Graft Compatibility of *Citrus* with Plants in the *Aurantioideae* and Their Susceptibility to Citrus Tristeza Virus

Toshio Yoshida, Okitsu Branch, Fruit Tree Research Station, Shimizu, Shizuoka 424-02, Japan

ABSTRACT

Yoshida, T. 1996. Graft compatibility of *Citrus* with plants in the *Aurantioideae* and their susceptibility to citrus tristeza virus. Plant Dis. 80:414-417.

Wild relatives of citrus, including 22 species in 19 genera, were evaluated for susceptibility to citrus tristeza virus (CTV). They were grafted onto rootstocks of Citrus spp., graft-inoculated with a severe strain of CTV, with the exception of a seedling of Sydney hybrid (a hybrid between species of Microcitrus), which was graft-inoculated to its stem directly. All the species used were graftable to Citrus; however, the rate of graft success varied from 27 to 100%, and growth varied markedly. Severinia buxifolia, Atalantia monophylla, A. citroides, Fortunella polyandra, Clymenia polyandra, Swinglea glutinosa, Feronia limonia, and Feroniella lucida grew as well as Citrus grafted onto Citrus. Other species grew poorly or very poorly. Fortunella polyandra, Clymenia polyandra, Microcitrus australis, Sydney hybrid, Eremocitrus glauca, Atalantia monophylla, A. citroides, Citropsis articulate, Pleiospermium sp., Hesperethusa crenulata, Swinglea glutinosa, Aeglopsis chevalieri, Clausena excavata, C. lansium, and Merrillia caloxylon were infected with CTV based on double antibody sandwich enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (DAS-ELISA) using polyclonal antibodies against CTV. On the other hand, no evidence of CTV infection was found in Severinia buxifolia brachytic form, Triphasia trifolia, Aegle marmelos, Feronia limonia, Feroniella lucida, Glycosmis pentaphylla, Murraya koenigii, and M. paniculata. Two sources of Severinia buxifolia from different stocks showed different responses to CTV.

Wild relatives of citrus may have desirable traits, such as resistance to pests and pathogens when used as rootstocks, or they may serve as sources of germ plasm for genetic improvement of citrus (14,15). However, *Citrus* cannot be crossbred with its wild relatives, except with some that are closely related (9). Recent progress in protoplast fusion and formation of somatic hybrids has made it possible to bypass sexual incompatibility. A number of somatic hybrids among *Citrus* and its related genera have been reported (6,7,13,16).

To use citrus relatives for breeding, we must know their useful traits, and these are not well understood. Bitters et al. (1,2) reported the performance of some citrus relatives as rootstocks for *Citrus*. Knorr (11), and Müller and Garnsey (12) investigated the CTV susceptibility of species within the orange subfamily *Aurantioideae*.

Trifoliate orange (*Poncirus trifoliata* (L.) Raf.), closely related to *Citrus*, is generally immune to CTV, but some genotypes are susceptible (18,21). The inheritance of immunity in hybrids of trifoliate orange has been demonstrated (18,19).

Contribution B-217 of the Fruit Tree Research Station.

Corresponding author: T. Yoshida E-mail: yt1105@okt.affrc.go.jp

Accepted for publication 7 November 1995.

Publication no. D-1996-0213-06R
© 1996 The American Phytopathological Society

The purpose of this study was to evaluate wild relatives of citrus for susceptibility to CTV, and many immune species that were graft-compatible with rootstocks of *Citrus* were identified.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Plant materials. The classification of plants in the Aurantioideae was according to the system by Swingle and Reece (14). Twenty-three species from 19 genera in the Aurantioideae and Sydney hybrid, which is a hybrid between Microcitrus australis (Planch.) Swing. and M. australasica (F. Muell.) Swing., were examined (Table 1). Two different sources and one form (brachytic form) of Severinia buxifolia (Poir.) Tenore were used.

Grafting. Scions of each species originated from a single tree. The scions, except for Sydney hybrid, were grafted onto seedlings of rough lemon (Citrus jambhiri Lush.), Natsudaidai (C. natsudaidai Hayata), or Eureka lemon (C. limon (L.) Burm. f.), which were grown in 2.5-liter plastic pots in an insect-proof glasshouse. These rootstocks are susceptible to CTV infection. Grafting was judged successful when the scion survived more than 3 months after grafting. In the cases where the grafting was unsuccessful or when the growth of the grafted scion was poor, grafting was repeated. The growth of the grafted scion was graded good, poor, or very poor by comparing its growth to that of Citrus grafted on Citrus.

Inoculation with CTV. A severe strain of seedling yellows tristeza virus (CTV-

SY) (17) was used. It was isolated originally from a tree of Kiyomi tangor, which is a hybrid of Miyagawa-Wase unshiu (Citrus unshiu var. praecox Tan.) × Trovita orange (C. sinensis Osbeck), planted at the Okitsu Branch, Fruit Tree Research Station. This strain caused severe stunting and yellowing in sour orange (C. aurantium L.) seedlings, and severe dwarfing and pittings in sour lime (C. aurantifolia (Christm.) Swing.) seedlings. Infected rough lemon seedlings were used as an inoculum source. Inoculation was achieved by grafting infected tissues to the rootstocks, except for Sydney hybrid, which was graft-inoculated to its stem directly. In some cases, inoculation to the rootstocks was done before graft of scion.

Inoculated plants were grown in the glasshouse, where the minimum temperatures were 20°C in winter and the maximum ranged from 25 to 35°C.

Assay for CTV infection. CTV infection was assayed by double antibody sandwich enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (DAS-ELISA) using polyclonal antibodies against CTV. Young leaf midribs of the scions were tested by ELISA, except for Microcitrus, where young shoots were used because of its tiny leaves. Leaf midribs of shoots that sprouted from the rootstocks were also tested for CTV infection. These materials for ELISA were sampled 4 to 12 months after inoculation. Each 0.3-g sample was ground in 3 ml of extraction buffer consisting of phosphatebuffered saline containing 0.05% Tween 20 and 2% polyvinylpyrollidone. After centrifugation at 5,000 rpm for 10 min, the supernatant was used for ELISA. The midribs of CTV-free Etrog citron (Citrus medica var. ethrog Engl.) and CTV-infected Trovita orange were used as healthy and CTV-infected controls, respectively, in

Reactions were read spectrophotometrically at 405 nm (OD_{405}) using a Microplate Reader MTP-32 (Corona Electric Inc., Ibaraki, Japan). A positive reaction was defined as an OD_{405} three times that of the healthy control, according to the method of Irey et al. (8). The plants that tested positive were confirmed, and the plants that tested negative were tested again 1 to 2 years after inoculation.

RESULTS

Graft compatibility. The results of grafting are shown in Table 1. The rate of graft success ranged from 27 to 100%, and all the species used were graftable to *Cit*-

rus. Clausena anisata (Willd.) Hook. f. and C. lansium (Lour.) Skeeds, which are remote from Citrus, were grafted with 100% success, while Microcitrus australis and Atalantia monophylla DC., which are close to Citrus, were grafted with a low success rate.

The growth of grafted trees varied markedly among the species. The following eight species grew well on Citrus (similar to Citrus on Citrus): Severinia buxifolia, Atalantia monophylla, A. citroides Pierre ex Guill., Clymenia polyandra (Tan.) Swing., and Fortunella polyandra (Ridl.) Tan. in the subtribe Citrinae of the tribe Citreae, and Swinglea glutinosa (Blanco) Merr., Feroniella lucida (Scheff.) Swing., and Feronia limonia (L.) Swing. in the subtribe Balsamocitrinae. The species grafted on Natsudaidai, such as Clymenia polyandra, Fortunella polyandra, and Swinglea glutinosa, grew vigorously, even if inoculated with CTV-SY. Other species grew poorly or very poorly, and Clausena anisata grew so poorly that no samples could be collected for ELISA.

Susceptibility to CTV infection. The results of ELISA are shown in Table 2. All the shoots from the inoculated rootstocks were found infected with CTV, and their ELISA values were as high as those of the CTV-infected control. This confirmed the success of the original graft inoculation.

Fortunella polyandra, Clymenia polyandra, Microcitrus australis, and Eremocitrus glauca (Lindl.) Swing., which belong to the group of true citrus fruit trees of Citrinae, and Sydney hybrid were infected with CTV. Their ELISA values were higher than that of the CTV-infected control. This indicated that CTV multiplied abundantly in these plants.

Atalantia monophylla, A. citroides, and Citropsis articulate (Willd.) Swing., which belong to the group of near-citrus fruit trees of Citrinae, were also infected with CTV. The ELISA value was low in A. citroides.

Pleiospermium sp. and Hesperethusa crenulata (Roxb.) Roem., which belong to the group of primitive citrus fruit trees of Citrinae, were infected with CTV. The ELISA value for the former was high, while that of the latter was low. Severinia buxifolia-1 and S. buxifolia brachytic form were negative for CTV infection. But S. buxifolia-2 was positive and showed a relatively high value.

Triphasia trifolia (Burm. f.) P. Wils., which belongs to the subtribe Triphasiinae of Citreae, was not infected with CTV.

In the Balsamocitrinae, Swinglea glutinosa and Aeglopsis chevalieri Swing, were infected with CTV. On the other hand, Aegle marmelos (L.) Corr., Feronia limonia, and Feroniella lucida were not infected with CTV.

In the Clauseneae, the other tribe of Aurantioideae, Clausena excavata Burm. f. and C. lansium, which belong to the subtribe Clauseninae, were infected with CTV, but their ELISA values were relatively low. On the other hand, Glycosmis pentaphylla (Retz.) Correa, Murraya koenigii (L.) Spreng., and M. paniculata (L.) Jack were negative for CTV infection.

Merrillia caloxylon (Ridl.) Swing., which belongs to the Merrilliinae, another subtribe of Clauseneae, was infected with CTV, but the reaction by ELISA was low.

DISCUSSION

All the species used were graftable to Citrus rootstocks, although the rate of graft success varied. Zakaria et al. (22) reported that a high graft compatibility was obtained between closely related species of Aurantioideae plants. In this study, there was no clear relation between the rate of graft success and the classification order of Aurantioideae. And the growth of scions did not agree with the rate of graft success. In addition to graft compatibility, CTV inoculation may also have influenced the growth of some species. Severinia buxifolia, Atalantia monophylla, A. citroides, Clymenia polyandra, Fortunella polyandra, Swinglea glutinosa, and Feronia limonia grew well on Citrus rootstocks, confirming a previous report (2).

The study revealed that 15 species out of the 22 species tested could be infected with CTV. Microcitrus australis, Swinglea glutinosa, and Aeglopsis chevalieri were previously reported susceptible to CTV (4,5,10-12). Citropsis gilletiana Swing. & M. Kell. (belonging to the near-citrus fruit trees of Citrinae), Pamburus missionis (Wt.) Swing. (belonging to Triphasiinae), and Afraegle paniculata (Schum.) Engl. (belonging to Balsamocitrinae), not tested in this study, have also been reported susceptible to CTV (11,12). These observations suggest that CTV has a wide host range in plants of the Aurantioideae. The species that tested negatively for CTV by ELISA are probably immune to the strain of CTV used.

Clausena excavata, C. lansium, Severinia buxifolia, Hesperethusa crenulata,

Table 1. Genera evaluated for susceptibility to CTV, and source, rate of graft success onto Citrus rootstocks and growth of each

Genus, species	Type of material ^a	Source	Grafted rootstocks ^b	Graft success (%) ^c	Growth of grafted tree ^d
Tribe Clauseneae					
Subtribe Clauseninae					
Glycosmis pentaphylla	S	Saga Univ., Japan	10	40	Poor
Clausena excavata	S	Malaysia	5e	40	Poor
C. anisata	S	USA	5	100	Very poor
C. lansium	S	Taiwan	3	100	Poor
Murraya koenigii	S	Saga Univ., Japan	7	57	Poor
M. paniculata	В	USA	18	28	Very poor
Subtribe Merrilliinae					, ,
Merrillia caloxylon	S	Malaysia	17	41	Very poor
Tribe Citreae		·			
Subtribe Triphasiinae					
Triphasia trifolia	S	Malaysia	6	67	Poor
Subtribe Citrinae		•			
Severinia buxifolia-1	U	USA	6	50	Good
S. buxifolia-2	В	Spain	5	100	Good
S. buxifolia		•			
Brachytic form	S	USA	8	50	Poor
Pleiospermium sp.	S	USA	6	83	Poor
Hesperethusa crenulata	В	Thailand	3	100	Poor
Citropsis articulata	S	USA	1	100	Poor
Atalantia monophylla	В	Thailand	11	27	Good
A. citroides	S	USA	5	100	Good
Eremocitrus glauca	S	Australia	14	71	Very poor
Microcitrus australis	В	USA	8	38	Poor
Sydney hybridf	S	Australia			
Clymenia polyandra	S	Papua New Guinea	5g	40	Good
Fortunella polyandra	S	Indonesia	3 ^g	100	Good
Subtribe Balsamocitrinae					
Swinglea glutinosa	S	Indonesia	3 ^g	67	Good
Aegle marmelos	S	Thailand	11	36	Poor
Aeglopsis chevalieri	S	USA	6	67	Very Poor
Feronia limonia	S	Malaysia	5	100	Good
Feroniella lucida	S	Thailand	10	40	Good

^a S = seed; B = budwood; U = unknown.

^b Rough lemon (Citrus jambhiri) was the primary rootstock.

^c Grafting was judged successful when the scion survived more than 3 months.

d Good = growth comparable to Citrus on Citrus; very poor = shoot did not develop more than 5 cm during experiment; poor = intermediate.

^e Eureka lemon (C. limon) was used as rootstock.

f A hybrid of Microcitrus australis × M. australasica.

g Natsudaidai (C. natsudaidai) was used as rootstock.

Atalantia monophylla, and A. citroides were infected with CTV in this study. These results are different from those reported by Knorr (11) and Müller and Garnsey (12). Possibly this is a reflection

of differences in CTV strains used or in methods of inoculation and determination. Knorr (11) inoculated plants by aphids and determined infection only by observing specific symptoms. Müller and Garnsey

Table 2. Results of enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) for CTV on Citrus-related genera graft-inoculated 4 to 27 months earlier

Genus, species	Plant no.	Date of grafting	Date of inoculation ^a	Results ^b
Glycosmis pentaphylla	1	3-11-92	3-11-92	_
Огусовни решарнуна	2	3-11-92	3-11-92	_
	3	3-11-92	3-11-92	_
Clausena excavata	1	8-29-90	8-29-90	+
	2	8-29-90	8-29-90	+
C. lansium	1	7-13-92	7-13-92	+
	2	7-13-92	7-13-92	+
	3	7-13-92	7-13-92	+
Murraya koenigii	1	3-11-92	3-11-92	
1.	2	3-11-92	3-11-92	-
M. paniculata	1	7-1-92	7-13-92	_
Merrillia caloxylon	1	7-1-92	7-13-92	_
	2	7-1-92	7-13-92	+
Tois beside the	3	7-1-92	7-13-92	_
Triphasia trifolia Severinia buxifolia-1	1	7-1-92	7-13-92	_
	2	3-6-93	5-23-93	_
	3 1	3-6-93	5-23-93	-
	2	3-6-93	5-23-93	-
	3	3-6-93	5-23-93	-
S. humifalia 2	3 1	3-6-93	5-23-93	-
S. buxifolia-2	2	7-1-92	7-13-92	+
	3	7-1-92	7-13-92	+
	4	7-1-92	7-13-92	+
	5	7-1-92 7-1-92	7-13-92	+
S. buxifolia	3	7-1-92	7-13-92	+
Brachytic form	1	3-11-92	2 11 02	
Pleiospermium sp.	1	7-1-92	3-11-92	_
rieiospermium sp.	2	7-1-92 7-1-92	7-13-92 7-13-92	+
	3	7-1-92 7-1-92	7-13-92 7-13-92	+
Hesperethusa crenulata	1	7-1-92 7-1-92	7-13-92 7-13-92	+
Hesperemusa cremulala	2	7-1-92 7-1-92	7-13-92 7-13-92	+
	3	7-1-92 7-1-92	7-13-92	+
Citropsis articulata	1	7-1-92	7-13-92	+
Atalantia monophylla	1	5-8-92	5-8-92	+
мишти топорнуни	2	5-8-92	5-8-92	+
	3	5-8-92	5-8-92	+
A. citroides	1	7-1-92	7-13-92	+
in emonaes	2	7-1-92	7-13-92	+
	3	7-1-92	7-13-92	+
	4	7-1-92	7-13-92	+
Eremocitrus glauca	1	5-8-92	3-11-92	+
	2	5-8-92	5-8-92	+
Microcitrus australis	1	3-11-92	3-11-92	+
	2	3-11-92	3-11-92	+
	3	3-11-92	3-11-92	+
Sydney hybrid	1		3-6-93	+
Clymenia polyandra	1	10-6-89	9-26-88	+
Fortunella polyandra	1	10-6-89	9-26-88	+
	2	10-6-89	9-26-88	+
	3	10-6-89	9-26-88	+
Swinglea glutinosa	1	10-6-89	9-26-88	+
5 5	2	10-6-89	9-26-88	+
Aegle marmelos	1	8-29-90	8-29-90	_
	2	3-17-92	3-17-92	_
	3	3-17-92	3-17-92	_
Aeglopsis chevalieri	1	7-1-92	7-13-92	+
Feronia limonia	1	3-6-93	5-23-93	_
	2	3-6-93	5-23-93	_
	3	3-6-93	5-23-93	_
Feroniella lucida	1	3-11-92	3-11-92	_
	2	3-11-92	3-11-92	-
	3	3-11-92	3-11-92	

^a Inoculation was performed by grafting infected tissues to rootstocks of *Citrus* spp., except for Sydney hybrid, which was graft-inoculated to its stem directly. In some cases, rootstocks were graft-inoculated before graft of scion.

(12) used a knife-slash method of inoculation and assayed for infection by ELISA.

Müller and Garnsey (12) reported that Aegle marmelos was infected with CTV and developed vein clearing symptoms, whereas in this study this species was not infected even though its rootstock was CTV-positive. There are many reports that concentration of CTV varies depending on host plants, parts of tissue tested, and CTV strains (3,20). Therefore, the different results in A. marmelos may be due to the different CTV strains used. Knorr (11) reported that Aeglopsis chevalieri was infected with Argentine strains of CTV, but not with Florida strains.

Two sources of Severinia buxifolia from different countries showed different responses. This species probably contains subtypes that are either susceptible or immune to CTV, similar to those of Poncirus trifoliata (18,21). Further investigations on many individuals from different sources are needed.

The group of true citrus fruit trees of Citrinae contains Citrus and five other genera. Among them, Eremocitrus, Clymenia, and Poncirus are monotypic. In this study, Eremocitrus glauca and Clymenia polyandra were confirmed as hosts of CTV. It has been clarified that Poncirus trifoliata contains subtypes that are either susceptible or immune to CTV (18,21). All species of Fortunella are apparently hosts of CTV, since F. margarita (Lour.) Swing., F. japonica (Thunb.) Swing., F. classifolia Swing., and F. obovata Tan. were found susceptible to CTV (21); and F. hindsii (Champ.) Swing. (T. Yoshida, unpublished) and F. polyandra are also susceptible. There are no known CTVimmune species or cultivars in Citrus. Two species of Microcitrus, M. australis and M. australasica, have been previously reported susceptible to CTV (12,21).

As a result of these investigations, in the group of true citrus fruit trees, the trait of immunity to CTV has been found only in *Poncirus trifoliata*. Therefore, *P. trifoliata* is very important for CTV immunity breeding of citrus by the ordinary crossing method. This species probably obtained the trait of immunity after its speciation, because the trait has not been found in closely related genera.

This study revealed several species that tested negatively by DAS-ELISA and are probably immune. However, further studies on the mechanisms of immunity and its inheritance are necessary.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank M. Koizumi, Okitsu Branch, Fruit Tree Research Station, and S. M. Garnsey, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Orlando, Florida, for a critical reading of the manuscript and useful comments.

LITERATURE CITED

1. Bitters, W. P., Brusca, J. A., and Cole, D. A. 1964. The search for new citrus rootstocks.

 $^{^{}b}$ + = infected with CTV; - = not confirmed to be infected with CTV.

- Calif. Citrogr. 49:443-448.
- 2. Bitters, W. P., Cole, D. A., and Brusca, J. A. 1969. The citrus relatives as citrus rootstocks. Proc. Int. Citrus Symp., 1st. 1:411-415.
- 3. Dodds, J. A., Jarupat, T., Lee, J. G., and Roistacher, C. N. 1987. Effects of strain, host, time of harvest, and virus concentration on double-stranded RNA analysis of citrus tristeza virus. Phytopathology 77:442-447.
- 4. Garnsey, S. M., Bar-Joseph, M., and Lee, R. F. 1981. Applications of serological indexing to develop control strategies for citrus tristeza virus. Proc. Int. Soc. Citriculture 1:448-452.
- 5. Garnsey, S. M., Barrett, H. C., and Hutchison, D. J. 1987. Identification of citrus tristeza virus resistance in citrus relatives and its potential applications. Phytophylactica 19:187-191.
- 6. Grosser, J. W., and Gmitter, F. G. 1990. Somatic hybridization of Citrus with wild relatives for germplasm enhancement and cultivar development. HortScience 25:147-151.
- 7. Grosser, J. W., Gmitter, F. G., Tusa, N., and Chandler, J. L. 1990. Somatic hybrid plants from sexually incompatible woody species: Citrus reticulate and Citropsis gilletiana. Plant Cell Rep. 8:656-659.
- 8. Irey, M. S., Permer, T. A., and Garnsey, S. M. 1988. Identification of severe isolates of citrus tristeza virus in young field plantings by enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay. Proc. Fla. State Hortic. Soc. 101:73-76.
- 9. Iwamasa, M., Nito, N., Katayama, Y., Yamaguchi, T., and Matsunaga, S. 1985. Crosscompatibility between Aurantioideae plants. Bull. Fac. Agric., Saga Univ. 59:57-69. (In

- Japanese with English summary.)
- 10. Kitajima, E. W., Silva, D. M., Oliveira, A. R., Müller, G. W., and Costa, A. S. 1965. Electron microscopical investigations on tristeza. Proc. Conf. Int. Organ. Citrus Virol., 3rd, 1-9. University of Florida, Gainesville.
- 11. Knorr, L. C. 1956. Suscepts, indicators, and filters of tristeza virus, and some differences between tristeza in Argentina and in Florida. Phytopathology 46:557-560.
- 12. Müller, G. W., and Garnsey, S. M. 1984. Susceptibility of citrus varieties, species, citrus relatives, and non-rutaceous plants to slash-cut mechanical inoculation with citrus tristeza virus (CTV). Proc. Conf. Int. Organ. Citrus Virol., 9th., 33-40. University of California, Riverside.
- 13. Shinozaki, S., Fujita, K., Hidaka, T., and Omura, M. 1992. Plantlet formation of somatic hybrids of sweet orange (Citrus sinensis) and its wild relative, orange jessamine (Murraya paniculata), by electrically-induced protoplast fusion. Japan. J. Breed. 42:287-296.
- 14. Swingle, W. T., and Reece, P. C. 1967. The botany of Citrus and its wild relatives. Pages 190-430 in: The Citrus Industry. Vol. 1. W. Reuther, H. J. Webber, and L. D. Bachelor, eds. University of California, Berkeley.
- 15. Sykes, S. R. 1987. An overview of the family Rutaceae. Pages 93-100 in: Citrus Breeding Work Shop. R. R. Walker, ed. CSIRO, Melbourne, Australia.
- 16. Takayanagi, R., Hidaka, T., and Omura, M. 1992. Regeneration of intergeneric somatic hybrids by electrical fusion between Citrus

- and its wild relatives: Mexican lime (Citrus aurantifolia) and Java feroniella (Peroniella lucida) or tabog (Swinglea glutinosa). J. Japan. Soc. Hortic. Sci. 60:799-804.
- Yamada, S., and Ieki, H. 1982. Tristeza virus indexing of citrus hybrids bred at Okitsu and Kuchinotsu Branch. Bull. Fruit Tree Res. Stn. B9:23-33. (In Japanese with English summary.)
- 18. Yoshida, T. 1985. Inheritance of susceptibility to citrus tristeza virus in trifoliate orange [Poncirus trifoliata Raf.]. Bull. Fruit Tree Res. Stn. B12:17-25. (In Japanese with English summary.)
- 19. Yoshida, T. 1993. Inheritance of immunity to citrus tristeza virus of trifoliate orange in some citrus intergeneric hybrids. Bull. Fruit Tree Res. Stn. 25:33-43. (In Japanese with English summary.)
- 20. Yoshida, T., and Mitsuoka, Y. 1993. Difference in rate of citrus tristeza virus multiplication among citrus cultivars. J. Japan. Soc. Hortic. Sci. 62(Suppl. 2):70-71. (In Japanese.)
- 21. Yoshida, T., Shichijo, T., Ueno, I., Kihara, T., Yamada, Y., Hirai, M., Yamada, S., Ieki, H., and Kuramoto, T. 1983. Survey for resistance of citrus cultivars and hybrid seedlings to citrus tristeza virus (CTV). Bull. Fruit Tree Res. Stn. B10:51-68. (In Japanese with English
- 22. Zakaria, A. J. B., Iwamasa, M., Nito, N., Yamaguchi, S., and Katayama, Y. 1985. Graft compatibility between Aurantioideae plants. (Abstr.) Japan. Soc. Hortic. Sci. Autumn Meet. 58-59. (In Japanese.)