The Pharma Innovation Journal 2021; SP-10(6): 103-111

www.ThePharmaJournal.com

The Pharma Innovation

ISSN (E): 2277- 7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.23
TPI 2021; SP-10(6): 103-111
© 2021 TPI
www.thepharmajournal.com
Received: 25-04-2021
Accepted: 27-05-2021

Sushma Raj Chellem
Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding, School of Agriculture, Lovely Professional University, Punjab, India

Sanjeev Kumar
Assistant Professor, Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding, School of Agriculture, Lovely Professional University, Punjab, India.

Corresponding Author:
Sushma Raj Chellem
Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding, School of Agriculture, Lovely Professional University, Punjab, India

Genetic engineering of legume crops and their key event transformations

Sushma Raj Chellem and Sanjeev Kumar

Abstract
A very much characterized, ideally straightforward, shoot recovery convention is essential for the creation of transgenic plants. Grain legumes are one of the most un-agreeable gatherings to change among dicotyledonous harvests, despite the fact that they are typically vulnerable to Agrobacterium disease. Significant boundaries for fruitful change of grain legumes incorporate the attributes of the Agrobacterium strain utilized for immunization of target plant tissues, the vectors which the bacterial strain conveys, the co-development time frame and a choice framework joined with reasonable explants that contain changeable cells. Molecule barrage is an elective technique for those legumes which neglect to react to Agrobacterium-intervened quality exchange.

Keywords: genetic engineering, legume crops, key event transformations

Introduction
Proceeded with hereditary improvement is a need for the advancement of harvests with expanded quality and yield. Methionine, for instance, is the primary restricting fundamental amino corrosive which impacts the natural worth of the protein in grain legumes. Nonetheless, the right equilibrium in amino corrosive synthesis can't be accomplished by customary reproducing however requires the misuse of hereditary designing methods, since the last offer the most encouraging technique for expanding (by 5-10%) the grouping of methionine. This requires move into target legumes, by Agrobacterium or different methods, of unfamiliar qualities encoding methionine-rich proteins, for example, the Brazil nut 2S egg whites or its homologue from sunflower. Surely, such quality exchange tests have shown that the protein equilibrium of grain legumes, like lupins, can be remedied to FAO guidelines (Molvig *et al*., 1997; Muntz *et al*., 1998) [46, 47].
In crop plants, a significant number of the shoot recovery conventions have been created lately explicitly for misuse in hereditary control tests (Böhmer *et al*., 1995) [9]. Notwithstanding, a few prerequisites should be satisfied to create steadily changed plants. At first, a reasonable strategy is needed to convey unfamiliar DNA to plant tissues, trailed by the suitable system for refined tissues before the recovery of shoots prompting the recuperation of transgenic plants. Thusly, the recently presented gene(s) should be communicated in transgenic plants and, at last, the unfamiliar DNA should be heritable and communicated reproducibly in succeeding seed ages.

Frameworks for DNA conveyance to trim plants
Agrobacterium-intervened change
The most broadly utilized DNA conveyance frameworks which have potential viable applications incorporate those dependent on the normal quality exchange instrument of the Gram-negative soil bacterium Agrobacterium, with strategies like molecule siege and electroporation and additionally substance treatment of detached protoplasts giving elective methodologies. While these methods vary in the manner by which DNA is conveyed into plant cells (De Block, 1993) [17], they all require the utilization of refined cells and tissues as beneficiaries of unfamiliar DNA. *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* and A. rhiz*ogenes* are the most every now and again abused quality exchange specialists for producing transgenic plants in a wide assortment of plant species (Hooykaas, 1989) [30]. These microorganisms are all around perceived plant microbes which instigate the agronomically-significant illnesses crown nerve (affected by *A. tumefaciens*) and shaggy root (impelled by A. rhiz*ogenes*) in numerous dicotyledons (Kersters and De Ley, 1984) [35].

The two illnesses are brought about by the exchange and stable joining of part (the moved or T-DNA), of an enormous tumor-(Ti) or root-instigating (Ri) plasmid from the bacterium into the genome of beneficiary plant cells (Tinland, 1996) [69]. Of importance is the way that unfamiliar qualities embedded between the T-DNA borders are additionally incorporated, on the T-DNA, into beneficiary plant genomes. In plasmids from wild-type strains of Agrobacterium, articulation of oncogenicity qualities on the T-DNA typically changes the physiology of plant cells to go through tumor development. In any case, evacuation of such qualities brings about incapacitated Ti or Ri plasmids, which can be utilized to bring unfamiliar qualities into plant cells without influencing their endogenous development controller balance. Consequently, such cells might be prompted to recover into phenotypically ordinary transgenic plants. Cointegrate vectors include the inclusion by homologous recombination of unfamiliar gene(s) between the T-DNA lines of incapacitated Ti plasmids and, less significantly, Ri plasmids. An issue experienced with co-integrate vectors is their size, which makes their control in the research facility troublesome. Thus, the double vector framework is the one of decision, wherein the incapacitated T-DNA is set on a little plasmid equipped for being presented and enhanced in Escherichia coli and later moved into Agrobacterium for plant change. The incapacitated T-DNA for the most part has a different cloning site to work with unfamiliar quality inclusion. T-DNA move from the double vector to plant cells is as yet constrained by destructiveness qualities on the bigger inhabitant Ti plasmid, erased of its T-DNA, inside the Agrobacterium cell. While the normal harmfulness of agrobacteria changes and thus their capacity to taint plants, the destructiveness of certain strains can be expanded by the presentation of a supervirulent plasmid, for example, pTOK47 conveying additional duplicates of a portion of the harmfulness qualities, into the Agrobacterium cell, close by the parallel vector. Such supervirulent strains of Agrobacterium seems to be helpful in changing certain dicotyledons, like lettuce (Curtis *et al*., 1994) [15]. Very paired vectors, in which additional duplicates of harmfulness qualities are on the parallel vector itself, have likewise demonstrated valuable in the change of cereals, as on account of rice (Hiei *et al*., 1994, 1997) [27, 26]. Agrobacteria conveying very paired vectors may likewise demonstrate helpful, later on, in the hereditary control of "troublesome to transform" dicotyledons, for example, grain legumes. Certain incapacitated strains of *A. tumefaciens* have been utilized widely for quite a long while to convey the parallel and very paired vectors, a magnificent model being LBA4404 (Hoekema *et al*., 1983) [29].

Biolistics for quality conveyance

Biolistics, molecule siege or "quality gunning" is a procedure which, in contrast to the utilization of Agrobacterium, is plant genotype-free. The method depends upon the speed increase of DNA covered particles (microprojectiles) into target cells. The microprojectiles for the most part comprise of pieces of inactive metal, generally gold, with widths of 0.2-4.0 µm. The most regularly utilized instruments for accelerating DNA covered particles are those controlled by an explosion of helium created by a burst film instrument (Kikkert, 1993) [36], or by a stun wave produced by a high voltage release through a water drop (McCabe and Christou, 1993) [42]. In the two cases, a macro carrier, whereupon the DNA covered microprojectiles have been set, is sped up towards a punctured halting screen. The macrocarrier is captured by the halting screen; the microprojectiles proceed at high speed, normally under vacuum, into the objective tissue. Accordingly, DNA is delivered from the microprojectiles inside the objective cells and gets incorporated into plant genomic DNA, albeit the exact systems associated with this cycle stay muddled

Different methodologies for quality exchange into plants

Electroporation or potentially polyethylene glycol (PEG) treatment of DNA-protoplast blends has been abused for transgenic plant creation where a protoplast-to-plant recovery framework is accessible, yet where the plant cells don't react promptly to Agrobacterium immunization. Moreover, disengaged protoplasts are a helpful test framework for examining transient quality articulation. For instance, Giovinazzo *et al*. (1997) [24] utilized protoplasts confined from suspension refined cells of Phaseolus vulgaris to examine the articulation and solidness of a phaseolin quality succession driven by a constitutive advertiser. Collection of the effectively glycosylated also, collected protein was recorded in the protoplasts, the last furnishing a brilliant trial framework with which to consider the statement of wild-type just as *in vitro* adjusted seed proteins. Other change approaches have been assessed and their benefits and restrictions have been examined (Southgate *et al*., 1998) [67], especially on account of monocotyledons. In any case, even in monocotyledons, the utilization of disengaged protoplasts as beneficiaries for unfamiliar DNA addition has been superceded as of late, in a few research centers, by the accessibility of very destructive strains of *A. tumefaciens*, especially those holding very twofold vectors.

Determination of changed cells, tissues furthermore, recovered plants

The incorporation of an anti-infection or herbicide in the way of life medium is regularly used to choose changed cells and tissues from which transgenic plants are recovered. The neomycin phosphotransferase (nptII) quality, presenting protection from the aminoglycoside anti-infection agents like kanamycin sulfate and geneticin (G418), has been abused most widely in plant change frameworks (Bevan *et al*., 1983) [7], despite the fact that hygromycin opposition has been utilized for determination in the grain legume *Vicia narbonensis* (Pickardt *et al*., 1991) [51]. On account of herbicide-based determination, the bar quality for bialaphos obstruction has given tight determination in a few cases (Mohapatra *et al*., 1999) [44], yet articulation of this quality has not been evaluated broadly in grain legumes. Articulation of the ß-glucuronidase (gus) quality (Jefferson *et al*., 1987) [33] stays a valuable marker for quick appraisals of the accomplishment of quality conveyance to plant cells, while articulation of the green fluorescent protein (gfp) quality from the jellyfish *Aequorea victoria* (Molinier *et al*., 2000) [45] gives an exceptionally valuable, non-ruinous methodology for observing quality exchange and articulation in plant tissues. As of late, GFP has been utilized in the transient and stable transformation of embryogenic suspension societies of soybean, following quality introduction by molecule barrage (Ponappa *et al*., 1999) [53].

Agrobacterium-intervened change of grain legumes

Collectively, grain legumes are less amiable to hereditary control *in vitro* contrasted and most other dicotyledonous harvest species, especially individuals from the Solanaceae

(de Kathen and Jacobsen, 1995) [19]. While a few leguminous categories are powerless to Agrobacterium immunization, moderately barely any grain legumes have been steadily changed utilizing incapacitated vectors conveyed by *A. tumefaciens*. An outline of the key change occasions identifying with grain legumes is introduced in Table 1. Generally speaking, notwithstanding their financial significance, grain legumes have pulled in less consideration for hereditary control, contrasted and grains, for instance, utilizing *in vitro*-based procedures. Potential special cases are soybean (Jacobsen, 1992) [32] and, to a lesser degree, pea (Bean *et al*., 1997) [6], with the age of transgenic tissues and recovered plants being all around reported. Without a doubt, soybean was the primary grain legume from which stable transgenic plants were obtained (Table 1). On account of pea, the parallel cotyledonary meristems were utilized to build up a reproducible *A. tumefaciens*-intervened change framework (Bean *et al*., 1997) [6]. As these creators underlined, the benefit of their framework was that it used dry seed as beginning material, while the profoundly regenerable cotyledonary meristems created transgenic plants quickly without a halfway callus stage. Phenotypically typical, fruitful plants contained useful transgenes which were acquired in a Mendelian design. Hereditary designing of the genera Phaseolus and Vigna has been investigated by Nagl *et al*. (1997) [48], while the coordination into grain legumes of qualities administering attractive characteristics, for example, protection from herbicides (Schroeder *et al*., 1993; Russell *et al*., 1993) [65, 59] and creepy crawlies (Schroeder *et al*., 1995, Chrispeels *et al*., 1998) [64, 11] and expanding methionine to change the proportion of seed proteins (Saalbach *et al*., 1994; Waddell *et al*., 1994; Saalbach *et al*., 1995; Muntz *et al*., 1998) [60, 72, 61, 47], have additionally been accounted for (Table 1).

Table 1: A summary of the transformation of grain legumes

Plant species	Bacterial strain/Procedure	Explants	Analysis/Result	Notes	References
Cicer arietinum, various genotypes	*A. tum*. strains A281, C58, A6; A. rhiz. strain R23.	7-d-old ex vitro seedlings; 10-d-old *in vitro* seedlings.	*In vitro* seedlings were more reactive than *in vivo* seedlings. Tumour and hairy root formation; Southern blot and opine analyses.	Hypocotyl explants were more sensitive than other explants to Agrobacterium. Avirulent Agrobacterium strains failed to elicit any response.	Riazuddin and Husnain, 1993 [58].
Cicer arietinum, local ecotypes	*A. tum*. strain LBA4404 carrying pBI121 with the gus and nptII genes. Co-cultivation of explants with agrobacteria for 20 min.	Embryonic axes devoid of apical domes.	Acetosyringone treatment ineffective in stimulating transformation. Dot and Southern blot analyses; gus and nptII gene expression. Transgenic rooted plants obtained.	4% transformation frequency. Origin of regenerants not discussed. First report of chickpea transformation.	Fontana *et al*., 1993 [21].
Cicer arietinum, various accessions	*A. tum*. strains C58C1/GV2260 carrying p35SGUSINT, and EHA101 harbouring pIBGUS.	Embryo axes.	GUS and Southern analyses. Kanamycin and phophinothricin resistant transgenic plants. Rooting of transgenic shoots difficult.	Grafting of transgenic shoots onto non-transformed stock plants resulted in recovery of phenotypically normal transgenic plants.	Krishnamurthy *et al*., 2000 [38].
Glycine canescens	A. rhiz. strain A4T and hypervirulent strain R1601.	Hypocotyl sections of 12-dand 35-42-d-old seedlings.	Hairy root formation; NPTII and Southern analyses; gene integration and regeneration of transgenic plants from hairy roots.	Young seedling explants are more responsive than older explants. A. rhiz. strain A4T failed to infect explants.	Rech *et al*., 1989 [57].
Glycine argyrea accession G1420 A.	rhiz. strains LBA9402, A4T and engineered strains R1601 and A4TIII.	9, 14 and 27 d-old seedling hypocotyl explants.	Hairy root formation; regeneration of transgenic plants from hairy roots; opine and NPTII analyses.	Explant age and bacterial concentrations important to maximise the transformation response.	Kumar *et al*., 1991 [39].
Glycine max	*A. tum*. with pTiT37-SE carrying nptII and gus genes; pTiT37-SE: pMON894 with nptII and glyphosate resistance genes	4-10-d-old seedling cotyledons with their adaxial surfaces in contact with the culture medium.	GUS and Southern analyses. First stable, Kan resistant and glyphosate tolerant transgenic soybean plants by Agrobacterium-mediated transformation.	Plant genotype was important in response to Agrobacterium. Kan selection enriched transformed tissues. Mendelian gene inheritance of genes.	Hinchee *et al*., 1988 [28].
Glycine max	Delivery of nptII and gus genes by electric discharge particle acceleration device.	Embryonic axes with exposed meristems devoid of leaf primordia.	GUS, NPTII and Southern analyses; gene expression and integration. First stably transformed soybean plant by particle bombardment.	Transformation frequency 2-4%. Variable gene expression and some chimaeric plants.	McCabe *et al*., 1988 [43].
Glycine max	Delivery of nptII and gus genes by tungsten	Shoot tips and embryonic cell	GUS and Southern analyses. Stable	Chimaeric gene expression in shoot tip	Sato *et al*., 1993 [62].

	particles using PDS100 instrument.	suspensions.	transformation of suspension cells leading to regeneration of somatic embryos and plants.	explants. DNA coated particles penetrated into the second cell layer of bombarded shoot tips.	
Lens culinaris	*A. tum.* strain GV2260 carrying p35SGUSINT.	Shoot apex consisting of apical dome, leaf primordia and part of the epicotyl.	GUS assay; transgenic shoots not regenerated. Pre-cultured explants exhibited less response than newly excised explants.	Longer co-cultivation periods (>3 d) reduced the number of buds which developed and survived.	Warkentin and McHugen, 1992 [73].
Lens culinaris	Electroporation of *in vivo* tissues.	Intact plant tissues from nodal axillary buds; juvenile nodal meristems.	GUS and Southern analyses.	Chimaeric shoots rooted to produce transgenic plants. Procedure also applicable to Pisum sativum, Vigna unguiculata and Glycine max	Chowrira *et al.*, 1996 [10].
Lupinus angustifolius cvs. Unicorp and Merit.	*A. tum.* carrying the bar gene.	Shoot apices producing multiple axillary shoots.	Southern analysis. Herbicide resistant transgenic plants and seed progeny.	Transformation frequency of 0.4-2.8%. Meristems required for successful transformation	Pigeaire *et al.*, 1997 [52].
Lupinus mutabilis cv. Potosi	*A. tum.* LBA4404 with a binary vector carrying gus and nptII genes, together with the super virulent pTOK47.	Shoot apical meristems of 4-7-d old seedlings from which initial cell layers removed.	GUS, NPTII and Southern analyses; integration and expression of gus and nptII genes. Production of Kan resistant plants.	Removal of apical cell layers promoted regeneration of buds. First transgenic sweet lupin plants.	Babaoglu *et al.*, 2000.
Lupinus mutabilis cv. Potosi; *L. angustifolius* cv. Kubesa	Hypervirulent A. rhiz. R1601 carrying nptII gene.	Intact hypocotyl and epicotyl explants from young seedlings.	NPTII and Southern analyses; gene integration a and expression. Kan resistant transgenic hairy roots with rapid growth rates in both species.	First report of hairy root induction in both species. Hairy roots exhibit stable growth over 4 years, but fail to regenerate plants.	Babaoglu, 1996
Phaseolus acutifolius cv. Gray.	*A. tum.* C58C1 carrying nptII, gus and orcelin-5a genes.	Regeneration-competent callus derived from bud explants of *in vivo* cultured plants.	GUS and Southern analyses; transient expression of gus gene; integration and segregation of genes in progenies at a single locus.	A new approach offering this species as a bridge for gene transfer to more important bean species.	Dillen *et al.*, 1997.
Phaseolus vulgaris cv. Goldstar	Particle bombardment with pSAG-734 carrying the gus gene under the canalin gene	Seeds.	GUS histochemical assay; production of transgenic plants.	Organ and maturation stage specific gene expression.	Kim and Minamikawa, 1997 [37]
Phaseolus vulgaris cv. Carioca	Delivery of gus and 2S albumin genes using an electrical particle acceleration gun.	Embryonic axes excised from mature seeds.	GUS, Western and ELISA assays; expression of gus and 2S genes.	Transgenic plants not regenerated, but first demonstration of the expression of a nutritional protein in legumes.	Aragao *et al.*, 1992 [2].
Phaseolus vulgaris	Electric discharge particle acceleration of pWRG2204 carrying gus and bar genes.	Apical meristems derived from seeds incubated overnight in MS-based medium.	Apical meristems derived from seeds incubated overnight in MS-based medium.	Germline transformed at low frequency (0.03%) to give transformed shoots and plants.	Russell *et al.*, 1993 [59].
Phaseolus vulgaris L. cv. Dark Red Kidney	*A. tum.* EHA101 carrying pKYLX71GUS.	Leaf disks and hypocotyl segments from 3-4- and 7-d-old seedlings.	NPTII ELISA and Southern analyses; Kan resistant callus from leaf disks with stable integration of DNA into cells.	Plants not regenerated from transformed tissues.	Franklin *et al.*, 1993 [22].
Phaseolus vulgaris, various cultivars and lines.	*A. tum.* oncogenic and disarmed strains with gus reporter gene.	Stab inoculation of nodal regions of germinating intact seedlings	GUS and tumourigenesis assays; GUS activity in different tissues.	Stab inoculation of apical meristems exposes the interior cell layers to agrobacteria.	Levis and Bliss, 1994 [41].
Phaseolus vulgaris, various cultivars	*A. tum.* carrying gus and nptII genes. A. rhiz.	Multiple buds from cotyledonary nodes. Epicotyl explants	GUS activity. Chimaeric shoots produced	Transgenic plants not regenerated.	Barros *et al.*, 1997 [5].
Pisum sativum cv. Puget	*A. tum.* wild-type strain C58; A rhiz. wild-type	Shoot apex, epicotyl and	Histological analysis of tumours and hairy roots.	Meristematic cells more responsive than other	Hussey *et al.*, 1989 [31].

	strain 9402.	cotyledons.		cell types to transformation.	
Pisum sativum. Various cultivars	*A. tum*. C58C1 carrying a binary vector.	Thin cell layers from nodes.	GUS assay; GUS activity in leaves of transformed shoots.	Freshly excised tissues are more vulnerable to infection to Agrobacterium; rooting of shoots is cultivar dependent.	Nauerby *et al*., 1991 [49].
Pisum sativum cvs. Greenfeast, Rondo	*A. tum*. strain AGL1 carrying bar and nptII genes.	Immature embryonic axes lacking roots, co-cultivated for 4 d.	PAT assay and Northern blot; stable transformation (1.5-2.5%). First herbicide resistant pea plants.	Mendelian inheritance of bar and nptII genes.	Schroeder *et al*., 1993 [64].
Pisum sativum cv. Puget	*A. tum*. C58/3 carrying pSLJ1911 with gus and nptII genes.	Cotyledonary nodes.	PCR, GUS and Southern analyses; multiple gus gene insertions; transformation frequency of 1.44%.	Some plants escape Kan selection; high initial Kan levels reduce the efficiency of selection.	Davies *et al*., 1993.
Pisum sativum cv. Greenfeast	As in Schroeder *et al*. (1993) [64] plus the ai gene.	Procedure of Schroeder *et al*. (1993) [64].	Gene expression restricted to cotyledons and embryonic axes.	Northern Blot; insect infestation assay. First pea plant partially resistant to Pea Weevil.	Schroeder *et al*., 1995 [65]
Pisum sativum cvs. Bolero, Huka and Trounce.	*A. tum*. strain AGL1 with pLN27 carrying bar and nptII genes.	Immature cotyledons.	PAT, Southern and cytological analyses. Transgenic herbicide resistant pea plants produced.	Stable inheritance and expression of transgenes.	Grant *et al*., 1995.
Pisum sativ*um* cv. Puget	*A. tum*. hypervirulent strain EHA105 carrying the binary vector pSLJ1561 with the bar gene.	Cotyledonary meristems	PAT analysis and Southern analyses; herbicide painting. Transformants phenotypically normal following grafting to cv. Puget rootstock. Mendelian inheritance of the bar gene.	Rooting of putative transformants slow, erratic and unreliable, taking 6-12 weeks. Transformants phenotypically abnormal exhibiting unless grafting.	Bean *et al*., 1997 [6].
Vicia narbonensis var. narbonensis	*A. tum*. strain C58C1 carrying pGV3850HPT.	Small segment of epicotyl and shoot tips.	Southern blot analysis; hygromycin resistant transgenic shoots.	All rooted shoots failed to undergo further development.	Pickardt *et al*., 1991 [51].
Vicia narbonensis	*A. tum*. strain EHA101 with pGSGLUC1-2S carrying gus, nptII and 2S genes.	Method of Pickardt *et al*. (1991) [51].	GUS and Southern analyses; R2 progeny analysis; first stable transgenic plants which express gus, nptII and 2S genes.	First expression of a nutritional protein in seed progeny.	Saalbach *et al*., 1994 [60].
Vicia faba, various cultivars	*A. tum*. with Ri plasmid; A. rhiz. strains.	Different sites on stem, stabbed to 2-3 mm depth.	Tumour formation preceding hairy root formation after 10 d.	Strain A4 (pRiA4) did not induce hairy roots, but strain A4T infected all cultivars.	Siefkes-Boer *et al*., 1995 [66].
Vigna aconitifolia, *Vigna mungo* and *Vigna radiata*	Particle bombardment using pB1221 carrying gus and nptII genes.	Mature embryos with one cotyledon.	GUS assay; gus gene expression in cotyledonary meristematic region.	Plants putatively transformed, but transformation not confirmed by Southern analysis.	Bhargava and Smigochi, 1994 [8].
Vigna mungo	*A. tum*. with binary vector pGA472.	Leaf-derived calli	NPTII and Southern analyses; transformed calli with gene integration.	Transgenic plants not regenerated.	Karthikeyan *et al*., 1996 [34]
Vigna unguiculata cv. Blackeye	Electroporation with plasmid carrying gus gene	Embryonic axes from mature seeds	GUS assay; microscopical analysis. GUS activity detected in various tissues.	Various levels of transgene expression. Progeny tests not reported.	Akella and Lurquin, 1993 [1]
Vigna unguiculata various accessions	*A. tum*. Strain C58 carrying pGV2260 and p35SGUSINT.	Mature, ungerminated, excised embryos.	GUS and DNA dot blot analyses; chimaeric GUS-positive shoots regenerated.	The majority of transgenic cells were located in the subepidermal layers of stems.	Penza *et al*., 1991 [50].

Preceding the presentation of agronomically helpful qualities into a harvest species by non-oncogenic strains of Agrobacterium, the plant reaction to bacterial vaccination is frequently assessed by immunizing explants or flawless plants with wild-type strains of Agrobacterium. These investigations give knowledge into such boundaries as the ideal co-development period and the plant cells generally equipped for change inside target tissues (de Kathen and Jacobsen, 1995)

[19]. For instance, Zhanyuan *et al*. (1997) [75] examined factors influencing change of regular bean, utilizing the Agrobacterium strains A2760 and EHA105 conveying the gus correspondent quality to work with quick screening of change. They affirmed an Agrobacterium-have plant connection and got information identifying with the impact of explant development, preculture and Agrobacterium-explant co-development conditions, and the choice strategy on the change rate. What's more, it was proposed that preconditioning of explants on a medium containing 20 μM benzyladenine preceding co-development in murkiness with concentrated suspensions of agrobacteria, was fundamental to improve change rates. Phenolic compounds, for example, acetosyringone, invigorate quality exchange from Agrobacterium to plant cells and, subsequently, are frequently remembered for the bacterial culture medium and additionally in the medium during co-development of agrobacteria with plant cells.

The best change frameworks in grain legumes prompting the recuperation of transgenic plants are those which have abused in early stage (Schroeder *et al*., 1993, 1995) [64, 65], stem nodal fragments or cotyledon-hypocotyl segments (de Kathen and Jacobsen, 1990; Nauerby *et al*., 1991; Davies *et al*., 1993) [18, 49, 16], and apical explants (Pickardt *et al*., 1991; Russell *et al*., 1993) [51, 59]. Such explants all have terminal or axillary meristems and, henceforth, a high shoot recovery limit.

While meristematic cells have been considered not to be equipped or then again to have a low ability to Agrobacterium-based change in pea (de Kathen and Jacobsen, 1995) [19], transgenic plants are acquired, nevertheless, in this grain legume (Hussey *et al*., 1989; Bean *et al*., 1997) [31, 6] and furthermore in chickpea (Fontana *et al*., 1993; Krishnamurthy *et al*., 2000) [21, 38], basic bean (Levis and Bliss, 1994) [41], sweet lupin (Babaoglu *et al*., 2000) [4] and blue lupin (Pigeaire *et al*., 1997) [52]. The change system includes extraction of the most apical meristematic layer(s) or cutting of the apical meristems earlier to immunization with Agrobacterium (Table 1). For instance, Pigeaire *et al*. (1997) [52] changed blue lupin with herbicide obstruction by cutting the apical arch and primordia of the third pair of leaves of shoot explants with *A. tumefaciens* conveying the bar quality. Strangely, Babaoglu *et al*. (2000) [4] could actuate various shoots solely after expulsion of the cell layer(s) of the apices of sweet lupin to a most extreme profundity of 300 mm underneath the apical arch. In this manner, such explants were immunized with a very destructive strain (1065) of *A. tumefaciens* (Curtis *et al*., 1994) [15] to get transgenic shoots. The benefit of utilizing such explants for Agrobacterium immunization contrasted with different tissues is that the technique is straightforward and generally quick, with the immediate advancement of shoots from the vaccinated explants without an interceding callus stage. The evasion of a callus stage, trailed by recovery through shoots or substantial undeveloped organisms, guarantees a low rate of somaclonal variety. The powerlessness of Agrobacterium to enter tissues and to stick to the dividers of cells fit for going through change and shoot recovery, is likely one of the principle factors restricting the change of numerous plants, including grain legumes. Sometimes, a blend of techniques has expanded the proficiency of change, as in oppressing plant tissues to brief times of ultrasound within the sight of microbes. This treatment, called Sonication Assisted Agrobacterium-interceded Transformation (SAAT), actuates the development of diverts in the objective plant tissues, working with bacterial admittance to inside cells of the explants. Such a technique has been ensnared in being particularly useful in changing meristems with high shoot recovery potential, yet which regularly are genuinely impermeable to agrobacteria. The strategy is additionally pertinent to embryogenic callus and suspension cells (Trick and Finer, 1997) [70]. Surely, stable change of soybean embryogenic cell suspensions has been accounted for utilizing this method (Trick and Finer, 1998) [71].

During the most recent decade, there has been an interest in building up A. rhiz*ogenes* as an elective framework to *A. tumefaciens* for presenting unfamiliar DNA into plant cells. The capacity to recuperate plants from changed roots is a fundamental element of this framework. Watchman (1991) inspected the writing identifying with the enlistment of changed (bushy) establishes in *Glycine* species, *Phaseolus vulgaris*, *Pisum sativum*, *Vicia sativa*, *Vicia faba*, *Vigna unguiculata* and *Vigna aconitifolia*, utilizing various strains of A. rhiz*ogenes*. For instance, the acceptance of changed roots was accounted for in *Cicer arietinum* (Riazuddin and Husnain, 1993; Siefkes-Boer *et al*., 1995) [58, 66], and in *Lupinus angustifolius* and *L. mutabilis* (Babaoglu, 1996) [3]. Be that as it may, plants could as it were be recovered from refined, changed foundations of the wild soybeans *Glycine canescens* (Rech *et al*., 1989) [57] and *Glycine argyrea* (Kumar *et al*., 1991) [39], and from *Vigna aconitifolia* (Tepfer, 1990) [68]. Restricted achievement has been accounted for from refined bristly underlying foundations of pea (Saalbach *et al*., 1994) [60]. All things considered, these outcomes demonstrate that plant recovery from changed, refined foundations of grain legumes remain troublesome and sporadic.

Microprojectile-interceded change of grain legumes

Albeit most exertion has focused upon the utilization of Agrobacterium for bringing qualities into grain legumes, there are additionally reports of the utilization of biolistics. Shoot apical meristems of develop seeds or entirety incipient organisms have been utilized broadly as target tissues for direct quality move by molecule siege in *Glycine max* (McCabe *et al*., 1988; Sato *et al*., 1993) [43, 62], *Phaseolus vulgaris* (Russell *et al*., 1993) [59] what's more, with more restricted achievement, in *Vigna* species (Bhargava and Smigocki, 1994) [8] (Table 1). In most of cases, explants from close to the shoot summit or the actual pinnacle, have been the objectives of decision (Christou, 1997) [14] with the special case, as of late, of soybean embryogenic cell suspensions which were changed with the jellyfish gfp quality (Ponappa *et al*., 1999) [53]. Apical meristems grant quick numerous shoot creation with least tissue culture contrasted and other kinds of tissues. All the more critically, the genotype has less impact on plant recovery. The change recurrence on account of biolistics is typically low contrasted with Agrobacterium-intervened quality move, while the choice of changed cells and shoots following siege of apical explants might be more troublesome than Agrobacterium-based methods on account of the perplexing association of the shoot peak (Yang, 1993) [74]. In any case, it has been accounted for that molecule barrage might be the favoured choice for quality presentation into enormous cultivated grain legumes, dodging the host explicitness of many grain legumes to disease by Agrobacterium (Christou, 1994, 1995, 1997) [12, 13, 14]. Unquestionably, this procedure might be helpful for embeddings unfamiliar DNA into apical tissues of an animal groups, in a variety independent way, when no other pathway

of plant recovery is accessible. The fundamental impediment to this methodology in certain labs might be the place where there stays restricted admittance to molecule siege instruments (Christou, 1997) [14]. An intriguing idea is one which joins parts of Agrobacterium-intervened change with biolistics. Along these lines, Hansen and Chilton (1996) portrayed a novel "agrolistic" framework in which harmfulness qualities from the Ti plasmid of *A. tumefaciens* were set on one plasmid and the last co-conveyed by siege with a second plasmid conveying the T-DNA borders flanking the quality of interest. Harmfulness quality articulation in planta instigated T-DNA move like that happening during ordinary Agrobacterium mediated quality conveyance. Until this point, just starter data has acquired in soybean and the use of this way to deal with a scope of legumes actually requires further examination.

Conclusion

This survey is expected to give a concise outline and foundation data to the change of grain legumes since there is still a necessity, conceivably through help from the European Union (EU), to create basic, reproducible and effective change systems for those legumes developed in Europe. Certain boundaries may arise as being normal to change conventions, such as the utilization of explicit bacterial strains, the co-development time frame, the barrage conditions and the idea of the vectors, selectable markers and target explants. Nonetheless, the establishing of transgenic shoots joined with helpless shoot development following establishing, have been recognized as challenges which stay basic to the change of some grain vegetables and which should be settled as soon as possible (Puonti-Kaerlas, 1993; de Kathen and Jacobsen, 1995; Ramsay, 1995) [19].

References

1. Akella V, Lurquin PF. Expression in cowpea seedlings of chimeric transgenes after electroporation into seed-derived embryos. Plant Cell Reports 1993;12:110-117.
2. Aragao FJL, Grossi de Sa MF, Almeida ER. Particle bombardment-mediated transient expression of a Brazil nut methionine-rich albumin in bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.). Plant Molecular Biology 1992;20:357-359.
3. Babaoglu M. Genetic Manipulation of Lupins. PhD Thesis. University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK 1996.
4. Babaoglu M, McCabe MS, Power JB, Davey MR. Agrobacterium-mediated transformation of *Lupinus mutabilis* L. using shoot apical explants. Acta Physiologiae Plantarum (In press) 2000.
5. Barros LMG, Gama MICS, Goncalves CHR, Barreto CC, Santana ET, Carciro VT *et al*. Bean tissue culture with a view to introducing foreign genes. *Presquisa agropecuaria* Brasileira 1997;32:267-275.
6. Bean SJ, Gooding PS, Mullineaux PM, Davies DR. A simple system for pea transformation. Plant Cell Reports 1997;16:513-519.
7. Bevan M, Flavell RB, Chilton MD. A chimaeric antibiotic resistance gene as a selectable marker for plant transformation. Nature 1983;304:184-187.
8. Bhargava SC, Smigocki AC. Transformation of tropical grain legumes using particle bombardment. Current Science 1994;66:439-442.
9. Böhmer P, Meyer B, Jacobsen HJ. Thidiazuron-induced high frequency of shoot induction and plant regeneration in protoplast derived pea callus. Plant Cell Reports 1995;15:26-29.
10. Chowrira GM, Akella V, Fuerst PE, Lurquin PF. Transgenic grain legumes obtained by in planta electroporation-mediated gene transfer. Molecular Biotechnology 1996;5:85-96.
11. Chrispeels MJ, de Sa MFG, Higgins TJV. Genetic engineering with alpha-amylase inhibitors makes seeds resistant to bruchids. Seed Science Research 1998;8:257-263.
12. Christou P. Biotechnology of crop legumes. Euphytica 1994;74:165-185.
13. Christou P. Strategies for variety-independent genetic transformation of important cereals, legumes and woody species utilising particle bombardment. Euphytica 1995;85:13-27.
14. Christou, P. Biotechnoloy applied to grain legumes. Field Crops Research 1997;53:83-97.
15. Curtis IS, Power JB, Blackhall NW, de Laat AMM, Davey MR. Genotype-independent transformation of lettuce using *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*. Journal of Experimental Botany 1994;45:1441-1449.
16. Davies DR, Hamilton J, Mullineaux P. Transformation of peas. Plant Cell Reports 1993;12:180-183.
17. De Block M. The cell biology of plant transformaion: current state, problems, prospects and implications for plant breeding. Euphytica 1993;71:1-14.
18. De Kathen A, Jacobsen HJ. *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* mediated transformation of *Pisum sativum* L. using binary and cointegrate vectors. Plant Cell Reports 1990;9:276-279.
19. De Kathen A, Jacobsen HJ. Cell competence for Agrobacterium mediated DNA transfer in *Pisum sativum* L. Transgenic Research 1995;4:184-191.
20. Dillen W, De Clerq J, Goossens A, Van Montagu M, Angenon G. Agrobacterium-mediated transformation of *Phaseolus acutifolius* A. Gray. Theoretical and Applied Genetics 1997;94:151-158.
21. Fontana GS, Santini L, Caretto S, Frugis G, Mariotti D. Genetic transformation in the grain legume *Cicer arietinum* L. (chickpea). Plant Cell Reports 1993;12:194-198.
22. Franklin CI, Trieu TN, Cassidy BG, Dixon RA, Nelson RS. Genetic transformation of green bean callus via Agrobacterium mediated DNA transfer. Plant Cell Reports 1993;12:74-79.
23. Grant JE, Cooper PA, McAra AE, Frew TJ. Transformation of peas (*Pisum sativum* L.) using immature cotyledons. Plant Cell Reports 1995;15:254-258.
24. Giovinazzo G, Greco V, Vitale A, Bollini R. Bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) protoplasts as a model system to study the expression and stability of recombinant seed proteins. Plant Cell Reports 1997;16:705-709.
25. Hansen G, Chilton MD. 'Agrolistic' transformation of plant cells: integration of T-strands generated in planta. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA 1996;93:14978-14983.
26. Hiei Y, Komari T, Kubo T. Transformation of rice mediated by *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*. Plant Molecular Biology 1997;35:205-218.
27. Hiei Y, Ohta S, Komari T, Lumashiro T. Efficient transformation of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) mediated by Agrobacterium and sequence analysis of the boundaries of the T-DNA. The Plant Journal 1994;6:271-282.

28. Hinchee MAW, Connor-Ward D, Christine AN, McDonald RE, Sato SJ, Gasser CS *et al*. Production of transgenic soybean plants using Agrobacterium-mediated DNA transfer. Bio/Technology 1988;6:912-922.
29. Hoekema A, Hirsch PR, Hooykaas PJJ, Schilperoort RA. A binary plant vector strategy based on separation of vir and T-region of the *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* Ti plasmid. Nature 1983;303:179-180.
30. Hooykaas PJJ. Transformation of plant cells via Agrobacterium. Plant Molecular Biology 1989;13:327-336.
31. Hussey G, Johnson RD, Warren S. Transformation of meristematic cells in the shoot apex of cultured pea shoots by *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* and A. rhiz*ogenes*. Protoplasma 1989;148:101-105.
32. Jacobsen HJ. Biotechnology applied to grain legumes-current state and prospects. In: Proceedings of Ist European Conference on Grain Legumes, Angers, France 1992, 99-103.
33. Jefferson RA, Kavanagh TA, Bevan MW. GUS fusions: beta glucuronidase as a sensitive and versatile gene fusion marker in higher plants. European Molecular Biology Organisation Journal 1987;6:3901-3907.
34. Karthikeyan AS, Sarma KS, Veluthambi K. *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*-mediated transformation of *Vigna mungo* (L.) Hepper. Plant Cell Reports 1996;15:328-331.
35. Kersters K, Deley J. Genus III. Agrobacterium Conn. 1942. In: Manual of Systematic Bacteriology. (Edited by Krieg, N.R.). William and Wilkins, Baltimore, USA, 1984, 224-254.
36. Kikkert JR. The Biolistic PDS-1000/He device. Plant Cell Tissue and Organ Culture 1993;33:221-226.
37. Kim JW, Minamikawa T. Stable delivery of a canavalin promoter beta-glucuronidase gene fusion into French bean by particle bombardment. Plant Cell Physiology 1997;38:70-75.
38. Krishnamurthy KV, Suhasini K, Sagare AP, Meixner M, de Kathen A, Pickardt T *et al*. Agrobacterium-mediated transformation of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) embryo axes. Plant Cell Reports 2000;19:235-240.
39. Kumar V, Jones B, Davey MR. Transformation by *Agrobacterium rhizogenes* and regeneration of transgenic shoots of the wild soybean *Glycine argyrea*. Plant Cell Reports 1991;10:135-138.
40. Lacorte C, Aragao FJL, Almeida ER, Mansur E, Rech EL. Transient expression of GUS and 2S albumin gene from Brazil nut in peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) seed explants using particle bombardment. Plant Cell Reports 1997;16:619-623.
41. Lewis ME, Bliss F*A. tum*our formation and beta glucuronidase expression in *Phaseolus vulgaris* inoculated with *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*. Journal of American Horticultural Science 1994;119:361-366.
42. McCabe D, Christou P. Direct DNA transfer using electric discharge particle acceleration (ACCELL technology). Plant Cell Tissue and Organ Culture 1993;33:227-236.
43. McCabe DE, Swain WF, Martinell BJ, Christou P. Stable transformation of soybean (*Glycine max*) by particle acceleration. Bio/Technology 1988;6:923-926.
44. Mohapatra U, McCabe MS, Power JB, Schepers F, Van Der Arend A, Davey MR. Expression of the bar gene confers herbicide resistance in transgenic lettuce. Transgenic Research 1999;8:33-44.
45. Moliner J, Himber C, Hahne G. Use of green fluorescent protein for detection of transformed shoots and homozygous offspring. Plant Cell Reports 2000;3:219-224.
46. Molvig L, Tabe LM, Eggum BO, Moore AE, Craig S, Spencer D *et al*. Enhanced methionine levels and increased nutritive value of seeds of transgenic lupins (*Lupinus angustifolius* L.) expressing a sunflower seed albumin gene. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA 1997;94:8393-8398.
47. Muntz K, Christov V, Saalbach G, Saalbach I, Waddell D, Pickardt T, *et al*. Genetic engineering for high methionine grain legumes. Nahrung-Food 1998;42:125-127.
48. Nagl W, Ignacimuthu S, Becker J. Genetic engineering and regeneration of *Phaseolus* and *Vigna*. State of the art and new attempts. Journal of Plant Physiology 1997;150:625-644.
49. Nauerby B, Madsen M, Christiansen J, Wyndaele R. A rapid and efficient regeneration system for pea (*Pisum sativum*), suitable for transformation. Plant Cell Reports 1991;9:676-679.
50. Penza R, Lurquin PF, Filippone E. Gene transfer by cocultivation of mature embryos with *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*: application to cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* Walp.). Journal of Plant Physiology 1991;138:39-43.
51. Pickardt T, Meixner M, Schade V, Scheider O. Transformation of *Vicia narbonensis* via Agrobacterium-mediated gene transfer. Plant Cell Reports 1991;9:535-538.
52. Pigeaire A, Abernethy D, Smith PM, Simpson K, Fletcher N, Lu Chin-Yi *et al*. Transformation of a grain legume (*Lupinus angustifolius* L.) via *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*-mediated gene transfer to shoot apices. Molecular Breeding 1997;3:341-349.
53. Ponappa T, Brzozowski AE, Finer JJ. Transient expression and stable transformation of soybean using the jellyfish green fluorescent protein. Plant Cell Reports 1999;19:6-12.
54. Porter JR. Host range and implications of plant infection by *Agrobacterium rhizogenes*. Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences 1991;10:387-421.
55. Puonti-Kaerlas J. Genetic engineering in pea crop improvement. Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica Section B. Soil and Plant Science 1993;43:65-73.
56. Ramsay GA. A joint approach on grain legume transformation. Grain Legumes 1995;10:23.
57. Rech EL, Golds TJ, Husnain T, Vainstein MH, Jones B, Hammatt N *et al*. Expression of a chimaeric kanamycin resistance gene introduced into the wild soybean Glycine canescens using a cointegrate Ri plasmid vector. Plant Cell Reports 1989;8:33-36.
58. Riazuddin S, Husnain T. Transformation in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). In Biotechnology in Agriculture and Forestry, Plant Protoplasts and Genetic Engineering IV. (Edited by Bajaj, Y.P.S.). Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1993; 23:183-193.
59. Russell DR, Wallace KM, Bathe JH, Martinell BJ, McCabe DE. Stable transformation of *Phaseolus vulgaris* via electric discharge mediated particle acceleration. Plant Cell Reports 1993;12:165-169.
60. Saalbach I, Pickardt T, Machemehl F, Saalbach G, Schieder O, Muntz K. A chimeric gene encoding the

methionine-rich 2S albumin of the Brazil nut (*Bertolletia excelsa* H.B.K) is stably expressed and inherited in transgenic grain legumes. Molecular and General Genetics 1994;242:226-236.
61. Saalbach I, Waddell D, Pickardt T, Schieder O, Muntz K. Stable expression of the sulphur-rich 2S albumin gene in transgenic *Vicia narbonensis* increases the methionine content of seeds. Journal of Plant Physiology 1995;145:674-781.
62. Sato S, Newell C, Kolacz K, Tredo L, Finer J, Hinchee M. Stable transformation via particle bombardment in two different soybean regeneration systems. Plant Cell Reports 1993;12:408-413.
63. Schenk PM, Elliott AR, Manners JM. Assessment of transient gene expression in plant tissues using green fluorescent protein as a reference. Plant Molecular Biology Reporter 1998;16:313-322.
64. Schroeder HE, Schotz AH, Wardley-Richardson T, Spencer D, Higgins TJV. Transformation and regeneration of two cultivars of pea (*Pisum sativum* L.). Plant Physiology 1993;101:751-757.
65. Schroeder HE, Gollasch S, Moore A, Tabe LM, Craig S, Hardie DC *et al*. Bean alpha-amylase confers resistance to the pea weevil (*Bruchus pisorum*) in transgenic peas (*Pisum sativum* L.). Plant Physiology 1995;107:1233-1239.
66. Siefkes-Boer HJ, Noonan MJ, Bullock DW, Conner AJ. Hairy root transformation system in large seeded grain legumes. Israeli Journal of Plant Sciences 1995;43:1-5.
67. Southgate EM, Davey MR, Power JB, Westcott RJ. A comparison of methods for direct gene transfer into maize (*Zea mays* L.). *In vitro* Cellular and Developmental Biology – Plant 1998;34:218-224.
68. Tepfer D. Genetic transformation using *Agrobacterium rhizogenes*. Physiologia Plantarum 1990;79:140-146.
69. Tinland B. The integration of T-DNA into plant genomes. Trends in Plant Science 1996;1:178-183.
70. Trick HN, Finer JJ. SAAT: Sonication-assisted Agrobacterium mediated transformation. Transgenic Research 1997;6:329-336.
71. Trick HN, Finer JJ. Sonication-assisted Agrobacterium mediated transformation of soybean [*Glycine max* (L.) Merrill] embryogenic suspension culture tissue. Plant Cell Reports 1998;17:482-488.
72. Waddell DR, Saalbach I, Pickardt T, Machemehl F, Hillmer S, Schieder O *et al*. Seed-specific expression of the sulphur-rich Brazil nut 2S albumin in transgenic plants. Journal of Cellular Biochemistry 1994;S1(8A):108.
73. Warkentin TD, Mc Hughen A. *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* mediated beta-glucuronidase (GUS) gene expression in lentil (*Lens culinaris* Medik.) tissues. Plant Cell Reports 1992;11:274-278.
74. Yang NS. Transgenic plants from legumes. In: Transgenic Plants (Edited by Kung, S-D. and Wu, R.), Vol. 2. Present Status and Social and Economic Impacts. Academic Press, New York 1993, 79-102.
75. Zhanyuan Z, Coyne DP, Mitra A. Factors affecting Agrobacterium-mediated transformation of common bean. Journal of the American Society for Horticultural Science 1997;122:300-305.