Alireza Rahemi Jean C. Dodson Peterson Karl True Lund

Grape Rootstocks and Related Species



Grape Rootstocks and Related Species

Alireza Rahemi · Jean C. Dodson Peterson · Karl True Lund

Grape Rootstocks and Related Species



Alireza Rahemi ©
College of Agriculture
Virginia State University
Petersburg, VA, USA

Karl True Lund (5) Cooperative Extension University of California Madera, CA, USA Jean C. Dodson Peterson Department of Wine and Viticulture Department of Horticulture and Crop Science
California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo, CA, USA

ISBN 978-3-030-99406-8 ISBN 978-3-030-99407-5 (eBook) https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-99407-5

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2022, corrected publication 2022

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Foreword

Grapevine rootstocks are an essential feature for sustainable viticulture around the world. Only a few grape-growing regions are spared infestation by phylloxera, and pests and diseases of grapevine roots challenge production nearly without exception. Since the introduction of phylloxera into Europe, the subsequent eruption of phylloxera in European viticulture, and the distribution of phylloxera very widely, the value of rootstocks in viticulture has been firmly appreciated and rootstocks steadily and increasingly recognized as critical for successful viticulture. Those who seek to maximize vine performance through rootstocks should understand the attributes and origin of rootstocks and how the characteristics of rootstocks may influence scion performance and vine adaptation.

This book describes the importance, utilization, and future of rootstocks in the context of grapevine botany, plant breeding, and horticulture. The early years of the phylloxera crisis saw pioneering research with many North American grape species selections and their hybrids, both as rootstocks and in direct production. That research was fueled by crisis and the exigency of identifying practical approaches for phylloxera management. Rootstocks developed in that first wave of research are still in use, and the fundamental biological and viticulture knowledge of phylloxera/rootstock/scion interactions guides further developments and investigations. Yet now, a more comprehensive understanding of *Vitis* species, their origins, relationships, and attributes informs viticulture, grape breeding, and the utilization of rootstocks.

We recognize that the North American grape species that coexist with phylloxera in nature show adaptations to reduce phylloxera damage, such as resistance and tolerance to the pest. Many questions about the ecology and evolution of grapevines and their pests and pathogens are relevant to species research and rootstock utilization and breeding. How does natural gene flow among grape species and populations influence interactions with phylloxera and other pests? Why does resistance and tolerance against pests and diseases with a delimited original distribution exist in grape species native to other areas? How stable is the resistance and tolerance of our rootstocks against pests and diseases that must infest to order to survive? How does the use of rootstocks shift pest and disease populations? In vineyards, phylloxera

vi Foreword

and other pests often encounter a genotypical monoculture, yet in nature, dioecy and vegetative propagation in this long-lived liana engender a mosaic of genetic diversity.

The chief role of rootstocks in viticulture is to provide protection against pests and diseases of the vine roots, with phylloxera protection the keystone. Other pests and pathogens, including fungi, bacteria, and nematodes, have long been recognized as important threats, and rootstocks that protect against them are increasingly the goal of breeding and evaluation programs. Is phylloxera vanquished? Hardly! Rather, protection against other pests and pathogens is taking its place alongside phylloxera protection as pest and pathogen populations shift with changing environments, management practices, and production regions. We now have the germplasm and evaluation methods to develop and introduce rootstocks that provide protection against crown gall and ground pearls, and more pest and disease protection is revealed as investigations continue. We can and must reduce pesticide applications to vineyards by using protective rootstocks instead.

Rootstocks have an important and emerging place in the management of grapevine virus diseases. Fanleaf degeneration and other diseases associated with nematode-transmitted viruses now may be managed with rootstocks that are resistant to nematodes or that provide protection against the diseases themselves. Yet, the mechanism and genetic drivers of this protection against virus diseases are poorly understood, which slows progress in breeding and introducing rootstocks with adaptation to diverse soils and climates. Rootstocks influence the development of leafroll disease and other virus-associated grapevine diseases, and the deployment of leafroll disease resistance and tolerance in rootstocks that provide protection against phylloxera and other pests would be an important step in harm reduction. Rootstocks and their progenitor species will be a source of genetic resistance and tolerance against virus disease protection for scion variety improvement.

While a handful of rootstock varieties dominate the global grapevine nursery trade, extensive and diverse breeding and evaluation programs continue to create and characterize rootstocks with superior adaptation to specific environments and varieties and which provide protection against newly emerging pests and diseases as well as against recognized threats. The movement of grape plant material in a secure phytosanitary context is an important contributor to the adoption of rootstocks. Similar growing conditions may favor the utilization of the same rootstocks in different regions for similar benefits, and familiarity both with well-established rootstocks and new rootstock variety introductions is essential. Shared trends drive shared needs—water use efficiency, yield efficiency, sodium and chloride tolerance, and adaptation to acidic and calcareous soils are valued in many areas, and rootstocks that provide special value must be introduced widely.

Through our familiarity with the species, their phenotypic characteristics, and their horticultural contributions increase steadily, new frontiers and opportunities are presented by technologies such as recombinant DNA technology, gene editing, somatic hybridization, doubled haploids, and synthetic seeds that are as yet incompletely realized in rootstock improvement and utilization. Botanical exploration and analysis reveal distinctions and relationships among species and populations, with

Foreword vii

newly recognized distinct types to be expected even in well-described habitats and with new Neotropical species on the horizon. From this book, future initiatives in grape rootstock breeding, horticulture of grape rootstock evaluation and use, and grape species research will be inspired.

Modesto, California, USA

Dr. Peter Cousins Grape Breeder and Geneticist

Preface

The genus *Vitis* includes approximately 80 different species of grapevines, depending on the subtle shifts in taxonomic classification taking place as natural hybridization and ongoing classification efforts continue to evolve. Of all species in the genus *Vitis*, the European grape, *Vitis vinifera*, is certainly the most important worldwide for the commercialized cultivation of table, raisin, and winegrapes. Grape species other than *V. vinifera* have also historically been used in the making of juices, wine, jellies, and jams. Many of these wild grape species have nutraceutical properties and health benefits that have drawn consumer attention and contributed to interest in incorporating them into breeding programs beyond the traditional efforts of rootstock hybridization from wild species.

Initially, V. vinifera was propagated asexually and without the common day practice of grafting to wild species hybrids. In the late nineteenth century, an aphid-like pest, phylloxera (Daktulosphaira vitifoliae), an aphid-like pest, was inadvertently introduced from North America to Europe and ultimately impacted most grapegrowing regions worldwide. Phylloxera causes damage by feeding on the structural roots of V. vinifera, eventually leading to vine death. In an effort to save the wine industry, American Vitis species which coevolved with phylloxera were eventually used as rootstocks for the widely planted V. vinifera scion cultivars. The use of wild species directly as a rootstock has become a common practice. Later, crosses between these wild species became common, and historical breeding efforts led to the modern grape rootstock breeding programs currently active around the world. Today, grape rootstocks play a fundamental role in resistance to biotic and abiotic stresses and adaptation of grapevine to different environmental conditions, a factor that has opened commercial grape growing up to regions that might otherwise be overlooked. Grape rootstocks can be used for adaptation to a variety of soil conditions, including soil texture, depth, nutrient availability, pH, salinity, lime content, water availability (drought), and water drainage. Rootstocks can also be used to shift scion cultivar the timing of various key phenological events and indirectly affect vineyard design.

Regardless of the specific rootstock selected or the environmental challenge addressed, it is necessary to introduce new rootstocks using resistance advantages from different species. There are around 1500 grape rootstocks developed in the

x Preface

world, of which around 50 are commonly used as commercial rootstock. North American species account for around 30 species, and two-third of them have already been used for rootstock breeding. However, it has been reported that the most commonly available rootstocks are derived from just three American species (*V. berlandieri, V. rupestris,* and *V. riparia*). Therefore, the most common grape rootstocks have a narrow genetic base, and efforts to extend the gene pools for breeding programs by using the other species are of ongoing importance to the industry and scientific community.

This book will annotate about 20 grape species that are vitally important in breeding programs and provide information on approximately 150 of the most familiar grape rootstocks in the world.

A great deal of research has been performed on grape rootstocks around the world. However, the resources and information are scattered, inaccessible, and unexploitable for the vast majority of grape growers and researchers. In this book, we have made substantial efforts to gather and classify this information and combine it with our own opinions and experiences in the hope that it will be useful to those interested and accessible to a broad audience. Various sources included in the text required permission and copyright approval. As such, we spent substantial time on this critical issue. It is necessary to thank all the authors, researchers, institutions, and associations for their help and cooperation. Some of the resources were particularly difficult to source and it would not have been possible to include them without the support of the corresponding authors and their contacts. This book is the result of the dedicated efforts of all of them. We hope that all faculties, researchers, and specialists will help us improve the quality of the book in future editions by sending comments to us.

Petersburg, Virginia, USA San Luis Obispo, California, USA Madera, California, USA Alireza Rahemi Jean C. Dodson Peterson Karl True Lund

Contents

1				1
2				4
4	•	_	manias' Tayanama	4
	2.1		pecies' Taxonomy	,
	2.2		pecies Used in Rootstock Breeding Programs	
		2.2.1	Vitis acerifolia Rafinesque (Mapleleaf Grape)	10
		2.2.2	Vitis aestivalis Michaux (Summer Grape)	10
		2.2.3	Vitis amurensis Ruprecht (Amur Grape)	11
		2.2.4	Vitis berlandieri Planchon (Spanish Grape)	11
		2.2.5	Vitis candicans Engelmann	11
		2.2.6	Vitis caribaea De Candolle (Syn. Vitis tiliifolia	
			Humboldt and Bonpland Ex Schultes)	12
		2.2.7	Vitis × champinii Planchon (Champin's Grape)	12
		2.2.8	Vitis cinerea Engelmann (Winter Grape, Grey	
			Bark Grape)	12
		2.2.9	Vitis cordifolia Michaux (Frost Grape)	13
		2.2.10	Vitis labrusca Linnaeus (Fox Grape)	13
		2.2.11	Vitis lincecumii Buckley (Post Oak Grape)	13
		2.2.12	Vitis longii Prince (Bush Grape)	14
		2.2.13	Vitis monticola Buckley (Sweet Mountain	
			Grape)	14
		2.2.14	Vitis mustangensis Buckley (Mustang Grape)	14
		2.2.15	Vitis riparia Michaux (Riverbank Grape)	16
		2.2.16	Vitis rotundifolia Michaux (Muscadinia	
			rotundifolia Michaux) (Muscadine Grape)	16
		2.2.17	Vitis rufotomentosa Small	17
		2.2.18	Vitis rupestris Scheele (Sand Grape)	17
		2.2.19	Vitis simpsonii Munson (Simpson's Grape)	17
		2.2.20	Vitis solonis (Planch.) Engelman Ex Millardet	18

xii Contents

	2.2.21	Vitis vinifera Linnaeus			
	2.2.22	Vitis vulpina Linnaeus			
Refe	erences				
Gra	pe Rootstoo	cks Breeding			
3.1		g Programs in Different Countries			
3.2		cks Evaluation			
3.3	Selection	n Protocols			
Refe	erences				
Gra	pe Scion an	nd Rootstock			
4.1	The Imp	portance of Grape Rootstocks			
4.2	Scion-R	ootstock Interactions and Effects			
4.3	Grafting	Compatibility and Affinity			
Refe	erences				
Biot	tic Stresses a	and Rootstock Selection			
5.1	Phylloxe	era			
5.2	Nematoo	des			
5.3	Viruses				
5.4	Crown C	Gall (Agrobacterium Tumefaciens)			
5.5		ıthora			
5.6	Grapevine Trunk Disease (GTD)				
Refe	erences				
Abi	Abiotic Stresses and Rootstock Selection				
6.1	Soil Cor	nditions and Problems			
	6.1.1	Soil Types			
	6.1.2	Soil Texture and Soil Depth			
	6.1.3	Soil Water Deficit (Drought)			
	6.1.4	Excess Soil Water (Saturation or Bad Drainage)			
	6.1.5	Soil Acidity (pH)			
	6.1.6	Soil Alkalinity (Lime Content)			
	6.1.7	Soil Salinity			
	6.1.8	Soil Fertility and Nutrient Deficiency			
6.2		onditions			
Refe	erences				
		Vineyard Design Considerations			
Refe	erences				
Fun	ction of Gra	ape Rootstock			
8.1	Effect of Rootstock on Fruit Set and Yield				
8.2	Effect of Rootstock on Berry Size				
Refe		•			
	erences	e Rootstock			
- Reit	STEHLES				

Contents xiii

10	Nurse	ry Stock C	Certification and Testing Programs	101
	10.1	Pathogen	Testing and Certified Grapevine Rootstock	101
	10.2	2 Intellectual Property and Plant Patents		
	10.3	Genetic I	Marker Testing for Rootstock Identification	104
	Refere	ences		114
11	Comn	nercial Gra	ape Rootstocks Selections	117
	11.1		rifolia	126
	11.2	Vitis aest	ivalis	126
		11.2.1	V . $aestivalis \times V$. $labrusca \times V$. $labrusca \times V$.	
			vinifera × V. labrusca × V. labrusca	126
		11.2.2	V . $aestivalis \times V$. $labrusca \times V$. $vinifera \times V$.	
			labrusca	126
		11.2.3	V . $aestivalis \times V$. $monticola \times V$. $riparia \times V$.	
			rupestris	126
		11.2.4	V. aestivalis × V. vinifera	127
		11.2.5	Vitis amurensis	127
	11.3	Vitis berl	andieri	127
		11.3.1	V. berlandieri	127
		11.3.2	V. berlandieri × V. berlandieri	127
		11.3.3	V. berlandieri × V. longii	128
		11.3.4	V. berlandieri × V. riparia	128
		11.3.5	V. berlandieri $ imes$ V. riparia $ imes$ V. berlandieri $ imes$	
			V. riparia	133
		11.3.6	V. berlandieri × V. riparia × V. cinerea	134
		11.3.7	V. berlandieri \times V. riparia \times V. riparia \times V.	
			rupestris	134
		11.3.8	$V.$ berlandieri \times $V.$ riparia \times $V.$ vinifera	134
		11.3.9	V. berlandieri \times V. riparia \times V. vinifera \times V.	
			berlandieri	135
		11.3.10	V. berlandieri × V. rupestris	135
		11.3.11	V. berlandieri \times V. rupestris \times V. aestivalis \times	
			V. vinifera	137
		11.3.12	V. berlandieri × V. vinifera	138
		11.3.13	V. berlandieri $ imes$ V. vinifera $ imes$ V. berlandieri $ imes$	
			V. longii	138
		11.3.14	$V.$ berlandieri \times $V.$ vinifera \times $V.$ rupestris	138
	11.4	Vitis cand	dicans	139
		11.4.1	V. candicans	139
		11.4.2	V. candicans × V. rupestris	139
		11.4.3	$V.\ candicans \times V.\ rupestris \times V.\ riparia \times V.$	
			rupestris	139
	11.5	Vitis cari	baea	140
		11.5.1	V. caribaea × V. riparia × V. rupestris	140

xiv Contents

11.6	$Vitis \times ch$	ampinii 14
	11.6.1	<i>V.</i> × <i>champinii</i>
	11.6.2	$V. \times champinii \times V. aestivalis \times V. labrusca$ 14
	11.6.3	$V. \times champinii \times V. riparia \times V. \times champinii$
		× V. berlandieri
	11.6.4	$V. \times champinii \times V. labrusca \times V. vinifera \times$
		<i>V. labrusca</i> 14
	11.6.5	V. × champinii × V. riparia
	11.6.6	V. × champinii × V. rufotomentosa × V. riparia 14
	11.6.7	V. × champinii × V. rupestris
11.7	Vitis ciner	rea 14
	11.7.1	<i>V. cinerea</i>
	11.7.2	<i>V. cinerea</i> × <i>V. cinerea</i>
11.8	Vitis cord	ifolia
	11.8.1	V. cordifolia × V. rupestris
11.9	Vitis labri	ısca 14
	11.9.1	<i>V. labrusca</i> × <i>V. riparia</i>
11.10	Vitis lince	cumii 14
	11.10.1	V. lincecumii \times V. rupestris \times V. vinifera \times V.
		<i>simpsonii</i>
11.11	Vitis long	<i>ii</i>
	11.11.1	V. longii × V. riparia × V. rupestris
11.12	Vitis mont	ticola 14
	11.12.1	V. monticola × V. riparia
11.13	Vitis must	angensis 14
	11.13.1	V. mustangensis × V. rupestris
11.14	Vitis ripar	ria 14
	11.14.1	<i>V. riparia</i>
	11.14.2	<i>V. riparia</i> × <i>V. cinerea</i>
	11.14.3	V. riparia × V. cordifolia × V. rupestris
	11.14.4	$V.\ riparia \times V.\ cordifolia \times V.\ rupestris \times V.$
		berlandieri 14
	11.14.5	V. riparia \times V. cordifolia \times V. rupestris \times V.
		<i>caribaea</i> 15
	11.14.6	V. riparia × V. labrusca
	11.14.7	V. riparia × V. rupestris
	11.14.8	V. riparia × V. rupestris × V. mustangensis ×
		<i>V. rupestris</i>
	11.14.9	$V.\ riparia \times V.\ rupestris \times V.\ vinifera \times V.$
		<i>vinifera</i>
	11.14.10	V. riparia × V. vinifera × V. rupestris
11.15	Vitis rotur	ndifolia
	11 15 1	V rotundifolia \times V rotundifolia 15

Contents xv

11.16	Vitis rufot	'omentosa	154
	11.16.1	V . $rufotomentosa \times V$. \times $champinii \times V$.	
		riparia × V. monticola	154
	11.16.2	V . $rufotomentosa \times V$. \times $champinii \times V$.	
		riparia × V. monticola	154
	11.16.3	V . $rufotomentosa \times V$. \times $champinii \times V$.	
		riparia × V. riparia	155
11.17	Vitis rupe.	stris	155
	11.17.1	V. rupestris	155
	11.17.2	V. rupestris × V. rupestris	156
	11.17.3	V. rupestris × V. berlandieri	156
	11.17.4	V. rupestris × V. monticola	156
	11.17.5	V. rupestris × V. rotundifolia	157
11.18	Vitis simp	sonii	157
	11.18.1	V. simpsonii × V. vinifera	157
11.19	Vitis solor	iis	157
	11.19.1	V. solonis × V. cordifolia × V. rupestris	157
	11.19.2	V. solonis × V. riparia	157
	11.19.3	$V. \ solonis \times V. \ riparia \times V. \ labrusca \times V.$	
		vinifera	158
	11.19.4	$V. \ solonis \times V. \ riparia \times V. \ labrusca \times V.$	
		vinifera × V. × champinii	158
	11.19.5	$V. \ solonis \times V. \ riparia \times V. \ labrusca \times V.$	
		vinifera × V. vinifera	159
11.20	Vitis vinife	era	160
	11.20.1	V. vinifera \times V. amurensis \times V. riparia \times V.	
		rupestris	160
	11.20.2	V. vinifera × V. berlandieri	160
	11.20.3	V . $vinifera \times V$. $berlandieri \times V$. $berlandieri \dots$	161
	11.20.4	V. vinifera × V. riparia	161
	11.20.5	V. vinifera × V. riparia × V. rupestris	162
	11.20.6	V. vinifera \times V. riparia \times V. rupestris \times V.	
		cinerea	162
	11.20.7	V. vinifera × V. rotundifolia	162
	11.20.8	V. vinifera × V. rufotomentosa	163
	11.20.9	V. vinifera × V. rupestris	164
	11.20.10	V. vinifera × V. rupestris × V. cordifolia	165
	11.20.11	V. vinifera × V. rupestris × V. riparia	165
	11.20.12	V. vinifera × V. solonis × V. riparia	165
	11.20.13	V. vinifera × V. vinifera	165
	11.20.14	V . $vinifera \times V$. $vinifera \times V$. $rotundifolia \times V$.	
		berlandieri × V. rupestris	166
Referen	nces		175
Correction	to: Abiotic	c Stresses and Rootstock Selection	C1

xvi	Contents

Appendix 1:	The Plant List, Vitis, Royal Botanic Gardens	181
Appendix 2:	Identification Key of North American Grape Species	185
Appendix 3:	Identification Key of Eastern North American Grape Species	189
Appendix 4:	Identification Key of Grape Species in Southeastern US	193
Appendix 5:	Identification Key of Grape Species in China	197

About the Authors



Dr. Alireza Rahemi is Postdoctoral Research Associate at Virginia State University, USA. He has done extensive research and continues to work on wild relatives of subtropical and temperate fruits and nut trees. He worked as a Horticulture Specialist at the Ministry of Agriculture in Iran. He received his Ph.D. in Horticulture and conducted part of his research at University of Florida, USA. His Ph.D. research was focused on wild almond species, including genetic diversity using new emerging molecular techniques. He has also conducted research on the wild grape species of Southern Ontario and their utilization as rootstock during his postdoctoral research at the University of Guelph, Canada.



Dr. Jean C. Dodson Peterson is Associate Professor of Viticulture at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo. She earned her undergraduate degree from the University of California, Davis, in Viticulture and Enology with a minor in Managerial Economics. She continued at UC Davis, earning her M.S. and Ph.D. in Horticulture and Agronomy. She teaches basic viticulture, the advanced viticulture series, advanced independent study, senior project research, and thesis courses. She has been awarded the Panhellenic Award for Excellence in Education and the Terrance Harris Award for Excellence in Mentorship. She has also earned her Certification in Effective College Instruction from the Association of College and University Educators and the American Council on Education. Her research program strives to advance the understanding of grapevine physiology, rootstock-scion interactions,

xviii About the Authors

rootstock selection, and vine performance factors. Her research mission is to execute innovative and inspiring research that advances the wine and viticulture industry and scientific community.



Dr. Karl True Lund is University of California Viticulture Advisor for Madera, Merced, and Mariposa Counties. The primary research he is currently conducting is looking at the adaptation of nematode-resistant rootstocks for high yielding mechanized vineyards. Prior to his current position, he was Lecturer at California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo, where he taught introductory viticulture and viticulture pest management classes. He conducted his Ph.D. work at the University of California at Davis. His Ph.D. work looked at the diversity of phylloxera within California. He also assessed the resistance of wild accessions and current rootstocks to the different types of phylloxera he identified within the state.

Chapter 1 Introduction



1

Grape cultivation is considered to be as old as civilization (OIV 2017). Today, grape-derived products are one of the most economically important fruit crops (Wen et al. 2018), with more than 10,000 grape varieties grown in 100 countries, on an estimated 7.5 m ha, with approximately 75 m tons of production each year (OIV 2017). Most production occurs in the zone between 30° and 50° latitude in the northern and southern hemispheres (Stevenson 2005).

Around 50% of world grape production is used to make wine (wine grapes), with 33% eaten as fresh fruit (table grapes), and the remaining 17% used as raisins, juice, or stored in the form of grape musts (freshly crushed fruit) whether concentrated or not (FAO-OIV 2016; OIV 2017). Most commercial production is with pure Vitis vinifera (Christensen 2003). 'Kyoho', 'Cabernet Sauvignon', 'Sultanina', 'Merlot', 'Tempranillo', 'Airen', 'Chardonnay', 'Syrah', 'Red Globe', 'Garnacha Tinta'/'Garanche noir', 'Sauvignon blanc', 'Pinot noir'/'Blauer burgunder', and 'Trebbiano toscano'/'Ugni blanc' are, in sequence, the varieties with the highest production and they cover more than one-third of the planted area (OIV 2017). 'Kyoho', a Concord-like cross popular in East Asia, is the most commonly planted variety by acreage (OIV 2017). It is not pure V. vinifera; however, it still owes more than 50% of its parentage to V. vinifera (VIVC 2019). The initial reason for the wide adoption of rootstocks was, and in many locations still is, due to phylloxera (Daktulosphaira vitifoliae), an aphid-like pest of grapevines. Phylloxera is native to the Eastern portion of North America and was inadvertently imported into the wine-producing regions of France in 1860 (Skinkis et al. 2009). By the end of the nineteenth century, France had lost more than 70% of its wine production (Robinson and Harding 2016). The French wine industry was historically based on the exclusive use of own-rooted *V. vinifera*, which has no resistance to root-feeding by phylloxera. However, some American Vitis species had co-evolved with phylloxera and thus had evolved tolerance to the pest. The use of hybrids between French V. vinifera varieties and American Vitis species failed to produce a variety that was resistant to phylloxera while also being considered to produce wine of commercially acceptable quality. The French wine industry eventually succeeded in addressing phylloxera by grafting 2 1 Introduction

French wine varieties (as scions) onto an American *Vitis* species, or species hybrid, as a rootstock. As phylloxera spread from France to virtually every wine-growing region worldwide, so did the use of rootstocks (Campbell 2004). The first rootstocks were simply selections of individual wild American Vitis species, some of which are still used today. The two initial American species utilized as rootstocks were Vitis riparia and Vitis rupestris. Rootstocks derived from these two species were initially successful but eventually declined in France's lime-rich soils as neither tolerated calcareous conditions. As a result, Vitis berlandieri was collected from America and incorporated into rootstock breeding programs in an effort to convey lime tolerance. Lime, however, was not the only abiotic soil condition that rootstocks must address. Over time, soil characteristics such as texture, drainage, salinity, and pH have all been addressed or attempted to be addressed through rootstock selection. Furthermore, biotic issues other than phylloxera have also required the use of rootstocks to address properly. Specifically, the control of nematodes has fallen mainly to rootstocks for control, an issue that is complex given the vast array of resistance levels across the various commercial rootstocks (Ferris et al. 2012).

In addition to dealing with issues in the soil and soil pests, rootstocks have been shown to affect scion growth (vigor) and yield (Keller et al. 2008; Kidman et al. 2014b; Nelson 2015; Dodson Peterson and Walker 2017), nutrition status (Holzapfel and Treeby 2007; Lambert et al. 2008; Kidman et al. 2014a), pollination, and fertilization efficacy (Kidman et al. 2014a), and berry characteristics and fruit chemistry (Rühl et al. 1988; Koundouras et al. 2009; Migicovsky et al. 2021). Expansion of grape production into new areas, development of new cultivars, and increasing concerns about adapting grapevines for changing climates continue to necessitate the use of wild grapevine species in breeding programs (Klein et al. 2018). An understanding of the effects a rootstock will have on a scion must start with an understanding of species parentage. Each American Vitis species, as well as the other grape species used in rootstock breeding, has a specific set of traits. They are possessing a basic understanding of the traits particular species have or are likely to have assisted in informing what traits might be observed in the newly bred progeny. The majority of rootstocks in use today are hybrids of three species: V. berlandieri, V. riparia, and V. rupestris (Galet 1998; Whiting 2005; Ollat 2016). Riaz et al. (2019) used 21 nuclear and 14 chloroplast markers to show that the relationship of many of these rootstocks is even closer. Twenty-six of the common rootstocks bred between the 1890s and 1930s had at least one parent coming from only three specific selections: Vitis berlandieri cv. Rességuier 2, V. rupestris cv. du Lot and V. riparia cv. Gloire de Montpellier. Overall, the results indicate that 39% of the genetic background of the major analyzed rootstocks originated from Vitis berlandieri cv. Rességuier 2, V. rupestris cv. du Lot and V. riparia cv. Gloire de Montpellier. The results found that the world's existing rootstocks have a narrow genetic base derived from only a few American grape species (Riaz et al. 2019). Lesser-known components of grapevine evolutionary biology include relationships among species that are used as rootstocks (e.g., V. cinerea var. helleri, V. riparia, V. rupestris). Hybrids between V. cinerea var. helleri and V. riparia or V. rupestris have been used to produce rootstocks that are easy to propagate, and that can withstand challenging abiotic conditions (Galet References 3

1979). Single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) used for a phylogenomic study in *Vitis* demonstrate that these important rootstock species occur in different clades within the North American subgenus *Vitis*. *V. cinerea* is most closely related to *V. vulpina*, while *V. riparia* and *V. rupestris* form a clade together with *V. acerifolia* (Miller et al. 2013). In general, the common grape rootstocks used today encompass around 20 different grape species. It is here where the industry must focus and advance understanding in order to make the most progress with future breeding efforts.

References

Campbell C (2004) Phylloxera: how wine was saved for the world. Harper Collins

Christensen LP (2003) Rootstock selection. In: Bettiga LJ (ed) Wine grape varieties in California. University of California, Oakland, CA, USA, pp 12–15

Dodson Peterson JC, Walker MA (2017) Influence of grapevine rootstock on scion development and initiation of senescence. Catalyst: Discovery into Practice 1(2):48–54. https://doi.org/10.5344/catalyst.2017.16006

FAO-OIV, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations—International Organisation of Vine and Wine (2016) Table and dried grapes. FAO-OIV Publication. p 64. ISBN: 978-92-5-109708-3. http://www.fao.org/3/a-i7042e.pdf

Ferris H, Zheng L, Walker MA (2012) Resistance of grape rootstocks to plant-parasitic nematodes. J Nematol 44(4):377–386

Galet P (1979) A practical ampelography, Translated and adapted by Lucie T. Morton. Ithaca, NY: Comstock Cornell University Press

Galet P (1998) Grape varieties and rootstock varieties. Oenoplurimedia press

Holzapfel BP, Treeby MT (2007) Effects of timing and rate of N supply on leaf nitrogen status, grape yield and juice composition from Shiraz grapevines grafted to one of three different rootstocks. Aust J Grape Wine Res 13:14–22

Keller M, Smithyman RP, Mills LJ (2008) Interactive effects of deficit irrigation and crop load on Cabernet Sauvignon in an arid climate. Am J Enol Vitic 59:221–234

Kidman CM, Dry PR, McCarthy MG, Collins C (2014a) Effect of rootstock on nutrition, pollination and fertilisation in 'Shiraz' (*Vitis vinifera* L.), Vitis 53(3):139–145

Kidman CM, Mantilla SO, Dry PR, McCarthy MG, Collins C (2014b) Effect of water stress on the reproductive performance of Shiraz (*Vitis vinifera* L.) grafted to rootstocks. Am J Enol Vitic 65(1):96–108

Klein LL, Miller AJ, Ciotir C, Hyma K, Uribe-Convers S, Londo J (2018) High-throughput sequencing data clarify evolutionary relationships among North American *Vitis* species and improve identification in USDA *Vitis* germplasm collections. Am J Bot 105(2):215–226

Koundouras S, Hatzidimitriou E, Karamolegkou M, Dimopoulou E, Kallithraka S, Tsialtas JT, Zioziou E, Nikolaou N, Kotseridis Y (2009) Irrigation and rootstock effects on the phenolic concentration and aroma potential of *Vitis vinifera* L. cv. 'Cabernet Sauvignon' grapes. J Agric Food Chem 57:7805–7813

Lambert JJ, Anderson MA, Wolpert JA (2008) Vineyard nutrient needs vary with rootstocks and soils. Calif Agric 62(4):202–207

Migicovsky Z, Cousins P, Jordan LM, Myles S, Striegler RK, Verdegaal P, Chitwood DH (2021) Grapevine rootstocks affect growth-related scion phenotypes. BioRxiv 864850:29p. https://doi.org/10.1101/864850

4 1 Introduction

Miller AJ, Matasci N, Schwaninger H, Aradhya MK, Prins B, Zhong GY, Simon C, Buckler ES, Myles S (2013) *Vitis* phylogenomics: hybridization intensities from a SNP array outperform genotype calls. PLoS ONE 8(11):e78680. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0078680.g001

- Nelson CC (2015) Zinfandel productivity is managed by pruning systems, applied water amounts, and rootstocks in a hot climate. PhD dissertation
- OIV, International Organisation of Vine and Wine (2017) Distribution of the world's grapevine varieties. OIV Publication, p 54. ISBN: 979-10-91799-89-8. http://www.oiv.int/public/medias/5888/en-distribution-of-the-worlds-grapevine-varieties.pdf
- Ollat N, Peccoux A, Papura D, Esmenjaud D, Marguerit E, Tandonnet JP, Bordenave L, Cookson SJ, Barrieu F, Rossdeutsch L, Lecourt J, Lauvergeat V, Vivin P, Bert PF, Delrot S (2016) Rootstocks as a component of adaptation to environment. In: Gerós H, Chaves MM, Gil HM, Delrot S (eds) Grapevine in a changing environment: a molecular and ecophysiological perspective. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118735985.ch4
- Riaz S, Pap D, Uretsky J, Laucou V, Boursiquot JM, Kocsis L, Walker MA (2019) Genetic diversity and parentage analysis of grape rootstocks. Theor Appl Genet, Under Rev, TAAG-D-18-00569
- Robinson J, Harding J (2016) The oxford companion to wine, 4th edn. Oxford University Press
- Rühl EH, Clingeleffer PR, Nicholas PR, Cirami RM, McCarthy MG, Whiting JR (1988) Effect of rootstocks on berry weight and pH, mineral content and organic acid concentrations of grape juice of some wine varieties. Aust J Exp Agric 28:119–125
- Skinkis P, Walton V, Kaiser C (2009) Grape phylloxera, biology and management in the pacific Northwest, Oregon state university, extension service, EC 1463-E. Revised, p 25
- Stevenson T (2005) The Sotheby's wine encyclopedia. Dorling Kindersley, pp 14–15. ISBN 0-7566-1324-8
- VIVC, Vitis International Variety Catalogue (2019) Passbord data. Utilization: Rootstock. http://www.vivc.de
- Wen J, Harris AJ, Kalburgi Y, Zhang N, Xu Y, Zheng W, Ickert-Bond SM, Johnson G, Zimmer EA (2018) Chloroplast phylogenomics of the new world grape species (*Vitis*, Vitaceae). J Syst Evol 56(4):297–308
- Whiting JR (2005) Grapevine rootstocks, in Viticulture. Volume 1: Resources. In: Dry PR, Coombe BG (eds) Winetitles Pty Ltd, Ashford, Australia, pp 167–188