A Review on Genetic Mechanisms of Plant-Pathogen Resistance in Crop Breeding

Abstract

Plant-pathogen resistance is a critical component of sustainable agriculture, essential for protecting crops from devastating diseases and ensuring global food security. This review explores the genetic mechanisms underlying plant-pathogen resistance, focusing on advances in breeding strategies and genetic engineering. Resistance (R) genes, the cornerstone of plant immunity, are categorized by their structural features, including nucleotide-binding site-leucine-rich repeat (NBS-LRR) domains, and function through pathways such as Effector-Triggered Immunity (ETI). The salicylic acid (SA) pathway, crucial for Systemic Acquired Resistance (SAR), and the jasmonic acid (JA) and ethylene (ET) pathways, which drive Induced Systemic Resistance (ISR), are pivotal in orchestrating plant defense responses. Emerging molecular tools like CRISPR-Cas9 enable precise gene editing to enhance R gene function and target susceptibility (S) genes, offering novel pathways to engineer durable resistance. Transgenic approaches, including the introduction of novel R genes and the expression of antimicrobial proteins, have expanded the genetic toolkit for combating pathogens. RNA interference (RNAi) technology further allows for the silencing of critical pathogen genes, adding a layer of defense. Traditional breeding methods, such as hybridization and backcrossing, remain integral, particularly when combined with Marker-Assisted Selection (MAS) and Genomic Selection (GS). MAS facilitates the efficient incorporation of resistance traits using molecular markers, while GS leverages genome-wide data to predict resistance, significantly enhancing breeding efficiency. However, challenges such as the rapid evolution of pathogens, resistance breakdown, and climate change-induced shifts in disease dynamics pose significant threats. These challenges necessitate an integrated approach, combining genetic and genomic tools with sustainable disease management practices, such as the use of beneficial microorganisms, precision agriculture, and diversified cropping systems. Future research must focus on understanding the molecular basis of resistance durability, improving predictive models for resistance traits, and developing climate-resilient crop varieties. This integrated strategy is crucial for mitigating disease impact, enhancing crop resilience, and ensuring sustainable agricultural productivity in the face of environmental and biological challenges.

Keywords: *Plant-Pathogen Resistance, Genetic Engineering, CRISPR-Cas9, RNA Interference, Resistance Genes*

I. Introduction

A. Importance of Plant-Pathogen Resistance in Agriculture

Plant-pathogen resistance plays a crucial role in safeguarding global food security by protecting crops from devastating diseases caused by a wide array of pathogens, including bacteria, fungi, viruses, and nematodes. The economic impact of plant diseases is substantial, with annual losses running into billions of dollars worldwide. For example, rice blast disease caused by *Magnaporthe oryzae* and wheat rusts, particularly stem rust caused by *Puccinia graminis f. sp. tritici*, have historically led to catastrophic yield losses, affecting both staple food availability and farmer livelihoods [1]. Additionally, plant-pathogen resistance is vital in reducing dependency on chemical pesticides, which pose environmental risks and can lead to

Commented [P1]: Author don't give the broad topic , only give the narrow topic

Commented [P2]: Otherwise give the information for specific or selective crop

Commented [P3]: Don t start here this review

Commented [P4]: Abstract no need this much information, what is the importance of this topic, what is the knowledge gap, from this what your give the suggestions for fill the knowledge gap in future

Commented [P5]: Introduction is not enough

the development of resistant pathogen strains. By incorporating genetic resistance, crops can withstand or mitigate disease impact, thereby promoting sustainable agricultural practices and enhancing productivity. The advent of modern breeding techniques has made it possible to identify and introduce resistance genes (R genes) into crop varieties, offering a cost-effective and environmentally friendly solution to disease management.

B. Scope of the Review

This review comprehensively explores the genetic mechanisms underlying plant-pathogen resistance, focusing on their application in crop breeding [2]. It delves into the molecular interactions between plants and pathogens, the role of resistance genes, and the signaling pathways that govern plant immune responses. Furthermore, it examines the latest advancements in genetic engineering and breeding strategies aimed at enhancing disease resistance. The review covers both qualitative and quantitative resistance, highlighting key studies and breakthroughs that have contributed to our understanding of plant immunity. By addressing the complexities of resistance breeding, this paper aims to provide a detailed overview that is valuable for researchers, breeders, and policymakers. The integration of classical breeding approaches with contemporary biotechnological tools is also discussed to emphasize the holistic strategies required for effective disease resistance management in crops.

C. Objectives of the Review

The primary objective of this review is to synthesize current knowledge on the genetic mechanisms of plant-pathogen resistance and their implications for crop breeding [3]. Specific goals include:

1. To elucidate the molecular basis of plant immune responses, including the identification and characterization of key resistance genes and signaling pathways.
2. To review recent advances in genetic engineering technologies, such as CRISPR-Cas9 and RNA interference (RNAi), and their applications in developing disease-resistant crops.
3. To discuss the role of traditional and modern breeding techniques in integrating resistance traits into high-yielding and resilient crop varieties.
4. To highlight challenges and future prospects in breeding for disease resistance, with an emphasis on sustainable agricultural practices and climate resilience.
5. To provide insights into how these genetic mechanisms can be leveraged to address emerging threats from new and evolving plant pathogens.

Commented [P6]: Objectives not satisfy the entire manuscript

II. Plant-Pathogen Interaction Dynamics

A. Overview of Plant Immune System

The plant immune system is an intricate defense network designed to detect and respond to pathogenic threats [4]. Unlike animals, plants lack a circulatory immune system; instead, they rely on a multi-layered immune response to recognize and combat pathogens. This defense mechanism is primarily categorized into two layers: Pattern-Triggered Immunity (PTI) and

Effector-Triggered Immunity (ETI). Together, these layers form a robust defense architecture that enables plants to resist a wide array of pathogens.

i. Pattern Recognition Receptors (PRRs)

Pattern Recognition Receptors (PRRs) are the primary components of PTI, functioning as the plant's first line of defense [5]. These receptors are membrane-bound proteins that recognize conserved molecular patterns known as pathogen-associated molecular patterns (PAMPs), such as bacterial flagellin, fungal chitin, and viral RNA. The recognition of PAMPs by PRRs triggers a cascade of immune responses, including the production of reactive oxygen species (ROS), activation of mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK) pathways, and the expression of defense-related genes. One well-studied example of a PRR is the flagellin-sensing 2 (FLS2) receptor in *Arabidopsis thaliana*, which detects bacterial flagellin. Upon recognition, FLS2 forms a complex with BAK1 (Brassinosteroid Insensitive 1-associated receptor kinase 1), leading to the activation of downstream defense responses [6]. This PTI response is generally broad-spectrum and serves as an essential deterrent against a wide range of pathogens.

ii. Effector-Triggered Immunity (ETI)

While PTI provides a robust initial defense, many pathogens have evolved to produce effectors—molecules that suppress PTI and facilitate infection. In response, plants have developed Effector-Triggered Immunity (ETI), a more specific and often stronger immune response. ETI is mediated by intracellular nucleotide-binding leucine-rich repeat (NLR) proteins, which recognize specific pathogen effectors directly or indirectly. This recognition often leads to a hypersensitive response (HR), a form of programmed cell death localized at the infection site to restrict pathogen spread [7]. The gene-for-gene hypothesis underpins ETI, where specific resistance (R) genes in the plant correspond to specific avirulence (Avr) genes in the pathogen. A classic example is the interaction between the *RPS2* gene in *Arabidopsis* and the *AvrRpt2* effector from *Pseudomonas syringae*. ETI typically results in a more rapid and robust defense response, including systemic acquired resistance (SAR), which enhances immunity throughout the plant.

B. Pathogen Attack Strategies

Pathogens employ a variety of sophisticated strategies to invade plant hosts and suppress their immune responses. These strategies are crucial for their survival and propagation, and understanding them is essential for developing effective disease management strategies.

i. Virulence Factors

Virulence factors are molecules produced by pathogens that facilitate infection and colonization of the host [8]. These include toxins, enzymes, and effector proteins that directly damage host tissues or interfere with host cellular processes. For instance, the bacterial pathogen *Xanthomonas oryzae*pv. *oryzae*, which causes rice bacterial blight, secretes transcription activator-like effectors (TALEs). TALEs bind to specific promoter regions in the host genome, activating the expression of susceptibility (S) genes that benefit the pathogen. Another example is the production of cell wall-degrading enzymes by fungal pathogens like *Botrytis cinerea*, which breaks down the plant cell wall components, allowing the pathogen to access nutrients and spread within the host tissue.

ii. Host Defense Suppression Mechanisms

In addition to producing virulence factors, many pathogens secrete effectors that specifically target and suppress the host's immune responses. These effectors can inhibit PRR signaling pathways, interfere with the production of ROS, or block the expression of defense genes. For example, *Pseudomonas syringae* delivers effector proteins into plant cells via its type III secretion system. One such effector, HopM1, targets and degrades the plant protein AtMIN7, which is involved in vesicle trafficking and is crucial for immune responses [9]. By disrupting AtMIN7, HopM1 effectively suppresses the host's ability to mount an immune response. Additionally, viral pathogens often produce proteins that interfere with RNA silencing, a key antiviral defense mechanism in plants. The *Tobacco etch virus* produces the HC-Pro protein, which suppresses the plant's RNA silencing machinery, allowing the virus to replicate unchecked.

III. Genetic Basis of Plant-Pathogen Resistance

A. Resistance (R) Genes

i. Structure and Function

Resistance (R) genes are pivotal in plant immunity, encoding proteins that recognize specific pathogen effectors and trigger defense mechanisms. These genes form the molecular basis of Effector-Triggered Immunity (ETI). The most common structure of R genes includes nucleotide-binding site leucine-rich repeat (NBS-LRR) domains. The NBS domain is crucial for ATP or GTP binding, providing the energy required for the activation of the R protein, while the LRR domain facilitates protein-protein interactions, particularly in recognizing pathogen effectors [10]. Additionally, some R proteins feature Toll/Interleukin-1 receptor (TIR) domains or coiled-coil (CC) motifs, which are important for downstream signaling. A well-studied example is the *RPS2* gene in *Arabidopsis*, which encodes an NBS-LRR protein that recognizes the bacterial effector AvrRpt2, initiating a defense response characterized by localized cell death.

ii. Classification of R Genes

R genes are broadly classified based on their structural domains and functional mechanisms. The main categories include:

1. **NBS-LRR R Genes:** These are the most prevalent and can be further divided into TIR-NBS-LRR (TNL) and CC-NBS-LRR (CNL) based on the presence of TIR or CC domains.
2. **Receptor-Like Kinases (RLKs) and Receptor-Like Proteins (RLPs):** These membrane-bound proteins play crucial roles in recognizing PAMPs and initiating PTI. FLS2, which recognizes bacterial flagellin, is a prominent example [11].
3. **R Genes Encoding Enzymes:** Some R genes encode enzymes that directly degrade pathogen molecules or modify the host cell environment to resist infection. Examples include those involved in glucanase and chitinase production, which degrade fungal cell walls.

B. DefenseSignaling Pathways

i. Salicylic Acid Pathway

Commented [P7]: Author don't concentrate on the basic concept, it already present in the amble number of litrature

The salicylic acid (SA) pathway is integral to systemic acquired resistance (SAR) and local defense against biotrophic and hemibiotrophic pathogens. SA acts as a signaling molecule that accumulates at infection sites, triggering the expression of pathogenesis-related (PR) genes and enhancing the plant's defensive capacity. NPR1 (Non-expresser of PR genes 1) is a key regulator in this pathway, acting as a transcriptional co-activator that mediates the expression of SA-responsive genes [12]. Mutations in NPR1 disrupt the SA signaling pathway, leading to increased susceptibility to various pathogens. SA-mediated defense responses also involve the synthesis of secondary metabolites like phenolics and flavonoids, which contribute to pathogen inhibition.

ii. Jasmonic Acid and Ethylene Pathways

The jasmonic acid (JA) and ethylene (ET) pathways are primarily associated with defense against necrotrophic pathogens and herbivorous insects. JA, derived from linolenic acid through the octadecanoid pathway, plays a crucial role in activating genes involved in cell wall fortification, production of secondary metabolites, and defense proteins like proteinase inhibitors [13]. The JA pathway often works in synergy with the ET pathway, particularly in response to necrotrophic pathogens such as *Botrytis cinerea*. The integration of JA and ET signaling is mediated by key transcription factors like ERF1 (Ethylene Response Factor 1), which activates defense gene expression. The interaction between SA and JA/ET pathways is complex, often involving antagonistic crosstalk, which helps the plant fine-tune its immune responses depending on the type of pathogen encountered.

C. Quantitative Trait Loci (QTL) in Disease Resistance

i. Identification and Mapping

Quantitative Trait Loci (QTL) are genomic regions associated with the variation in a quantitative trait, such as disease resistance, which is controlled by multiple genes [14]. QTL mapping involves the identification of these regions through the use of genetic markers in segregating populations. Techniques like linkage analysis and genome-wide association studies (GWAS) have been instrumental in pinpointing QTLs linked to resistance traits. For example, in rice, the QTL *qSB-11* has been associated with resistance to sheath blight, a devastating fungal disease caused by *Rhizoctonia solani*. The identification of QTLs allows researchers to understand the genetic basis of complex traits and their interactions with environmental factors.

ii. Application in Breeding Programs

The incorporation of QTLs into breeding programs has revolutionized the development of disease-resistant crops [15]. Marker-Assisted Selection (MAS) is a widely used approach, where markers linked to resistance QTLs are employed to select desirable traits in breeding populations. This method accelerates the breeding process by enabling the selection of resistant genotypes at the seedling stage, even before disease symptoms appear. In maize, the incorporation of QTLs for resistance to northern leaf blight has led to the development of varieties with improved resistance. Furthermore, genomic selection (GS) leverages whole-genome marker data to predict the genetic value of individuals, allowing for the simultaneous

selection of multiple resistance traits. This holistic approach enhances the efficiency and accuracy of breeding programs, particularly in crops with complex resistance traits [16].

IV. Molecular Mechanisms of Resistance

A. Hypersensitive Response (HR)

The Hypersensitive Response (HR) is a critical component of plant defense against biotrophic pathogens. It involves localized cell death at the site of infection to limit pathogen spread and is often associated with Effector-Triggered Immunity (ETI).

i. Programmed Cell Death

Programmed cell death (PCD) is a hallmark of HR, characterized by a tightly regulated process that leads to the controlled destruction of infected and adjacent cells [17]. This response is crucial in restricting the availability of nutrients to the invading pathogen, thereby impeding its growth and proliferation. PCD in HR is distinct from necrosis as it involves specific cellular events, including chromatin condensation, DNA fragmentation, and the formation of apoptotic-like bodies. The execution of PCD is mediated by a complex network of signaling molecules, including calcium ions, mitogen-activated protein kinases (MAPKs), and salicylic acid (SA). Caspase-like proteases, although structurally different from animal caspases, also play a role in orchestrating the PCD process in plants. For instance, the metacaspase AtMC1 in *Arabidopsis* is crucial for HR-associated PCD [18].

ii. Reactive Oxygen Species (ROS) Production

Reactive Oxygen Species (ROS) production is a rapid and early event during HR, serving as both a signaling molecule and a direct antimicrobial agent. The oxidative burst, characterized by the rapid accumulation of ROS such as superoxide (O_2^-) and hydrogen peroxide (H_2O_2), is triggered upon pathogen recognition. ROS generation is primarily mediated by membrane-bound NADPH oxidases, particularly the Respiratory Burst Oxidase Homolog (RBOH) family. H_2O_2 not only acts as a direct antimicrobial agent by damaging pathogen cell structures but also functions as a secondary messenger in the activation of downstream defense responses. Additionally, ROS contribute to the strengthening of the plant cell wall through the cross-linking of cell wall proteins, thereby creating a physical barrier against pathogen ingress.

B. Systemic Acquired Resistance (SAR)

Systemic Acquired Resistance (SAR) is a long-lasting, broad-spectrum immune response activated following a localized infection [19]. SAR primes the entire plant to respond more robustly to subsequent attacks by a wide range of pathogens.

i. Induction and Signaling

The induction of SAR is typically initiated by the accumulation of SA at the site of primary infection. This local increase in SA leads to the production of signaling molecules such as methyl salicylate and azelaic acid, which are translocated to distant tissues to confer systemic resistance. The SAR signaling cascade involves a complex interplay of various molecules, including lipid transfer proteins, pipecolic acid, and glycerol-3-phosphate. A key feature of SAR is the enhanced expression of pathogenesis-related (PR) genes, which encode proteins like β-1,3-glucanases and chitinases with direct antimicrobial activities [20].

ii. Role of Non-expresser of Pathogenesis-Related Genes 1 (NPR1)

NPR1 is a central regulator of SAR, acting as a transcriptional co-activator in the SA signaling pathway. Under non-inducing conditions, NPR1 resides in the cytoplasm as an oligomer. Upon SAR induction, the cellular redox changes lead to the reduction of NPR1 oligomers into monomers, which translocate to the nucleus. In the nucleus, NPR1 interacts with transcription factors such as TGA factors to activate the expression of PR genes. NPR1 also modulates the crosstalk between SA and JA signaling pathways, thereby fine-tuning the plant's immune responses based on the type of pathogen encountered.

C. Induced Systemic Resistance (ISR)

Induced Systemic Resistance (ISR) is a plant immune response triggered by beneficial microorganisms, such as plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) and mycorrhizal fungi, which enhance the plant's defensive capacity against a broad spectrum of pathogens [21].

i. Role of Beneficial Microorganisms

ISR is typically activated by PGPR such as *Pseudomonas fluorescens* and *Bacillus subtilis*, which colonize plant roots and induce resistance in above-ground tissues. Unlike SAR, ISR does not rely on SA but is mediated by JA and ET signaling pathways. The activation of ISR involves the production of secondary metabolites, phytoalexins, and defense-related proteins that enhance the plant's resistance mechanisms. Beneficial microorganisms also promote ISR by inducing systemic changes in the plant’s transcriptome and metabolome, which prime the plant for a faster and stronger defense response upon pathogen attack.

ii. Cross-Talk with Other Pathways

ISR involves intricate crosstalk with other defense pathways, particularly those mediated by SA, JA, and ET. The interaction between ISR and SAR is often synergistic, with each pathway enhancing the plant's overall immune competence. For instance, while ISR predominantly activates JA/ET-responsive genes, it can also augment the SA-dependent SAR pathway under certain conditions, leading to a more comprehensive defense response [22]. This crosstalk is critical for optimizing the plant's defensive strategy based on the specific pathogen encountered, whether biotrophic, necrotrophic, or hemibiotrophic.

V. Advances in Genetic Engineering for Resistance

A. CRISPR-Cas9 in Disease Resistance

The CRISPR-Cas9 system has revolutionized genetic engineering by providing a precise and efficient tool for genome editing. It has been widely adopted in plant breeding to enhance resistance against various pathogens by targeting specific genes involved in immunity.

i. Gene Editing for R Gene Enhancement

CRISPR-Cas9 has been effectively used to enhance the function of resistance (R) genes, which play a critical role in recognizing pathogen effectors and triggering immune responses. The precision of CRISPR-Cas9 allows for targeted modifications, such as the insertion or deletion of nucleotides, which can either improve the binding affinity of R proteins for pathogen effectors or broaden their recognition spectrum [23]. For example, studies on rice

(*Oryza sativa*) have demonstrated the enhancement of the *Pi-ta* R gene, which confers resistance to *Magnaporthe oryzae*, the causative agent of rice blast. By editing specific regions of the *Pi-ta* gene, researchers were able to enhance its resistance capability and durability. Similarly, CRISPR-Cas9 has been used to modify R genes in other crops, such as wheat and tomato, to confer resistance against rusts and bacterial speck disease, respectively.

ii. Targeting Susceptibility (S) Genes

CRISPR-Cas9 also offers the potential to improve disease resistance by targeting susceptibility (S) genes, which are exploited by pathogens to facilitate infection [24]. Editing or knocking out these genes can effectively block the pathogen's ability to establish infection. For instance, in rice, the *OsSWEET14* gene, which is targeted by *Xanthomonas oryzae*pv. *oryzae* to promote bacterial blight, was successfully edited using CRISPR-Cas9 to enhance resistance. By disrupting the pathogen's ability to manipulate the host's cellular machinery, plants can be engineered to resist infections without relying solely on traditional R gene-mediated defenses. This approach is particularly valuable for combating pathogens that rapidly evolve to overcome R gene-based resistance.

B. Transgenic Approaches

Transgenic approaches involve the introduction of foreign genes into a plant's genome to confer new traits, such as disease resistance. This method has been widely utilized to introduce novel resistance genes and antimicrobial proteins that enhance a plant's defensive capabilities.

i. Introduction of Novel R Genes

The introduction of novel R genes from different species or genera into crop plants has been a successful strategy to confer resistance against various pathogens [25]. Transgenic plants expressing R genes from wild relatives or other resistant varieties have shown enhanced resistance to a wide range of diseases. For example, the introduction of the *Rpi-vnt1.1* gene from wild potato species into cultivated potato varieties conferred resistance to *Phytophthora infestans*, the pathogen responsible for late blight. This approach not only provides resistance but also helps in preserving genetic diversity by utilizing resistance genes from less commonly used germplasm.

ii. Expression of Antimicrobial Proteins

Another transgenic strategy involves the expression of antimicrobial proteins, such as defensins, chitinases, and glucanases, which have direct inhibitory effects on pathogens. These proteins can degrade pathogen cell walls, disrupt membrane integrity, or interfere with essential metabolic processes, thereby reducing pathogen virulence. For instance, transgenic rice plants expressing the *Chi11* chitinase gene showed enhanced resistance to sheath blight disease caused by *Rhizoctonia solani* [26]. Similarly, plants expressing defensins have exhibited increased resistance to fungal pathogens by disrupting fungal membrane integrity.

C. RNA Interference (RNAi)

RNA interference (RNAi) is a post-transcriptional gene silencing mechanism that involves the degradation of specific mRNA molecules, thereby preventing the translation of target

Commented [P8]: Basic information, author should concentrate the update the information last three years,

proteins. This technology has been harnessed to develop resistance against various pathogens by silencing essential genes in the pathogen or susceptibility genes in the host.

i. Gene Silencing Mechanisms

The RNAi pathway involves the production of small interfering RNAs (siRNAs) that guide the degradation of complementary mRNA molecules. Double-stranded RNA (dsRNA) corresponding to the target gene is introduced into the plant, where it is processed by the enzyme Dicer into siRNAs. These siRNAs are incorporated into the RNA-induced silencing complex (RISC), which identifies and degrades the target mRNA [27]. This process effectively silences the expression of the target gene, reducing the production of the corresponding protein.

ii. Application in Pathogen Control

RNAi has been successfully applied to control plant pathogens by targeting essential genes in the pathogen itself or by modulating the host's gene expression. One notable example is the use of RNAi to control the root-knot nematode (*Meloidogyne incognita*) in crops like tomato and banana. By expressing dsRNA corresponding to essential nematode genes, transgenic plants were able to significantly reduce nematode infestation and damage. Additionally, RNAi has been used to confer resistance to viral pathogens by targeting viral RNA. Transgenic plants expressing dsRNA against the coat protein gene of the *Papaya ringspot virus* (PRSV) showed high levels of resistance to PRSV infection.

VI. Breeding Strategies for Disease Resistance

A. Marker-Assisted Selection (MAS)

Marker-Assisted Selection (MAS) has revolutionized plant breeding by enabling the selection of desirable traits based on molecular markers linked to genes of interest, including those for disease resistance [28]. This approach allows for more precise and efficient breeding compared to traditional phenotypic selection.

i. Molecular Markers for Resistance Traits

Molecular markers are DNA sequences associated with specific traits, such as disease resistance, and serve as proxies for the presence of resistance genes. These markers can be of various types, including simple sequence repeats (SSRs), single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), and amplified fragment length polymorphisms (AFLPs). The identification of molecular markers linked to resistance genes is typically achieved through quantitative trait loci (QTL) mapping or genome-wide association studies (GWAS). For instance, in rice, markers linked to the *Pi54* gene have been used to select for resistance to rice blast disease. Similarly, in wheat, SNP markers associated with the *Lr34* gene, which provides durable resistance to leaf rust, have been effectively used in breeding programs [29].

ii. Integration in Breeding Programs

The integration of MAS into breeding programs significantly accelerates the development of disease-resistant varieties. By using molecular markers, breeders can screen large populations for the presence of resistance alleles without the need for extensive field trials. This not only reduces the time and cost associated with breeding but also improves the accuracy of selection. For example, in maize, the use of MAS has enabled the rapid development of

varieties resistant to northern leaf blight by selecting for QTLs associated with resistance. The incorporation of MAS into conventional breeding workflows involves a multi-step process, including marker validation, genotyping of breeding populations, and selection based on marker data. The success of MAS depends on the availability of reliable markers, high-throughput genotyping platforms, and the integration of marker data into breeding decisions [30].

B. Genomic Selection (GS)

Genomic Selection (GS) is an advanced breeding approach that leverages whole-genome marker data to predict the genetic value of individuals for complex traits, including disease resistance. This method offers a holistic approach by considering the cumulative effect of all genetic markers across the genome.

Commented [P9]: A review article give the two or more comprehensive table, detailed information explaining figure is important

i. Predictive Models for Resistance Traits

GS relies on predictive models that use genome-wide marker data to estimate the breeding value of individuals for resistance traits. These models are trained on a reference population with known phenotypic and genotypic data, allowing for the prediction of genetic potential in untested individuals. The most commonly used models include genomic best linear unbiased prediction (GBLUP) and Bayesian methods. For example, GS has been successfully applied in wheat to predict resistance to Fusarium head blight, a complex trait influenced by multiple genes [31]. By incorporating all marker information, GS captures both major and minor genetic effects, providing a more comprehensive prediction of resistance traits compared to MAS.

ii. High-throughput Phenotyping

High-throughput phenotyping (HTP) is a critical component of GS, as it provides the necessary phenotypic data to train predictive models. HTP involves the use of advanced technologies such as remote sensing, imaging, and robotics to rapidly and accurately measure disease resistance traits in large populations. For instance, imaging technologies have been used to assess disease severity in crops like wheat and barley, providing quantitative data that enhance the accuracy of GS models. The integration of HTP with GS enables breeders to evaluate large populations efficiently, thereby accelerating the breeding cycle and enhancing the selection process.

C. Traditional Breeding Approaches

Despite the advancements in molecular breeding, traditional approaches like hybridization and backcross breeding remain fundamental in developing disease-resistant varieties [32]. These methods form the basis of breeding programs and are often complemented by molecular tools.

i. Hybridization and Selection

Hybridization involves the crossing of genetically diverse parents to combine desirable traits, including disease resistance, into a single progeny. This method is widely used to introduce resistance genes from wild relatives or landraces into elite cultivars. The progeny are then subjected to rigorous selection based on phenotypic evaluation for resistance traits. For example, in rice, hybridization between resistant wild species and susceptible cultivated

Commented [P10]: In this review can t find out the any figure or table

varieties has led to the development of blast-resistant lines [33]. The success of hybridization and selection depends on the genetic diversity of the parents, the accuracy of phenotypic evaluation, and the selection intensity applied during breeding cycles.

ii. Backcross Breeding

Backcross breeding is a traditional method used to incorporate a specific resistance gene into an elite variety while retaining the desirable agronomic traits of the recurrent parent. This involves repeated crossing of the hybrid progeny with the recurrent parent, followed by selection for the resistance trait. Backcross breeding has been effectively used in many crops to introgress resistance genes from wild relatives into cultivated varieties. For instance, the *Xa21* gene, conferring resistance to bacterial blight in rice, was introgressed into high-yielding varieties through backcross breeding [34]. While backcross breeding is time-consuming, its efficiency can be enhanced through the use of MAS to select for resistance genes at each generation, thus accelerating the process.

VII. Challenges and Future Perspectives

A. Emerging Pathogens and Resistance Breakdown

One of the significant challenges in plant disease resistance is the constant evolution of pathogens, leading to the emergence of new strains capable of overcoming existing resistance mechanisms. Pathogen populations are highly dynamic, with the potential for rapid genetic changes that can result in resistance breakdown. This phenomenon is particularly evident in rust diseases, such as wheat stem rust caused by *Puccinia graminis* f. sp. *tritici*. The emergence of the highly virulent Ug99 lineage in East Africa highlighted the vulnerability of global wheat production, as this strain overcame major resistance genes like *Sr31*. Similarly, rice blast caused by *Magnaporthe oryzae* has shown a pattern of resistance breakdown due to the pathogen's ability to mutate and adapt to host resistance genes.

The emergence of novel pathogens and pathotypes is driven by various factors, including genetic recombination, horizontal gene transfer, and host-pathogen co-evolution [35]. The agricultural practice of monoculture, where genetically uniform crop varieties are planted over large areas, further exacerbates the problem by creating a conducive environment for pathogen evolution. To address these challenges, there is a need for continuous monitoring of pathogen populations, deployment of resistance genes in a pyramided or stacked fashion, and diversification of resistance sources to ensure durability.

B. Climate Change Impact on Disease Dynamics

Climate change poses a significant threat to global agriculture by altering disease dynamics, influencing pathogen distribution, virulence, and host susceptibility. Rising temperatures, changes in precipitation patterns, and increased frequency of extreme weather events are reshaping the epidemiology of plant diseases. For instance, higher temperatures can accelerate the life cycle of pathogens, increase spore production, and enhance infection rates. The expansion of rust diseases like stripe rust (*Puccinia striiformis* f. sp. *tritici*) into previously non-endemic areas is a stark example of climate-induced changes in pathogen distribution.

Furthermore, climate change can stress plants, making them more susceptible to infections. Water scarcity and drought conditions can weaken plant defenses, while excessive rainfall

and humidity create favorable conditions for the proliferation of fungal and bacterial diseases [36]. The interplay between climate variables and disease dynamics necessitates the development of climate-resilient crop varieties with broad-spectrum resistance. Additionally, predictive modeling and early warning systems are essential to anticipate disease outbreaks and implement timely management practices.

C. Integration of Genomic Tools in Breeding Pipelines

The integration of genomic tools into breeding pipelines offers immense potential for accelerating the development of disease-resistant crops. Advances in genomics, such as next-generation sequencing (NGS), genome-wide association studies (GWAS), and genomic selection (GS), have revolutionized our ability to identify and utilize resistance genes. These tools enable the discovery of novel resistance genes, the mapping of quantitative trait loci (QTLs), and the prediction of genetic values for complex traits [37].

One of the critical challenges in integrating genomic tools is the translation of genetic information into practical breeding outcomes. This requires the development of robust predictive models, high-throughput phenotyping platforms, and the establishment of genomic databases. The implementation of genomic selection in breeding programs is particularly promising, as it allows for the simultaneous selection of multiple traits, including disease resistance, yield, and stress tolerance. However, the success of these tools depends on the availability of high-quality reference genomes, accurate phenotypic data, and the capacity to handle and analyze large datasets.

D. Sustainable Disease Management Practices

Sustainable disease management practices are essential to ensure long-term agricultural productivity while minimizing environmental impact. Integrated disease management (IDM) combines multiple control strategies, including host resistance, cultural practices, biological control, and the judicious use of chemical pesticides. The focus on sustainability involves reducing reliance on chemical inputs, which can lead to environmental pollution, non-target effects, and the development of pathogen resistance [38].

The use of biocontrol agents, such as beneficial microbes that induce systemic resistance or antagonize pathogens, is gaining traction as a sustainable approach. For example, rhizobacteria like *Pseudomonas fluorescens* and *Bacillus subtilis* have been shown to enhance plant resistance against various diseases through induced systemic resistance (ISR) (Van Loon et al., 1998). Additionally, the adoption of precision agriculture technologies, such as remote sensing and decision support systems, can optimize disease management by providing real-time data on disease incidence and environmental conditions.

Another aspect of sustainable disease management is the deployment of crop diversification and intercropping systems, which reduce disease pressure by disrupting pathogen life cycles and increasing biodiversity. The integration of traditional knowledge with modern scientific approaches can also contribute to sustainable practices by promoting the use of resistant local varieties and indigenous disease management techniques [39].

VIII. Conclusion

Advancing genetic resistance in crops through cutting-edge breeding strategies, such as Marker-Assisted Selection, Genomic Selection, and traditional methods like hybridization, is

essential for sustainable disease management. The integration of CRISPR-Cas9, transgenic approaches, and RNA interference has further enhanced our ability to develop robust disease-resistant varieties. However, challenges persist, including the emergence of new pathogen strains, climate-induced shifts in disease dynamics, and the need for holistic integration of genomic tools in breeding pipelines. Addressing these challenges requires a combination of innovative genetic technologies and sustainable practices, such as the use of beneficial microorganisms and precision agriculture. By adopting these approaches, we can mitigate the impact of plant diseases, enhance crop resilience, and ensure food security in the face of evolving environmental and biological threats.

Commented [P11]: Future prospects give

IX. References

1. Borrelli, V. M., Brambilla, V., Rogowsky, P., Marocco, A., & Lanubile, A. (2018). The enhancement of plant disease resistance using CRISPR/Cas9 technology. *Frontiers in plant science*, *9*, 1245.
2. Dubin, H. J., & Brennan, J. P. (2009). Combating stem and leaf rust of wheat. *Historical perspective impacts and lessons learned Millions Fed: Proven Successes in Agricultural Developmented D Spielman and R Pandya-Lorch (Washington DC, USA: IFPRI)*.
3. Collinge, D. B., Jørgensen, H. J., Lund, O. S., & Lyngkjær, M. F. (2010). Engineering pathogen resistance in crop plants: current trends and future prospects. *Annual review of phytopathology*, *48*(1), 269-291.
4. Seifi, A., Visser, R. G. F., & Bai, Y. (2013). How to effectively deploy plant resistances to pests and pathogens in crop breeding. *Euphytica*, *190*, 321-334.
5. Mores, A., Borrelli, G. M., Laidò, G., Petruzzino, G., Pecchioni, N., Amoroso, L. G. M., ... & Marone, D. (2021). Genomic approaches to identify molecular bases of crop resistance to diseases and to develop future breeding strategies. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, *22*(11), 5423.
6. Saijo, Y., Loo, E. P. I., & Yasuda, S. (2018). Pattern recognition receptors and signaling in plant–microbe interactions. *The Plant Journal*, *93*(4), 592-613.
7. Li, C., Wang, K., Tan, M., Lei, C., & Cao, S. (2023). Involvement of a receptor-like kinase complex of FvFLS2 and FvBAK1 in brassinosteroids-induced immunity in postharvest strawberry fruit. *Postharvest Biology and Technology*, *198*, 112266.
8. Morel, J. B., & Dangl, J. L. (1997). The hypersensitive response and the induction of cell death in plants. *Cell Death & Differentiation*, *4*(8), 671-683.
9. Wu, H. J., Wang, A. H., & Jennings, M. P. (2008). Discovery of virulence factors of pathogenic bacteria. *Current opinion in chemical biology*, *12*(1), 93-101.
10. Nomura, K., Mecey, C., Lee, Y. N., Imboden, L. A., Chang, J. H., & He, S. Y. (2011). Effector-triggered immunity blocks pathogen degradation of an immunity-associated vesicle traffic regulator in Arabidopsis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *108*(26), 10774-10779.
11. Belkhadir, Y., Subramaniam, R., & Dangl, J. L. (2004). Plant disease resistance protein signaling: NBS–LRR proteins and their partners. *Current opinion in plant biology*, *7*(4), 391-399.
12. Bigeard, J., Colcombet, J., & Hirt, H. (2015). Signaling mechanisms in pattern-triggered immunity (PTI). *Molecular plant*, *8*(4), 521-539.
13. Vidhyasekaran, P., & Vidhyasekaran, P. (2015). Salicylic acid signaling in plant innate immunity. *Plant hormone signaling systems in plant innate immunity*, 27-122.

Commented [P12]: References should be a recent one

14. Akbar, M. U., Aqeel, M., Shah, M. S., Jeelani, G., Iqbal, N., Latif, A., ... & Noman, A. (2023). Molecular regulation of antioxidants and secondary metabolites act in conjunction to defend plants against pathogenic infection. *South African Journal of Botany*, *161*, 247-257.
15. Young, N. D. (1996). QTL mapping and quantitative disease resistance in plants. *Annual review of phytopathology*, *34*(1), 479-501.
16. Mores, A., Borrelli, G. M., Laidò, G., Petruzzino, G., Pecchioni, N., Amoroso, L. G. M., ... & Marone, D. (2021). Genomic approaches to identify molecular bases of crop resistance to diseases and to develop future breeding strategies. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, *22*(11), 5423.
17. Cobb, J. N., DeClerck, G., Greenberg, A., Clark, R., & McCouch, S. (2013). Next-generation phenotyping: requirements and strategies for enhancing our understanding of genotype–phenotype relationships and its relevance to crop improvement. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics*, *126*, 867-887.
18. Ranganath, R. M., & Nagashree, N. R. (2001). Role of programmed cell death in development.
19. Tsiatsiani, L. (2012). *The multifunctionality of Arabidopsis metacaspases highlighted by their degradomes* (Doctoral dissertation, Ghent University).
20. Kamle, M., Borah, R., Bora, H., Jaiswal, A. K., Singh, R. K., & Kumar, P. (2020). Systemic acquired resistance (SAR) and induced systemic resistance (ISR): role and mechanism of action against phytopathogens. *Fungal biotechnology and bioengineering*, 457-470.
21. Jain, D., & Khurana, J. P. (2018). Role of pathogenesis-related (PR) proteins in plant defense mechanism. *Molecular aspects of plant-pathogen interaction*, 265-281.
22. Yu, Y., Gui, Y., Li, Z., Jiang, C., Guo, J., & Niu, D. (2022). Induced systemic resistance for improving plant immunity by beneficial microbes. *Plants*, *11*(3), 386.
23. Roychowdhury, R., Mishra, S., Anand, G., Dalal, D., Gupta, R., Kumar, A., & Gupta, R. (2024). Decoding the molecular mechanism underlying salicylic acid (SA)-mediated plant immunity: an integrated overview from its biosynthesis to the mode of action. *Physiologia Plantarum*, *176*(3), e14399.
24. Borrelli, V. M., Brambilla, V., Rogowsky, P., Marocco, A., & Lanubile, A. (2018). The enhancement of plant disease resistance using CRISPR/Cas9 technology. *Frontiers in plant science*, *9*, 1245.
25. Yang, S., Li, J., Zhang, X., Zhang, Q., Huang, J., Chen, J. Q., ... & Tian, D. (2013). Rapidly evolving R genes in diverse grass species confer resistance to rice blast disease. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *110*(46), 18572-18577.
26. Sripriya, R., Parameswari, C., & Veluthambi, K. (2017). Enhancement of sheath blight tolerance in transgenic rice by combined expression of tobacco osmotin (ap 24) and rice chitinase (chi 11) genes. *In Vitro Cellular & Developmental Biology-Plant*, *53*, 12-21.
27. Iwakawa, H. O., & Tomari, Y. (2022). Life of RISC: Formation, action, and degradation of RNA-induced silencing complex. *Molecular cell*, *82*(1), 30-43.
28. Hasan, N., Choudhary, S., Naaz, N., Sharma, N., & Laskar, R. A. (2021). Recent advancements in molecular marker-assisted selection and applications in plant breeding programmes. *Journal of Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology*, *19*(1), 128.
29. Kassa, M. T., You, F. M., Hiebert, C. W., Pozniak, C. J., Fobert, P. R., Sharpe, A. G., ... & McCartney, C. A. (2017). Highly predictive SNP markers for efficient selection of the wheat leaf rust resistance gene Lr16. *BMC plant biology*, *17*, 1-9.
30. Cobb, J. N., Biswas, P. S., & Platten, J. D. (2019). Back to the future: revisiting MAS as a tool for modern plant breeding. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics*, *132*, 647-667.

Commented [P13]: Crosscheck the references, and references should be give as per the journal style

31. Buerstmayr, M., Steiner, B., & Buerstmayr, H. (2020). Breeding for Fusarium head blight resistance in wheat—Progress and challenges. *Plant breeding*, *139*(3), 429-454.
32. Khan, A. H., Hassan, M., & Khan, M. N. (2020). Conventional plant breeding program for disease resistance. *Plant disease management strategies for sustainable agriculture through traditional and modern approaches*, 27-51.
33. Das, A., Soubam, D., Singh, P. K., Thakur, S., Singh, N. K., & Sharma, T. R. (2012). A novel blast resistance gene, Pi54rh cloned from wild species of rice, Oryza rhizomatis confers broad spectrum resistance to Magnaporthe oryzae. *Functional & integrative genomics*, *12*, 215-228.
34. Swathi, G., Durga Rani, C. V., Md, J., Madhav, M. S., Vanisree, S., Anuradha, C., ... & Jagadeeswar, R. (2019). Marker-assisted introgression of the major bacterial blight resistance genes, Xa21 and xa13, and blast resistance gene, Pi54, into the popular rice variety, JGL1798. *Molecular Breeding*, *39*, 1-12.
35. Stavrinides, J., McCann, H. C., & Guttman, D. S. (2008). Host–pathogen interplay and the evolution of bacterial effectors. *Cellular microbiology*, *10*(2), 285-292.
36. Hanaka, A., Ozimek, E., Reszczyńska, E., Jaroszuk-Ściseł, J., & Stolarz, M. (2021). Plant tolerance to drought stress in the presence of supporting bacteria and fungi: An efficient strategy in horticulture. *Horticulturae*, *7*(10), 390.
37. St. Clair, D. A. (2010). Quantitative disease resistance and quantitative resistance loci in breeding. *Annual review of phytopathology*, *48*(1), 247-268.
38. Miller, S. A., Ferreira, J. P., & LeJeune, J. T. (2022). Antimicrobial use and resistance in plant agriculture: a one health perspective. *Agriculture*, *12*(2), 289.
39. Altieri, M. A. (2004). Linking ecologists and traditional farmers in the search for sustainable agriculture. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, *2*(1), 35-42.