<br>TCS10<br>IR72<br>Taipei 309  | FIIE   |                   | LBA4404<br>At656         | pTOK233<br>pCNL56                                    |                            | hpt                  | 27% (Radon)<br>1-5% (TCS10<br>and IR72)                             |                              | Aldemita and<br>Hodges [59]         |
|   | EC   |                   | LBA4404                  | pTOK233  |                            | hpt                  |   |                              |                                     |
| Gulfmont<br>Jefferson   | EC   |                   | EHA101                   | PIG121Hm   |                            | hpt                  | 8.3-13.3%   |                              | Dong et al. [58]                    |
| Maybelle  | ISA  |                   | EHA101                   | pGSFR781<br>pBARNPT                                  |                            | bar                  | low   |                              | Park et al. [60]                    |
| Tsukinohikari<br>Asanohikari<br>Koshihikari   | Calli derived<br>from scutella,<br>immature<br>embryos,<br>suspension<br>cells | 35S               | LBA4404                  |  |                            | Hpt<br>gus           | Hygromycin  | Southern Analysis            | Hiei et al. [61]                    |

|  |   |                       |                         |                    |                            |           |   |                      |                        |
|--|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|-----------|---|----------------------|------------------------|
| Tsukinahikari<br>Asanohikari<br>Kashihikari  | EC<br>FIEE<br>SC                          |                       | LBA4404<br>EHA101       | pTOK233<br>pG121Hm |                            | hpt       | 12.8-28.6%  |                      | Hiei et al. [61]       |
| Shoot apices,<br>root segments<br>from young<br>seedlings, scutella,<br>immature embryos,<br>call, cells from<br>suspension cultures | Tuskinikari<br>Asanohikari<br>Koshihikari | EHA101<br>LBA4404     | p1G121Hm<br>pTOK233     | hpt                | GUS<br>Hygromycin          | Gus assay | 18.2-28.6%<br>(Tuskinikari)<br>12.8-19.5%<br>(Asanohikari)<br>17.6-18.8%<br>(Koshihikari) |                      | Hiei et al. [61]       |
| Tainung<br>62  | Precultured<br>immature<br>embryos        |                       | A281                    | pAG8               |                            |           | nptII   | A few events         | Chan et al. [62]       |
| Taichung native 1  | Roots from<br>germinate<br>seeds          | Nos<br>35S            | C58C1<br>LBA4404        |                    | nptII<br>gus               | G418      |   | Southern<br>Analysis | Chan et al. [62]       |
| Nipponbare<br>Fujisaka 5   | Mature embryo<br>from germinate<br>seeds  | Nos<br>35S            | LBA4404<br>A281<br>A856 |                    | NptII<br>Gus<br>onco genes | Kanamycin |   | Southern Analysis    | Raineri et al.<br>[62] |
| Tainung 62   | Cultured<br>immature<br>embryos           | nos<br>alpha-<br>amy8 | A281                    |                    | nptII<br>gus               | G418      |   |                      | Chan et al. [62]       |

**Table 1:** Trends in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) transformation through Agrobacterium-mediated genetic transformation.

*enod12*, *PEPC*, *glgC*, *rolC*, *sd1* confirming the genotype independence of the transformation method (For details see Table 1) [32]. The main disadvantages of particle bombardment in comparison with *Agrobacterium* i.e. the tendency to generate large transgene arrays containing rearranged and broken transgene copies, are not borne out by the recent detailed structural analysis of transgene loci produced by each of the methods.

Genetic transformation occurs in the two stages: DNA transfer into the cell followed by DNA integration into the genome. The integration stage is much less efficient than the DNA transfer stage, with result of that only a small proportion of the cells that initially receive DNA actually become stably transformed. In many cells, DNA enters but expressed for a short time (transient expression), but it is never integrated and it is eventually degraded by nucleases. Transient expression occurs almost immediately after gene transfer, it does not require the regeneration of whole plants, and it occurs at a much higher frequency than stable integration. Therefore, transient expression can be used as a rapid assay to evaluate the efficiency of direct DNA transfer and to verify the function of expression constructs. In addition, transient expression following particle bombardment with a reporter gene such as *gusA* or *gfp* is used routinely to compare different expression constructs and to identify those with most appropriate activities. When the aim is to extract recombinant proteins from transgenic plants, transient expression following particle bombardment may also be used to produce small amounts of protein rapidly for testing [63]. Hoffman et al. [64] used particle bombardment for the mechanical transmission of polioviruses and particle bombardment is routinely employed for the inoculation of whole plants and leaf tissues with viruses that are difficult to introduce via conventional mechanical infection. It also has an important role in extending virus-induced gene silencing (VIGS) into economically important crop plants [65].

### Critical parameters to increase transformation efficiency

**Type/physiological and developmental stage of the target tissue:** Embryogenic calli of rice have been extensively used in particle bombardment experiments. The calli should be young not more than 30 days old. If we use old calli, the transformation efficiency will be low as calli loses its regeneration capacity ultimately affecting transformation efficiency.

**Particle type/size, helium pressure and target distance on bombardment:** Efficiency of the DNA delivery to target cells depends largely upon the size of micro-particles and the force in which these DNA coated particles are pushed towards the target cells. The depth of penetration into the target tissues can be controlled by varying particle size, helium pressure and the target distance. The target distance has direct relation with target area i.e. lesser the target distance narrower is the target area and greater the target distance, wider is the target area. So these three parameters are important in determining optimal conditions for efficient DNA delivery to target cells/tissues.

**Effect of particle and DNA loads:** For obtaining high efficiency of DNA delivery to target tissues, different DNA to particle ratios has been used to determine a suitable combination. A particle load of 3 mg (0.5 mg/shot) is sufficient to produce high level of transient GUS expression during conjunction by 9 µg of DNA (1:3 particle-DNA ratio).

### In-Planta transformation

A number of advances in reducing the dependence to tissue culture have been made in rice transformation including, *in planta* transformation method. Cereal transformation via the tissue culture phase has been successful, but involves several limitations. The use of tissue culture allows selection of single transformed cells which are

regenerated in a whole plant. However, the tissue culture approach causes somaclonal variation due to both epigenetic effects and chromosomal rearrangements [66,67]. The *in planta* transformation method overcomes the disadvantages of the conventional *in vitro* *Agrobacterium*-mediated transformation method. The latter requires sterile condition, that is time consuming and causes somatic mutation or somaclonal variation in plant cells during *in vitro* culture, and some plants are recalcitrant to regeneration. In contrast, *in planta* transformation involves no *in vitro* culture of plants cells or tissue, which is its greatest advantage.

### Floral dip transformation

Clough and Bent [68] modified the *Agrobacterium* vacuum infiltration method to transform *Arabidopsis thaliana*. This process was eliminated in favor of simple dipping of developing floral tissues into a solution containing *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*, 5% sucrose and 500  $\mu\text{L}^{-1}$  of surfactant Silwet L-77. Sucrose and surfactant were critical to the success of the floral dip method. Plants inoculated when numerous immature floral buds and few siliques were produced transformed progeny at the highest rate. Plant tissue culture media, the hormone BAP and pH adjustment were unnecessary, and *Agrobacterium* could be applied to plants at a range of cell densities. Repeated application of *Agrobacterium* improved transformation rates and overall yield of transformants approximately two fold. Covering plants for 1 day to retain humidity after inoculation also raised transformation rates two fold.

Desfeux et al. [69] also investigated the mechanisms that underlie the floral-dip method for *Agrobacterium*-mediated transformation in *Arabidopsis* to facilitate its usage in other plant species. In manual outcrossing experiments, application of *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* to pollen donor plants did not produce any transformed progeny, whereas application of *Agrobacterium* to pollen recipient plants yielded transformants at a rate of 0.48%. Their results suggested that ovules were the site of productive transformation in the floral-dip method, and further suggested that *Agrobacterium* must be delivered to the interior of the developing gynoecium prior to locule closure.

Rod-in et al. [70] reported *Agrobacterium-mediated* transformation method for rice carrying the *gusA* gene to infect rice spikelets via the floral-dip method. The tip-cut spikelets of the rice inflorescence stage 51 (beginning of panicle emergence: tip of inflorescence emerged from sheath) were dipped in the *Agrobacterium* and co-cultivated at 25 °C for 3 d. Floral dip approach transform primarily anthers and to a small extent the ovary. The highest transformation efficiency in case of anther was 89.16% whereas in case of ovary 7.23%. Their results suggest that floral-dip transformation is a simple potential tool for production of transgenic rice with no requirement of tissue culture.

Naseri et al. [71] demonstrated the inoculation of *A. tumefaciens* into embryonic apical meristem of the soaked seeds, a region on the seed surface where a shoot would later emerge and was pierced twice up to depth of about 1 to 1.5 mm with a needle (0.70 mm) dipped in the *A. tumefaciens* inoculum. The inoculated seeds were then placed on filter papers on wet per liter in flasks covered with aluminum foil and incubated at 23°C in dark for nine days that 70 to 75% of inoculated seeds are germinated to seedlings. PCR results showed that 24% plants inoculated with *Agrobacterium* integrated transgene.

**Critical parameters:** During the *agrobacterium* infection,  $\text{OD}_{600}$  of the bacterial suspension must be 1.0 for higher transformation.

### Source of Explants

Tissue culture which involves manipulating the totipotent nature of plant cells is one of the necessary technology for production of transgenic plants. For genetic transformation in different experiments, many types of explants has been used by researchers likewise mature seeds, mature zygotic embryos, immature embryos, mature embryos, calli, inflorescence, embryogenic apical meristem, spikelet, roots, isolated shoot apices (Tables 1-3).

### Vectors and Markers in Gene Transfer

In plant research, binary vectors are standard tools for delivery of a wide range of genes into the cells of higher plants [72]. This vector has certain important characters like multiple cloning sites, bacterial origin of replication, unique restriction sites and selectable marker gene cassettes enabling the recognition of untransformed cells. A selectable marker gene encodes a product that allows the transformed cell to survive and grow under conditions that kill or restrict the growth of non-transformed cells. The most used genes in rice are dominant selectable markers that confer resistant to antibiotics or herbicides i.e. *ble* (glycopeptides binding protein), *dhfr* (dihydrofolate reductase), *hpt* (hygromycin phosphotransferase), *nptII* (neomycin phosphotransferase), *bar* and *pat* (phosphinothricin acetyltransferase), *csr1-1* (acetolactate synthase), *tms2* (indolaacetic acid hydrolase) (For details see Table 1 [20]). In addition to selectable marker genes, plant researchers also used reporter genes known as screenable marker, a visual marker or a scorable marker, such as *gus A* ( $\beta$ -glucuronidase, GUS), *luc* (firefly luciferase), *gfp* (green fluorescent protein) (For details see Table 1) [20]. It generates a product that can be detected using a simple and often quantitative assay. It is mainly used for confirming transformation, determining transformation efficiency and monitoring gene or protein activity. It has ability to form fusion genes at the transcriptional level and it can be used to assay the activity of regulatory elements. It also forms translational fusion products, which allows them to be used, to monitor protein localization in the cell or at a whole-plant level.  $\beta$ -glucuronidase activity can be easily monitored within 1-2 days post co-cultivation in infected plant tissues by enzymatic conversion of colourless X-Gluc substrate to blue precipitates [73] so, it is a powerful assay for detecting transformation events.

Next major aspects of binary vector is the usage of constitutive promoters providing transgene expression in majority of the plant tissues. Studies have been done on rice transformation by using CaMV35s constitutive promoters. By using this promoter Brietler et al. [74] reported 70-80% genetic transformation for *yfp* and *hph* genes. Besides this promoter, there are many others has been used for genetic transformation in rice such as Actin 1, *ubi-1*, ubiquitin, OSCc1 (Tables 1-3).

### Transgenic Analysis

To confirm the real transgenic, efforts should be undertaken with a long term goal rather than just the analysis of the initial transformants. Development of transgenic plants is not only limited to the confinement of laboratory, it should have wider scope of application. So, to test the real transgenic we have to go for different complementary tests like GUS Assay, PCR, Semi-quantitative PCR, Quantitative Real Time PCR, Southern blotting, Western blotting, ELISA, Northern blotting. Most of the studies conducted molecular analysis of the primary transformants, rather than proceeding further. GUS analysis revealed transformation efficiency in wide range (7.23% to 95%) that has been shown by different studies by using different explants in various cultivars of rice [21,75-

| Genotype                        | Explant               | Promoter      | plasmid                        | Transgene                  | Marker gene                  | Efficiency   | Analysis  | References           |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|----------------------|
| MR219                           | Mature seeds          | 35S           | pCAMBIA1304                    | hptII                      | gusA<br>mgfp5                | Regenerability 100%  | Southern Analysis<br>GUS staining<br>RT-PCR<br>Fluorescence<br>microscopy<br>Stastical Analysis | Htwe et al. [78]     |
| Swarna Mahsuri                  | Mature seeds          | 35S           | pCAMBIA1301                    | Cry1Ac<br>hpt              | GUS<br>hygromycin            | Regeneration efficiency<br>Swarna (79.23%)<br>Mahsuri(86.07%)                        | GUS assay<br>Southern blot and<br>PCR Analysis  | Pravin et al. [79]   |
| PAU201                          | Mature seeds          | 35S           | pWRG1515                       | GUS                        | GUS                          | 32-39%   | GUS Assay   | Wani et al. [77]     |
| Rice cv. MR81 Taipei 309        | Mature seeds          | 35S           | pRQ6                           | hph                        | GUS                          | >95%   | GUS Assay   | Rahman et al. [76]   |
| BMS (black mexican sweet) Maize | Mature embryo         | 35S           | pRESQ70                        | HPH                        | GUS                          |  | PCR and southern analysis   | Sivamani et al. [81] |
| L1345 L3                        | Immature embryos      | 35S           | Pcambia3301                    | PAT                        | GUS                          | L1345 (20.23-49.38%)<br>L3 (25.19-69.02%)  | GUS Analysis  | Petrillo et al. [82] |
| Xiushui04 Jia59                 | Immature embryo       | 35S           | pCB1                           | bar                        |                              |  | Southern Analysis   | Zhao et al. [83]     |
| Rice cv. Chainat 1              | Mature seeds          | 35S           | PCAMBIA 1305.1                 | Chitinase                  | GUS<br>Hygromycin resistance | 100% at 9cm distance from<br>stopping screen to callus and<br>35.5%at 12 cm distance | PCR<br>Analysis   | Maneewan et al. [84] |
| Rasi Taipei309                  | Mature seeds          | 35S           | PUCGUS<br>pHX4                 | hph                        | GUS                          | Rasi (15.5-24.2%)<br>Taipei309 (33.3-37.55)  | GUS assay   | Ramesh et al. [86]   |
| Taipei309 Nippanbare            | Mature seeds embryos  | 35S           | pYEP<br>p1LTAB227              | Yfp<br>hph                 |                              | 70-80%   | Southern blot analysis  | Breitler et al. [74] |
| Eyi105 Ewan 5                   | Mature seeds          | 35S           | pJIMB15<br>pRSSGNA1<br>pAHXA21 | hpt<br>gusA<br>Xa21<br>gna | Hygromycin                   | Eyi105 (16%)<br>Ewan 5 (18%)   | PCR analysis<br>Dot and southern blot<br>analysis<br>RT-PCR Analysis<br>Genetic Analysis        | Tang et al. [88]     |
| IR64 IR72 Minghui 63 BG90-2     | seeds                 | 35S           | pC822<br>pHX4                  | Xa21<br>hph                | Hygromycin                   | IR64(91%)<br>IR72(100%)<br>Minghui 63(54%)<br>BG90-2 (100%)                          | Southern blot   | Zhang et al. [54]    |
| Jingyin 119 Zhongbai 4          | Immature embryos      | 35S<br>Act1   | pCB1                           | Cecropin<br>Bgene          | bar                          |  | PCR analysis<br>Dot and southern blot<br>analysis<br>Northern blot analysis                     | Danian et al. [89]   |
| Taipei 309 77125 Tetep TN1 8706 | Immature emryo Callus | Actin1<br>35S | pAct1D<br>pNG3<br>PMON410      | hph                        | GUS                          | Taipei 309 (25.6%)<br>8706 (31.0-42.3%)  | GUS<br>assay  | Li et al. [21]       |

**Table 2:** Trends in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) transformation through particle bombardment.

77]. PCR analysis showed various range of transformation efficiency i.e. 16%-100% [48-53]. Molecular analysis were carried out by most of the workers to check the integration pattern and copy number by southern blot analysis, northern and real time pcr [78,79,81-84].

## Future Prospects

As we look to the future of rice biotechnology, we have many transformation technique but till now no transgenic line of rice has been released successfully. Near about 100 genotypes have been used by different groups for transformation (Tables 1-3). Among them, Taipei 309 (*Japonica* rice) and Basmati (*Indica* rice) has been widely used in *Agrobacterium*-mediated genetic transformation with an efficiency of 31% and 40-75%, respectively. Though some reports has been shown that some of the transgenic line has been released. Gupta et al. [85] reported that Huaghi-1 Rice for insect resistance has been released by Huazhong Agricultural University, China. SO, we have to

focus on particular assay of that transgene which has been transferred along with series of confirmatory test. Ultimately we need high yield so, our main objective should be to check our transgene is working or not, which may not affect the yield. As for example, if we transfer salinity tolerance gene, we must go for salinity screening technique, in which transgenic line must show higher tolerance level in respect to wild. In most of the research this assay are lacking. So, to check or confirm real transgenic we must go for particular assay.

## Conclusion

In the present scenario, population growth is increasing day by day along with demand for food supply. Genetic transformation must be implemented to bridge the gap between production and human need. Whatever achievement has been done so far in transgenic, is not sufficient to fill the demand. The full realization of the plant biotechnology revolution depends on successful and innovative

| Genotype                           | Explants   | Promoters      | Strain  | Plasmid            | Transgene                 | Marker gene | Efficiency                    | Analysis                                | References            |
|------------------------------------|--|----------------|---|--------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| RD41                               | Rice spikelets   | 35S            | AGL1  | pCAMBIA1304        | hptII                     | gusA<br>gfp | Anther-89.16%<br>Ovary- 7.23% | Histochemical Gus assay                 | Rodin et al. [47]     |
| Zhong Zuo321<br>Nippanbare<br>IR64 | Antepenultimate emerged leaf of plantlets at tillering stage | Ubi-1<br>CsVMV | EHA101<br>AGL1<br>LBA4404<br>GV2200<br>GV3101 | pC5300<br>PB10S738 | UidA<br>Sc4A              | GUS         | -                             | Real time PCR Analysis                  | Andrieu et al. [87]   |
| Oryza sativa                       | Seeds  | 35S            | EHA101  | pAJ21              | TLPD34                    |             | 24%                           | PCR Analysis                            | Naseri et al. [71]    |
| Koshihikari                        | Embryonic apical meristem                                    | 35S            | M-21<br>LBA4404                               | P1G121Hm           | Hpr<br>nptII              | GUS         | 40-43%                        | PCR                                     | Supartana et al. [90] |
| Taipei 309                         | Inflorescence  | 35S            | LBA4404                                       | PJD4               | Bialaphos resistance gene | GUS         | -                             | GenomeDNA blot analysis<br>PCR analysis | Dong et al. [91]      |

**Table 3:** Trends in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) transformation through in-planta transformation.

research, as well as on favorable regulatory guidelines and public acceptance. Thus, all the strategies discussed in the present review will definitely contribute to biotechnological breeding programs of rice for its improvement.

### References

- Khush GS (2003) Productivity improvement in rice. *Nutritional Review* 61: 114-116.
- Datta SK (2004) Rice biotechnology: A need for developing countries. *Ag Bio Forum* 7: 31-35.
- Bakshi S, Dewan D (2013) Status of Transgenic Cereal Crops: A Review. *Clon Transgen* 3: 1.
- Epstein E, Norlyn JD, Rush DW, Kingsbury RW, Kelley DB, et al. (1980) Saline culture of crops: a genetic approach. *Science* 210: 399-404.
- Boyer JS (1982) Plant productivity and environment. *Science* 218: 443.
- Grover A, Minhas D (2000) Towards production of abiotic stress tolerant transgenic rice plants: Issues, progress and future research needs. *Proceedings of Indian National Science Academy (PINS)* B66: 13-32.
- Thakur P, Kumar S, Malik JA, Berger JD, Nayyar H (2010) Cold stress effects on reproductive development in grain crops: An overview. *Environmental and Experimental Botany* 67: 429-443.
- Mantri N, Patade V, Penna S, Ford R, Pang E (2012) Abiotic stress responses in plants: present and future. In: Ahmad P, Prasad MNV (eds.) *Abiotic stress responses in plants: metabolism, productivity and sustainability*. Springer, New York, pp. 1-19.
- Munns R, Tester M (2008) Mechanisms of salinity tolerance. *Annual Review of Plant Biology* 59: 651-681.
- Wang W, Vincur B, Altman (2003) Plant responses to drought, salinity and extreme temperature. es: Towards genetic engineering for stress tolerance. *Planta* 218: 1-14.
- Shanker A, Venkateswarlu B (2011) *Abiotic stress Response in Plants- Physiological, Biochemical and Genetic perspectives*. Intech Publishers.
- Ismail AM, Heuer S, Thomson MJ, Wissuwa M (2007) Genetic and Genomic approaches to develop rice germplasm for problem soils. *Plant Molecular Biology* 65: 547-570.
- Singh AK, Ansari MW, Preek A, Singla-pareek SL (2008) Raising salinity tolerant rice: Recent progress and future perspectives. *Physiology and Molecular Biology of Plant* 14: 23-32.
- Hiei Y, Ohta S, Komari T, Kubo T (1997) Transformation of rice mediated by *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*. *Plant Molecular Biology* 35: 205-218.
- Yookongkaew N, Srivatanakul M, Narangajavana J (2007) Development of Genotype independent regeneration system for transformation of rice (*Oryza sativa* ssp. *Indica*). *Journal of Plant Research* 120: 237-245.
- Abe T, Futsuhara Y (1984) Varietal differences in plant regeneration from root callus tissues of rice.
- Abe T, Futsuhara Y (1986) Genotypic variability for callus formation and plant regeneration in rice. *Theoretical Applied Genetics* 72: 3-10.
- Kavi kishor PB, Reddy GM (1986) Retention and revival of regenerating ability by osmotic adjustment in long-term cultures of four varieties of rice. *Journal of Plant Physiology* 126: 49-54.
- Mikami T, Kinoshita T (1988) Genotypic effects on the callus formation from different explants of rice, *Oryza sativa* L. *Plant Cell and Tissue Organ Culture* 12: 311-314.
- Twyman RM, Stoger E, Kohli A, Capell T, Christou P (2002) Selectable and Screenable Markers for Rice Transformation. *Molecular Methods of Plant Analysis, Vol. 22 Testing for Genetic Manipulation in Plants* Edited by J.F. Jackson, H.F. Linskens, R.B. Inman © Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2002.
- Li L, Qu R, Kochko AD, Fauquet C, Beachy RN (1993) An improved rice transformation system using the biolistic method. *Plant Cell Reports* 12: 250-255.
- Smith EF, Townsend CO (1907) A plant tumor of bacterial origin. *Science* 25: 671-673.
- Braun, A C (1947) Thermal studies on the factors responsible for tumor initiation in crown gall. *American Journal of Botany* 34: 234-240.
- Braun AC, Mandle RJ (1948) Studies on the inactivation of the tumor-inducing principle in crown gall. *Growth* 12: 255-269.
- Horsch RB, Fraley RT, Rogers SG, Sanders PR, Lloyd A, Hoffman N (1984) Inheritance of functional genes in plants. *Science* 223: 496-498.
- Barro F, Rooke L, Bekes F, Gras P, Tatham AS, et al. (1997) Transformation of wheat with high molecular weight subunit genes resulted in improved functional properties. *National Biotechnology* 15: 1295-1299.
- Dobrzańska M, Krysiak C, Kraszewska E (1997) Transient and stable transformation of wheat with DNA preparations delivered by a biolistic method. *Acta Physiologiae Plantarum* 19: 277-284.
- Takumi S, Shimada T (1997) Genetic transformation of durum wheat (*Triticum durum* Desf.) through particle bombardment of scuteller tissues. *Plant Biotechnology* 14: 151-156.
- Cheng X, Sardana R, Kaplan H, Altosaar I (1998) *Agrobacterium*-transformed rice plants expressing synthetic cryIA(b) and cryIA(c) genes are highly toxic to striped stem borer and yellow stem borer. *Proceedings of National Academy and Sciences USA* 95: 2767-2772.
- Johnston SA, Anziano PQ, Shark K, Sanford JC, Butow RA (1988) Mitochondrial transformation in yeast by bombardment with microprojectiles. *Science* 240: 1538-1541.
- Christou P, Ford TL, Kofron M (1991) Genotype independent stable transformation of rice (*Oryza sativa*) plants. *Bio/Technology* 9: 957-962.
- Alpeter F, Baisakh N, Beachy R, Bock R (2005) Particle bombardment and the genetic enhancement of crops: myths and realities. *Molecular Breeding* 15: 305-327.
- Basu A, Ray S, Sarkar S, chadhuri RT, Kundu S (2014) *Agrobacterium* mediated genetic transformation of popular indica rice Ratna (IET1411). *African journal of biotechnology* 13: 4187-4197.
- Pinto LMN, Fiuza LM, Ziegler D, Oliveira JVD, Menezes VG, et al. (2013) *Indica Rice Cultivar IRGA 424, Transformed with cry Genes of B. thuringiensis*,



- Provided High Resistance Against *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). *Journal of Economic Entomology* 106: 2585-2594.
35. Radhesh Krishnan SR, Priya AM, Ramesh M (2013) Rapid regeneration and ploidy stability of 'cvIR36' indica rice (*Oryza Sativa*. L) confers efficient protocol for in vitro callus organogenesis and *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* mediated transformation. *Botanical Studies* 54: 47.
  36. Guruprasad M, Raja DS, Jaffar SK, Shanthisri KV, Naik MS (2012) An Efficient And Regeneration Protocol for *Agrobacterium* mediated transformation of indica rice. *International journal of Pharmacy And Technology* 4: 4280-4286.
  37. Sahoo KK, Tripathi AK, Pareek A, Sopory SK, Singla-Pareek SL (2011) An improved protocol for efficient transformation and regeneration of diverse indica rice cultivars. *Plant Methods* 7: 49.
  38. Ratnayake RMKL, Hettiarachchi GHCM (2010) Development of an Efficient *Agrobacterium* Mediated Transformation Protocol for Sri Lankan Rice Variety (Bg 250). *Tropical Agricultural Research* 22: 45-53.
  39. Sarangi S, Ghosh J, Bora A, Das S, Mandal AB (2009) *Agrobacterium* mediated genetic transformation of Indica rice varieties involving Am-SOD gene. *Indian Journal Of Biotechnology* 10: 9-18.
  40. Hossain MR, Hassan L, Patwary AK, Ferdous MJ (2009) Optimization of *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* mediated genetic transformation protocol for aromatic rice. *Journal of Bangladesh Agricultural University* 7: 235-240.
  41. Sohn SI, Kim YH, Cho JH, Kim JK, Lee JY (2006) An Efficient Selection Scheme for *Agrobacterium*-mediated Co-transformation of Rice Using Two Selectable Marker Genes hpt and bar. *Korean Journal of Breeding* 38: 173-179.
  42. Saharan V, Yadav RC, Yadav NR, Ram K (2004) Studies on improved *Agrobacterium*-mediated transformation in two indica rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *African Journal of Biotechnology* 3: 572-575.
  43. Lucca P, Hurrell R, Potrykus I (2001) Genetic engineering approaches to improve the bioavailability and the level of iron in rice grains. *Theoretical Applied Genetics* 102: 392-397.
  44. Pons MJ, Marfa V, Mele E, Messeguer J (2000) Regeneration and genetic transformation of Spanish rice cultivars using mature embryos. *Euphytica* 114: 117-122.
  45. Azhakanandam K, McCabe MS, Power B, Lowe KC, Cocking EC and Davey MR (2000) T-DNA transfer, integration, expression and inheritance in rice: effects of plant genotype and *Agrobacterium* super-virulence. *Journal of Plant Physiology* 157: 429-439.
  46. Datta K, Koukolikova-Nicola Z, Baisakh N, Oliva N, Datta SK (2000) *Agrobacterium*-mediated engineering for sheath blight resistance of indica rice cultivars from different ecosystems. *Theoretical Applied Genetics* 100: 832-839.
  47. Upadhyaya NM, Surin B, Ramm K, Gaudron J, Schnmann PHD, Taylor W Waterhouse PM and Wang MB (2000) *Agrobacterium* mediated transformation of Australian rice cultivars Jarrah and Amaroo using modified promoters and selectable markers. *Australian Journal of Plant Physiology* 27: 201-210.
  48. Hoa THC, Bahagiawati A, Hodges TK (1999) *Agrobacterium*-Mediated Transformation of Indica Rice Cultivars Grown in Vietnam. *Omonrice* 7.
  49. Enriquez-Obregon GA, Prieto-Samsonov DL, de la Riva GA, Perez M, Selman-Housein G, et al. (1999) *Agrobacterium* mediated Japonica rice transformation: a procedure assisted by an antinecrotic treatment. *Plant Cell Tissue and Organ Culture* 59: 159-168.
  50. Mohanty A, Sarma NP, Tyagi AK (1999) *Agrobacterium*-mediated high frequency transformation of an elite indica rice variety Pusa Basmati 1 and transmission of the transgenes to R2 progeny. *Plant Science* 147: 127-137.
  51. Hashizume F, Tsuchiya T, Ugaki M, Niwa Y, Tachibana N, et al. (1999) Efficient *Agrobacterium*-mediated transformation and the usefulness of a synthetic GFP reporter gene in leading varieties of japonica rice. *Plant Biotechnol.* 16: 397-401.
  52. Khanna HK, Raina SK (1999) *Agrobacterium*-mediated transformation of indica rice cultivars using binary and superbinary vectors. *Australian Journal of Plant Physiology* 26: 311-324.
  53. Cheng X, Sardana R, Kaplan H, Altosaar I (1998) *Agrobacterium*-transformed rice plants expressing synthetic cryIA(b) and cryIA(c) genes are highly toxic to striped stem borer and yellow stem borer. *Proceedings of National Academy and Sciences USA* 95: 2767-2772.
  54. Zhang J, Xu RJ, Elliott MC, Chen DF (1997) *Agrobacterium*-mediated transformation of elite indica and japonica rice cultivars. *Molecular Biotechnology* 8: 223-231.
  55. Uze M, Wunn J, Puonti-Kaerlas J, Potrykus I, Sautter C (1997) Plasmolysis of precultured immature embryos improves *Agrobacterium* mediated gene transfer to rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Plant Science* 130: 87-95.
  56. Toki S (1997) Rapid and Efficient *Agrobacterium*-Mediated Transformation in Rice. *Plant Molecular Biology Reporter* 15.
  57. Rashid H, Yokoi S, Toriyama K, Hinata K (1996) Transgenic plant production mediated by *Agrobacterium* in indica rice. *Plant Cell Reporter* 15: 727-730.
  58. Dong J, Teng W, Buchholz WG, Hall TC (1996) *Agrobacterium*-mediated transformation of javanica rice. *Molecular Breeding* 2: 267-276.
  59. Aldemita RR, Hodges TK (1996) *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*-mediated transformation of japonica
  60. Park SH, Pinson SR, Smith RR (1996) T-DNA integration into genomic DNA of rice following *Agrobacterium* inoculation of isolated shoot apices. *Plant Molecular Biology* 32: 1135-1148.
  61. Hiei Y, Ohta S, Komari T, Kumashiro T (1994) Efficient transformation of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) mediated by *Agrobacterium* and sequence analysis of the boundaries of the T-DNA. *The Plant Journal* 6: 271-282.
  62. Chan MT, Chang HH, Ho SL, Tong WF, Yu SM (1993) *Agrobacterium*-mediated production of transgenic rice plants expressing a chimeric  $\alpha$ -amylase promoter/ $\beta$ -glucuronidase gene. *Plant Molecular Biology* 22: 491-506.
  63. Twyman RM, Stoger E, Schillberg S, Christou P, Fischer R (2003) Molecular farming in plants: host systems and expression technology. *Trends in Biotechnology* 21: 570-8.
  64. Hoffmann K, Verbeek M, Romano A, Dullemans A M, vanden Heuvel JF, et al. (2001) Mechanical transmission of poliovirus. *J Virol Methods* 91: 197-201.
  65. Fofana IBF, Sangare A, Collier R, Taylor C, Fauquet CM (2005) A geminivirus-induced gene silencing system for gene function validation in Cassava. *Plant Molecular Biology* 56: 613-624.
  66. Kaeppeler SM, Kaeppeler HF, Rhee Y (2000) Epigenetic aspects of somaclonal variation in plants. *Plant Molecular Biology* 43: 179-188.
  67. Mohan Jain S (2001) Tissue culture-derived variation in crop improvement. *Euphytica* 118: 153-166.
  68. Clough SJ, Bent AF (1998) Floral dip: a simplified method for *Agrobacterium* mediated transformation of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Plant Journal* 16: 735-743.
  69. Desfeux C, Clough SJ, Bent AF (2000) Female reproductive tissues are the primary target of *Agrobacterium* mediated transformation by the *Arabidopsis* floral dip method. *Plant Physiology* 123: 895-904.
  70. Rod-in W, Sujipuli K, Ratanasut K (2014) The floral-dip method for rice (*Oryza sativa*) transformation. *Journal of Agricultural Technology* 10(2): 467-474.
  71. Naseri G, Sohani MM, Pourmassalehgou A, Allahi S (2012) In planta transformation of rice (*Oryza sativa*) using thaumatin-like protein gene for enhancing resistance to sheath blight. *African Journal of Biotechnology* 11(31): 7885-7893.
  72. Dafny-Yelin M, Tzfira T (2007) Delivery of multiple transgenes to plant cells. *Plant Physiology* 145: 1118-1128.
  73. Jefferson RA (1987) Assaying chimeric genes in plants: The GUS gene fusion system. *Plant Mol Biol Rep* 5: 387-405.
  74. Breitter JC, Labeyrie A, Meynard D, Legavre T, Guiderdoni E (2002) Efficient microprojectile bombardment-mediated transformation of rice using gene cassettes. *Theoretical Applied Genetics* 104: 709-719.
  75. Petrillo CP, Carneiro NP, Antonio Álvaro, Carvalho CHS, Alves JD, et al. (2008) Otimização dos parâmetros de bombardeamento de partículas para a transformação genética de linhagens brasileiras de milho. *Pesq. agropec. bras., Brasília* 43: 371-378.
  76. Rahman ZA, Seman ZA, Roowi S, Basirun N, Subramaniam S (2010) Production of transgenic Indica rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) Cv. MR 81 via particle bombardment system. *Emir. J. Food Agric.* 22 (5): 353-366.
  77. Wani SH, Sanghera GS, Haribhushan A, Singh NB, Gosal SS (2011) Biophysical parameters affecting transient GUS expression in Indica rice variety PAU 201 via particle bombardment. *Elixir Bio. Tech.* 34: 2496-2501.

78. Htwe NN, Ling HC, Zaman FQ, Mazizh M (2014) Plant genetic Transformation efficiency of selected Malaysian Rice Based on Selectable Marker Gene (hptII). Pakistan Journal of Biological Sciences 17: 472-481.
79. Pravin J, Mahendra D, Saluja T, Sarawgi AK, Ravi S, et al. (2011) Assessment of critical factors influencing callus induction, in vitro regeneration and selection of bombarded indica rice genotypes. Cell & Plant Science 2: 24-42.
80. Rahman ZA, Seman ZA, Roowi S, Basirun N, Subramaniam S (2010) Production of transgenic Indica rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) Cv. MR 81 via particle bombardment system. Emir. J. Food Agric. 22: 353-366.
81. Sivamani E, DeLong RK, Qu R (2009) Protamine-mediated DNA coating remarkably improves bombardment transformation efficiency in plant cells. Plant Cell Reporter 28: 213-221.
82. Petrillo CP, Carneiro NP, Antonio Álvaro Corsetti Purcino AAC, Carvalho CHS, Alves JD, et al. (2008) Otimizaco dos parametros de bombardeamento de partículas para a transformação genética de linhagens brasileiras de milho. Pesq. agropec. bras., Brasília 43: 371-378.
83. Zhao Y, Qian Q, Wang H, Huang D (2007) Hereditary Behavior of bar Gene Cassette is Complex in Rice Mediated by Particle Bombardment. Journal of Genetics and Genomics 34: 824-835.
84. Maneewan K, Bunnag S, Theerakulpisut P, Kositrakun M, Suwanagul A (2005) Transformation of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) cv. Chainat 1 using chitinase gene. Songklanakarin Journal of Science and Technology 27: 1151-1162.
85. Gupta SM, Grover A, Nasim M (2013) Transgenic Technologies In Agriculture: From Lab To field to market, CIBTech Journal of Biotechnology 3: 20-47.
86. Ramesh M, Gupta AK (2005) Transient expression of  $\beta$ -glucuronidase gene in indica and japonica rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) callus cultures after different stages of co-bombardment. African Journal of Biotechnology 4: 596-600.
87. Andrieu A, Breitter JC, Sire C, Meynard D, Gantet, et al. (2012) An in planta, Agrobacterium-mediated transient gene expression method for inducing gene silencing in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) leaves. Rice 5: 23.
88. Tang K, Tinjuangjun P, Xu Y, Sun X, Gatehouse JA, et al. (1999) Particle-bombardment-mediated co-transformation of elite Chinese rice cultivars with genes conferring resistance to bacterial blight and sap-sucking insect pests. Planta 208: 552-563.
89. Darian H, Bing Z, Wei Y, Rui X, Han X, et al. (1996) Introduction of cecropin B gene into rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) by particle bombardment and analysis of transgenic plants. Science in China 39: 652-661.
90. Supartana P, Shimizu T, Shioiri H, Nogawa M, Nozue M, et al. (2005) Development of Simple and Efficient in Planta Transformation Method for Rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) Using Agrobacterium tumefaciens. Journal of bioscience and bioengineering 100: 391-397.
91. Dong J, Kharb P, Teng W, Hall TC (2001) Characterization of rice transformed via an Agrobacterium-mediated inflorescence approach. Molecular Breeding 7: 187-194.