M. Maccaferri · M. C. Sanguineti · P. Donini · R. Tuberosa

## Microsatellite analysis reveals a progressive widening of the genetic basis in the elite durum wheat germplasm

Received: 2 December 2002 / Accepted: 12 February 2003 / Published online: 4 July 2003 © Springer-Verlag 2003

Abstract It has been argued that the level of genetic diversity in the modern durum wheat (Triticum turgidum L. var. *durum*) elite germplasm may have declined due to the high selection pressure applied in breeding programs. In this study, 58 accessions covering a wide spectrum of genetic diversity of the cultivated durum wheat gene pool were characterized with 70 microsatellite loci (or simple sequence repeats, SSRs). On average, SSRs detected 5.6 different allelic variants per locus, with a mean diversity index (DI) equal to 0.56, thus revealing a diversity content comparable to those previously observed with SSRs in other small-grain cereal gene pools. The mean genetic similarity value was equal to 0.44. A highly diagnostic SSR set has been identified. A high variation in allele size was detected among SSR loci, suggesting a different suitability of these loci for estimating genetic diversity. The B genome was characterized by an overall polymorphism significantly higher than that of the A genome. Genetic diversity is organised in well-distinct sub-groups identified by the corresponding foundationgenotypes. A large portion (92.7%) of the molecular variation detected within the group of 45 modern cvs was accounted for by SSR alleles tracing back to ten foundation-genotypes; among those, the most recent CIMMYT-derived founders were genetically distant from the old Mediterranean ones. On the other hand, rare alleles were abundant, suggesting that a large number of genetic introgressions contributed to the foundation of the well-diversified germplasm herein considered. The profiles of recently released varieties indicate that the level of

Communicated by F. Salamini

M. Maccaferri · M. C. Sanguineti (☞) · R. Tuberosa Department of Agroenvironmental Science and Technology, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy e-mail: minnasan@agrsci.unibo.it Tel.: +39-051-209-6651 Fax: +39-051-209-6241

P. Donini National Institute of Agricultural Botany, Cambridge, United Kingdom genetic diversity present in the modern durum wheat germplasm has actually increased over time.

**Keywords** Durum wheat · SSRs · Genetic distance · Germplasm · Fingerprinting · *Triticum turgidum* L. var. *durum* 

## Introduction

It has been suggested that the elite germplasm of the major crops, especially self-pollinating cereals, has experienced an overall reduction of its genetic basis as a result of high selection pressures, recurrent use of the adapted elite germplasm and the adoption of breeding schemes not favouring genetic recombination (Allard 1996; Rosegrant et al. 1997; Hoisington et al. 1999). However, the debate as to the extent and the consequences of this reduction in diversity is still open (Le Buanec 1999; Smale et al. 2001) and more detailed phenotypic and molecular data are required (Donini et al. 2000b). On the other hand, genetic gains in yield potential, adaptation and tolerance to multiple biotic and abiotic stresses need to be ensured to sustain the predicted future increase in food demand (Pfeiffer et al. 2000).

Durum wheat (Triticum turgidum L. var. durum, 2n = 4x = 28; AABB genomes) is an important crop, mainly used for human consumption. Recently, this cereal has been the object of renewed interest, because of its valuable production and adaptation to low rainfall and semiarid environments. More than half of the durum acreage lies in the Mediterranean basin, mainly Italy, Spain, France, Greece and the West Asian and North African (WANA) countries, where through history this cereal has received special attention as an important commodity (Royo et al. 2000). The genetic structure of the durum germplasm cultivated in the Mediterranean basin varies largely, encompassing traditional landraces, varieties directly obtained from the local materials, more recent and successful CIMMYT-derived cvs as well as modern varieties characterized by high yield potential,

wide adaptability (also in terms of yield stability) and technological quality (Nachit et al. 1998; Pfeiffer et al. 2000).

Among the Mediterranean countries, Italy has the longest tradition in durum wheat breeding (Bozzini et al. 1998) and its germplasm can be considered as one of the richest and most valuable. There are indications that in the past decades the genetic basis of the durum wheat elite germplasm may have been eroded (Pecetti and Annicchiarico 1998), mainly due to the limited differentiation of the end-use, the high quality level required by customers and the uniformity of the plant ideotype pursued by breeders, coupled with the diffusion of a relatively small number of outstanding genotypes with proven adaptability and yield potential. Autrique et al. (1996) observed that a limited number of ancestral lines contributed largely to the development of the modern durum wheat materials and that the molecular fingerprints of a few ancestors accounted for the majority of the molecular diversity detected in the cultivated gene pool. Molecular markers provide a powerful tool to analyse genetic relationships. In cereals, extensive information is available for rice (Ishii and McCouch 2000; Temnykh et al. 2001), maize (Mumm and Dudley 1994; Smith et al. 1997; Lu and Bernardo 2001) and barley (Melchinger et al. 1994). Genetic diversity in the Triticeae has been explored using a range of molecular markers (reviewed in Gupta et al. 1999; Koebner et al. 2001). Among smallgrain cereals, barley and bread wheat adapted germplasm has been investigated in detail with amplified fragment length polymorphisms (AFLPs; Barrett and Kidwell 1998) and simple sequence repeat loci (SSRs; Prasad et al. 2000; Russell et al. 2000); only recently molecular diversity surveys have focused on durum wheat (Eujail et al. 2002; Soleimani et al. 2002).

The evaluation of genetic changes occurred over time and the degree of persistence of chromosome regions tracing to known ancestors can be conveniently monitored with the use of single-locus, mapped molecular markers, particularly SSRs. Retrospective analyses of the genetic diversity, integrated by phenotypic and/or pedigree data, have been carried out in barley (Russell et al. 2000) and bread wheat (Donini et al. 2000a; Manifesto et al. 2001) but not in durum wheat. A detailed knowledge, at the molecular level, of the genetic structure and variability of improved populations and elite materials is useful for a more effective planning and management of breeding programmes (Pfeiffer 2000). The preservation in the adapted germplasm of successful allelic combinations obtained over repeated breeding cycles is also an important target when exploiting exotic genetic variability. Consequently, information as to the abundance and polymorphism level of molecular markers in the adapted germplasm of each crop is valuable when addressing breeding issues.

In wheat, microsatellite markers are becoming the markers of choice, due to the level of polymorphism shown even in closely related varieties (Plaschke et al. 1995; Donini et al. 1998) and the uniform distribution in

the wheat genome (Röder et al. 1998), while they have also proved reliable and suitable for multiplexing. The richness in allelic variants shown by dinucleotide repeats is particularly valuable for estimating relatedness based on molecular data, since the upward bias of genetic similarities versus co-ancestries will be substantially reduced (Lynch 1988). In the allopolyploid wheats, in most cases SSRs behave as genome-specific markers (single-locus markers). Several SSRs have been isolated and mapped in wheat and more markers are being developed in silico and through international collaborative efforts (Eujail et al. 2002; Kantety et al. 2002; see the GrainGenes web site at http://www.graingenes.org). Due to the transferability of SSRs, the results of molecular studies carried out on the A and B genomes in bread wheat can be fully exploited in durum wheat. SSRs retain a highly successful amplification rate and conservation of map position across the *Triticeae* maps (Korzun et al. 1999; Peng et al. 2000; Nachit et al. 2001).

Herein, we report on the use of highly informative dinucleotide SSRs covering all of the durum wheat chromosomes to investigate the genetic diversity present in elite durum wheat accessions. Additionally, important ancestors of modern varieties and check cvs have been included to ascertain to what degree breeding practices may have led to a reduction in the genetic basis of modern, elite durum wheats.

## **Materials and methods**

#### Plant material

The 58 durum wheat accessions listed in Table 1 were selected in order to represent the most relevant durum germplasm in Italy and other Mediterranean countries. The 58 accessions included: (1) 34 Italian cvs recently released or widely grown in the last four decades, characterized either by a broad adaptability across environments or adapted to specific agro-geographical areas; (2) five French, four U.S. and two recently released CIMMYT cvs, all of them well-adapted to Mediterranean environments; (3) ten cvs (seven obtained in Italy and three from the CIMMYT breeding program) released from 1915 to 1984, hereafter called "founders" and representing important milestones in the durum breeding programmes for the Mediterranean areas; and (4) two Italian (Russello SG7 and Saragolla) accessions and one Tunisian (Inrat 69) accession selected to represent the allelic variants present in the native landraces mostly grown in the centre of the Mediterranean basin before the advent of modern breeding. The pedigree, country of origin, year of release and seed source for each accession are reported in Table 1. Pedigree information was obtained from either published (Brajcich et al. 1986) or web-based pedigree databases (e.g. http://www.ars-grin.gov) and from the annual publications of the Italian durum wheat national list (available on request).

#### Microsatellite analysis

Genomic DNA was extracted from young leaves of 20 plantlets according to Saghai-Maroof et al. (1984). Initially, eight distantly related accessions were screened for polymorphism using 120  $X_{gwm}$  SSR loci isolated and mapped in bread wheat by Röder et al. (1998). These loci were chosen based on the available map information and on the results of previous studies in wheat (Plaschke et al. 1995; Röder et al. 1995; Fahima et al. 1998). The

Genotype	Year of release	Country of origin	Registered pedigree	Breeder	Seed source
Adamello	1985	Italy	Valforte/Turkish line	Ist Sper Cerealicoltura	2
Appio	1082	Italy	Cappelli//Gaviota/Vuma	FederConsorzi	a b
Appio	1962	Italy	Cappelli/Gaviola/Tullia	Consorzio Diforma Fondiaria Bari	0
Arponeolo	1975	Italy	Crass/Annula	Consomelmo Dori	a
Arcangelo	1985		Creso/Appulo		a
Arcobaleno	1995	Italy-Spain	Chen/Altar 84	Semillas Battle	a
Bronte	1996	Italy	Berillo/Latino	Ist. Sper. Cerealicoltura	b
Capeiti 8	1940	Italy	Cappelli/Eiti	Stazione Granic. Sicilia	с
Cappelli	1915	Italy	Strampelli' selection from Jennah Khetifa	Strampelli	a
Ciccio	1996	Italy	F6 Appulo/Valnova//Valforte/Patrizio	Eurogen	d
Cirillo	1992	Italy	Jucci/Polesine//Creso/Montanari	Maliani Genetica	d
Colosseo	1995	Italy	Mutante di Mexa/Creso	Eurogen	d
Creso	1974	Italy	Yt 54-N10-B/2* Cp 63//3*TC 60/3/Cp B 14	ENEĂ	d
Duilio	1984	Italy	Cappelli//Anhinga/Flamingo	FederConsorzi	b
Flaminio	1998	Italy	Latino/Cappelli	SIS	b
Flavio	1992	Italy	Latino/Cappelli	SIS	h
Fortore	1995	Italy	Capeiti 8/Valforte	Ist Sper Cerealicoltura	9
Gargano	1007	Italy	Trinakria/Valforte//Valnova/Appulo	Ist Sper Cerealicoltura	a
Grazia	1095	Italy	M 6800127/Valsalve	Maliani Constian	a d
Ulazia	1965	Italy	VI 00001277 v disciva		d
	1995			SPB	a
Iride	1996	Italy	Altar 84/Ares (= Ionio)	SPB	d
Italo	1993	Italy	complex cross between Italian and Turkish genotypes	Mosconi	d
Karel	1980	Italy	Mex 198/Maristella	Centro Reg. Cagliari	е
1.35	_	Italy	Altar $84/Ares$ (= Ionio)	SPB	d
Latino	1082	Italy	Cappelli/Aningha//T_turgidum	FederConsorzi	h
Liro B 45	1085	Italy	Mandon/ED 1104	SDR	d
Massania	1082	Italy	Mandoll/1D 1104 Max (Cropa "S"//Tita	Jot Migl Dari	d d
Oferte	1962	Italy	Appula/Adamalla	Ist. Sman. Canadiaaltum	d
	1990		Appulo/Adameno	ist. Sper. Cereancontura	a
Platani	1995		vainova/Capeili	Stazione Granic. Sicilia	e
Plinio	1988	Italy	Line D50/Trigo Candeal	FederConsorzi	b
San Carlo	1996	Italy	Grazia/Degamit	Maliani Genetica	d
Simeto	1988	Italy	Capeiti 8/Valnova	Stazione Granic. Sicilia	d
Solex	1995	Italy	Creso/Valgerardo	Giordani	d
Svevo	1996	Italy	CIMMYT's Selection/Zenit	SPB	d
Trinakria	1970	Italy	B 14/Capeiti 8	Ist. Agronomia Palermo	d
Valbelice	1992	Italy	0111/BC 5	Ist. Agronomia Palermo	а
Valforte	1980	Italy	Yt54-N10-B/2*BY//LD390 II 14587 /3/Cappelli*2/	Ist. Sper. Cerealicoltura	e
Valnova	1975	Italy	Yt54-N10-B/2*BY//LD390 II 14587/3/Cp/4/Cp/	Ist. Sper. Cerealicoltura	a
V	1007	T4 - 1	1  unita	Let Same Concellingtone	L
v arano	1997		Capelli 8/Creso//Creso/3/ vall./Trinakria	Ist. Sper. Cereancoltura	a
Vitromax	1996	Italy-Spain	Turchia / // 3/Jori/Anninga//Flamingo	Semillas Battle	а
Vitron	1987	Italy-Spain	Turchia / //3/Jori/Anhinga//Flamingo	Semillas Battle	a
Zenit	1992	Italy	Valriccardo/Vic	SPB	d
Russello SG/	-	Italy	Selection from the Italian landraces "Russie"	-	с
Saragolla	-	Italy	Selection from the Italian landraces "Saragolle"	-	c
WB881	n.a.	U.S.A.	Complex cross of Ward-Wells-Cando-Waskana- Mexicali 75	WPB	d
Kronos	n.a.	U.S.A.	APB MSFRS POP Sel (D03-21)	APB	d
Produra	1980	USA	TMF/2*TC60//7B/Wells/3/TC60/2*BYF//	Northrup King	e
- i oddia	1900	0.0.71	Tecur125E /2*TC60		C
Colorado	1995	U.S.A.	P 92/932-2	Pioneer Hi Bred	а
Durfort	1996	France	Selected from the REVA population	Verneuil Semences de Provence	а
Exeldur	1992	France	Valdur/Regal	Gae Maisse	d
Ixos	1990	France	Valnova/3/Tomclear/662//662	Verneuil Semences de Provence	d
Nefer	1996	France	164/Keops	Verneuil Semences de Provence	d
Neodur	1987	France	184-7/Valdur//Edmore	GAE-Maisse	d
Mexicali 75	1975	Mexico	61.130/Leeds//Jori"S"/3/GDOV7469	CIMMYT-INIA	d
Altar 84	1984	Mexico	Ruff "S"/Flamingo "S"//Mexicali 75/3/SHWA"S"	CIMMYT-INIA	d
Aconchi 80	1080	Mexico	Altar 84/Arans	CIMMYT-INIA	e
Inrat 60	1060	Tunisio	Mahamoudi/Kyperounda		f
Korim	1082	Tunisia	Iori"S"/Anhingo"S"//Flomingo"S"	CIMMVT IND AT	r f
Khiar	1007	Tunisia	Chen/Altar 8/		f
1511101	1774	1 1111514			1

Table 1 List of durum wheat accessions used in the SSR analysis. Year of release, country of origin, pedigree, breeder and seed source of each accession are reported. Bold denotes founder-genotypes

a Ente Nazionale Sementi elette (ENSE), Milan, Italy b Società Italiana Sementi (SIS), Bologna, Italy

c Istituto del Germoplasma (Germplams Institute), Bari, Italy d Società Produttori Sementi (SPB), Bologna, Italy

e Istituto Sperimentale Cerealicoltura, Sezione di Foggia (Experimental Institute for Cereal Research), Foggia, Italy f Institute Nationale de la Recherce Agricole, INRAT, Ari-

ana, Tunisia n.a.: not available results from the EU Demonstration Project BIO4-CT97-2377 "Molecular marker systems for variety testing" were also considered (Röder et al. 2002; P. Donini and R. Cooke, unpublished results). PCR amplifications were carried out as described in Röder et al. (1998) and products were separated on 3% agarose gels (Seakem LE Agarose, BMA, Rockland, Me.). Sixty nine out of the 120 Xgwm loci (amplified by 65 WMS primer pairs) were selected based on their uniform distribution in the genome, profile quality and polymorphism level. The microsatellite *Taglut*, a trinucleotide repeat SSR (Devos et al. 1995), was also included because of its proven suitability for genotyping purposes (P. Donini, unpublished results).

PCR amplifications were carried out in a final volume of 25  $\mu$ l as described in Röder et al. (1998), except for the forward primers which were fluorescently labelled; two different fluorochromes, IRD-700 and IRD-800 (MWG-Biotech, Ebesberg, Germany) were alternatively used. PCR reactions were electrophoresed in 25-cmlong denaturing 6% polyacrylamide (SequaGel XR, Polymed) gels in 1× TBE buffer. Real-time detection of alleles from multiplexed SSRs was achieved using the LI-COR dual-laser system. Amplicons were run on the LI-COR DNA Analysis 4200 Gene Read IR<sup>2</sup> automated genotyper (LI-COR, Lincoln, Neb.). For multiplexing PCR reaction products, 2  $\mu$ l of each PCR product were pooled and diluted from 1:6 to 1:10 (regarding to the relative PCR product concentration) with IR<sup>2</sup> Stop Solution; 0.5  $\mu$ l of the mix were loaded onto the gel. Alleles from different SSRs were discriminated on the basis of the differential labelling of the primers and molecular weights. The molecular weight of each allele was recorded by comparing the strongest of the corresponding stuttered bands with an IR-labelled molecular weight standard (IR Dye Sizing Standards, LI-COR, Lincoln, Neb.).

#### Data analysis

The gene diversity (discriminatory power) of each microsatellite locus was expressed as the diversity index (DI), which takes into account both the number of alleles present at a locus and the relative frequency of each allele:

$$DI = 1 - \Sigma p_i^2$$

where  $p_j$  is the frequency of the *j*<sup>th</sup> allele across all the 58 accessions (Weir 1990; Powell et al. 1996).

Following results and indications of previous studies (Matsuoka et al. 2002b), the proportion of loci with shared alleles was chosen as the most appropriate measure of genetic similarity. For each pair of accessions, the similarity value ( $GS_{ij}$ ) was calculated according to Sneath and Sokal (1973) using the Simple Matching coefficient (SM) for multi-state qualitative data:

#### $GS_{ij} = m/n$ ,

where m = number of loci with allelic variants of the same molecular weight present in the two accessions *i* and *j* being compared, summed over all the surveyed loci, and n = total number of loci, excluding loci with missing data.

In some cases, microsatellite loci showed the presence of a residual non-uniformity within accessions (i.e. the presence of two different alleles per locus): in such cases the two alleles were considered as equally contributing to the genetic make-up of the accession. Taking into account this residual non-uniformity, the genetic diversity values were calculated as the exact proportion of loci with shared alleles between cvs by assigning two characters to each one of the 70 SSR loci. Principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) was performed from the genetic similarity matrix (Gower 1966). All computations were carried out with appropriate procedures of the software package NTSYS-pc ver. 2.0 (Rohlf 1997).

#### Results

#### SSR polymorphism

In total, 394 alleles were identified at the 70 polymorphic SSR loci. Polymorphism features of each SSR are reported in Table 2. These 70 SSR loci covered ca 80% of the A and B wheat genomes, as estimated from the microsatellite map obtained in bread wheat by Röder et al. (1998). The average number of allelic variants detected per locus ranged from two (Xgwm164, *Xgwm165-4A*, *Xgwm357* and *Xgwm415*) up to 12 (Xgwm312), with a mean of 5.63  $\pm$  2.32. Two allelic variants were simultaneously detected in 3.6% of the investigated locus-genotype combinations (excluding missing data). A high frequency (i.e. >10%) of null alleles confirmed by two repeated PCR amplifications was detected at only five loci (Xgwm126, Xgwm162, Xgwm282, Xgwm499 and Xgwm611b). DI values (the gene diversity estimates) of the 69 dinucleotide repeats ranged from 0.07 (Xgwm67, Xgwm165-4A and Xgwm357) to 0.80 (Xgwm544 and Xgwm611a), with an average value of  $0.56 \pm 0.19$ . Taglut, the only trinucleotide repeat, revealed a DI value of 0.21 with four allelic variants, each one showing two distinct but co-migrating fragments, according to Devos et al. (1995).

Observed DI values have been reported as a function of the number of alleles/locus (Fig. 1) and were compared with the corresponding maximum theoretical DI values (mt-DI), i.e. the DI value corresponding to the highest possible diversity level: this comparison allowed us to assess the level of allelic imbalance present at each SSR locus. All the four bi-allelic loci had DI values considerably lower than their corresponding mt-DI (0.5), thus showing a strong allelic imbalance. Considering the relative DI value of each locus (the ratio of the DI value over the corresponding mt-DI), the 33 loci with three to five allelic variants showed lower values and a higher variation than the 32 loci with six to 12 allelic variants  $(64.6 \pm 17.9\% \text{ vs } 75.1 \pm 11.7\%)$ , thus indicating that the presence of allelic imbalance is more frequent at SSR loci with a low to medium number of alleles.

SSR loci showed differences as to the allele-size variation within a locus. Irrespective of the allelic richness of loci, in some cases (*Xwmg11, Xwmg304, Xwmg537, Xwmg544* and *Xwmg639-5B*) allele-size differences greater than two or three repeat units were rarely observed; these loci were characterized by low mean values of allele size differences. Other loci (*Xwmg122, Xwmg268, Xwmg291, Xwmg302, Xwmg408* and *Xwmg499*) showed a non-continuous, irregular distribution of allele-size differences, with the presence of high size differences among alleles.

Based on the sequencing information provided by Röder et al. (1998), among the 69 dinucleotide loci herein assessed, 40 of those can be considered as simple-perfect repeats, 17 as compound repeats and 12 as imperfect repeats, i.e. 29 irregular repeats in total (Table 2). Since imperfect and compound repeats are characterized by

**Table 2** Characteristics of the 70 wheat microsatellite loci. Designation, chromosome location, centromere distance, sequence of the core repeat (as in Chinese Spring bread wheat: Devos et al. 1995; Röder et al. 1998), number of alleles across the 58 accessions, diversity index (DI) value, allele size range, size

differences between alleles (mean and maximum values), and correlation coefficient of each SSR with the complete set of data. Loci highlighted in bold identify a core set of 20 primer combinations highly informative in cultivated durum wheat

$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	SSR loci	Map position <sup>a</sup>	Distance from centromere	Repeat class <sup>b</sup>	Motif	Allele number	DI	Allele size range	Allele s differen	ize ces	Correlation coefficient <sup>c</sup>
		Chrom.	сМ			n		бр	Mean	Max.	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Xgwm136	1AS	39	р	CT	11	0.76	278-370	9.2	26	0.34 ***
$ \begin{array}{c} Agom 197 \\ Agom 187 \\ Agom 188 \\ Agom 162 \\ Agom 163 \\ Agom 163 \\ Agom 164 \\ Ago$	TAGLUT	IAS	-	с	CAG/CAA	4	0.23	144-160	5.3	8	0.29 ***
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Xgwm104 Xauna 257		2	p		2	0.21	125-129	2.0	2	0.05  ns
	Agwin 557 Yawm 00	IAL 1AI	9	p	GA CA	27	0.07	110-120	2.0	14	0.04 IIS
$ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c}$	Xown 18	1RS	6	P C	CA/TA	3	0.40	186_190	2.0	2	0.20
	Xewm 11	1BL	2	c	TA/CA	5	0.57	214-226	2.5	4	0.35 ***
$ \begin{array}{c} \chi_{gven} \ 65 & 2AS & 95 & i \\ \chi_{gven} \ 65 & 2AS & 5 & p \\ X_{gven} \ 64 & 2AS & 5 & p \\ X_{gven} \ 64 & 2AS & 5 & p \\ X_{gven} \ 64 & 2AS & 5 & p \\ X_{gven} \ 64 & 2AS & 5 & p \\ X_{gven} \ 64 & 2AS & 5 & p \\ X_{gven} \ 64 & 2AS & 5 & p \\ X_{gven} \ 72 & 2AL & 3 & c \\ X_{gven} \ 72 & 2AL & 3 & c \\ X_{gven} \ 72 & 2AL & 14 & i \\ i \\ X_{gven} \ 72 & 2AL & 14 & i \\ X_{gven} \ 72 & 2AL & 14 & p \\ GA & 5 & 0.47 & 182-255 & 8.0 & 10 & 0.43 & *** \\ X_{gven} \ 72 & 2AL & 14 & p \\ GA & 5 & 0.47 & 182-255 & 8.0 & 10 & 0.40 & *** \\ X_{gven} \ 72 & 2AL & 14 & p \\ GA & 5 & 0.47 & 182-255 & 8.0 & 10 & 0.44 & *** \\ X_{gven} \ 72 & 2BL & 19 & c \\ X_{gven} \ 72 & 2BL & 19 & c \\ X_{gven} \ 72 & 2BL & 19 & c \\ X_{gven} \ 72 & 2BL & 106 & p & CT & 6 & 0.57 & 140-156 & 3.6 & 6 & 0.33 & *** \\ X_{gven} \ 73 & 3AL & 4 & c & TCGTGA & 7 & 0.77 & 156-174 & 3.0 & 4 & 0.36 & *** \\ X_{gven} \ 73 & 3AL & 4 & c & TCGTGA & 7 & 0.77 & 156-174 & 3.0 & 4 & 0.36 & *** \\ X_{gven} \ 73 & 3AL & 4 & c & CTGGT & 6 & 0.47 & 116-132 & 3.0 & 0.34 & *** \\ X_{gven} \ 73 & 3BL & 127 & i & CA & 5 & 0.54 & 200-204 & 2.0 & 2 & 0.23 & *** \\ X_{gven} \ 73 & 3BS & 118 & c & CTGGT & 6 & 0.47 & 116-132 & 3.2 & 6 & 0.14 & * \\ X_{gven} \ 730 & 3BS & 118 & c & CTGGT & 6 & 0.47 & 116-132 & 3.2 & 6 & 0.14 & * \\ X_{gven} \ 730 & 3BL & 132 & p & GA & 10 & 0.76 & 137-150 & 5.8 & 20 & 0.23 & *** \\ X_{gven} \ 730 & 3BL & 132 & p & GA & 10 & 0.76 & 137-150 & 5.8 & 20 & 0.23 & *** \\ X_{gven} \ 730 & 8BL & 8S & p & CA & 6 & 0.75 & 158-173 & 5.8 & 6 & 0.38 & *** \\ X_{gven} \ 730 & 8BL & 8S & p & CA & 6 & 0.75 & 158-173 & 5.8 & 6 & 0.38 & *** \\ X_{gven} \ 747 & 4AL & 17 & p & CA & 6 & 0.75 & 158-173 & 5.8 & 6 & 0.38 & *** \\ X_{gven} \ 747 & 4AL & 17 & p & CA & 4 & 0.57 & 96-118 & 7.3 & 6 & 0.13 & *** \\ X_{gven} \ 747 & 4AL & 10 & p & CA & 4 & 0.57 & 96-118 & 7.3 & 6 & 0.13 & *** \\ X_{gven} \ 747 & 4BL & 10 & p & CA & 4 & 0.57 & 96-118 & 7.3 & 6 & 0.33 & *** \\ X_{gven} \ 747 & 4BL & 10 & p & CA & 4 & 0.57 & 96-118 & 7.3 & 6 & 0.33 & *** \\ X_{gven} \ 747 & 4BL & 10 & p & C$	Xgwm 268	1BL	74	i	GA	5	0.57	204-232	7.0	16	0.48 ***
	Xgwm 636	2AS	95	i	GA	8	0.76	87-113	3.7	10	0.36 ***
Xgwm 4482AS5pGA90.75220-224.080.48 $^{***}$ Xgwm 2242AL14iGA40.4772-11012.7300.43 $^{***}$ Xgwm 322AL14pGA50.47182-2358.0100.40 $^{***}$ Xgwm 1482BS19pCA60.63146-1684.8180.19 $^{***}$ Xgwm 5262BL76pCTCA50.58128-16610.0180.29 $^{***}$ Xgwm 533AL4cCTCGTCA70.57140-1686.5100.48 $^{***}$ Xgwm 503AL9iCA50.54200-202.0 <t< td=""><td>Xgwm 95</td><td>2AS</td><td>5</td><td>р</td><td>AC</td><td>7</td><td>0.65</td><td>110-131</td><td>3.3</td><td>10</td><td>0.40 ***</td></t<>	Xgwm 95	2AS	5	р	AC	7	0.65	110-131	3.3	10	0.40 ***
Xgwm 1/2         2AL         3         c         CUTCA         6         0.39         128-205         15.4         5.2         0.43         ****           Xgwm 3/2         2AL         14         p         GA         5         0.47         182-235         8.0         10         0.40         ****           Xgwm 1/2         2AL         14         p         GA         5         0.47         182-235         8.0         10         0.40         ****           Xgwm 1/20         2BL         19         c         CT         5         0.38         128-166         6.5         10         0.48         ****           Xgwm 1/20         2BL         106         p         CT         5         0.39         142-166         6.5         10         0.48         ***           Xgwm 1/20         2BL         106         p         CT         3         0.35         127-13         1.5         2         0.36         ***           Xgwm 1/5         3AL         64         p         CT         3         0.35         127-13         1.5         2         0.3         3***           Xgwm 1/5         3AL         4         c         CA<	Xgwm 448	2AS	5	р	GA	9	0.75	220-252	4.0	8	0.48 ***
Xgwn 224         ZAL         14         1         GA         4         0.47         72-110         12.7         30         0.43         ****           Xgwn 148         2BS         19         p         CA         6         0.63         146-168         4.8         18         0.19         ****           Xgwn 120         ZBL         76         p         CT         6         0.53         142-168         6.5         10         0.18         ****           Xgwn 55         3AL         4         c         TCGTGA         7         0.57         140-156         3.6         6         0.33         ****           Xgwn 53         3AL         4         c         TCGTGA         7         0.51         12.7         3.0         4         0.36         ****           Xgwn 53         3AL         91         i         CA         5         0.50         138.1         15         2         0.36         ****           Xgwn 56         3BL         127         i         CA         5         0.5         1.0         0.34         ****           Xgwn 63         3BL         132         p         GA         10.77         188-193	Xgwm 122	2AL	3	c	CT/CA	6	0.59	128-205	15.4	52	0.43 ***
Agem         J2         ZhL         14         p         GA         3         0.47         IS2-253         6.0         10         0.47***           Xgum         120         ZBL         19         c         CTCA         5         0.58         128-160         10.0         18         0.29****           Xgum         52         ZBL         19         c         CTCA         5         0.53         124-168         6.5         10         0.48****           Xgum         53         JAL         4         c         CTCGTG         0.57         142-168         6.5         10         0.48****           Xgum         53         JAL         64         p         CT         30.53         127-130         1.5         2         0.66****           Xgum         33BS         127         i         CA         3         0.77         161-132         30         0.34****           Xgum         343         3BS         127         i         CA         0.47         161-132         32         6         0.14**           Xgum         63         JAL         4.0         c         CA/GA/TA         3         0.57         177-173 <td< td=""><td>Xgwm 294</td><td>2AL</td><td>14</td><td>1</td><td>GA</td><td>4</td><td>0.47</td><td>72-110</td><td>12.7</td><td>30</td><td>0.43 ***</td></td<>	Xgwm 294	2AL	14	1	GA	4	0.47	72-110	12.7	30	0.43 ***
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Agwm 512 Vaum 148	2AL 2DS	14	p	GA	5	0.47	182-233	8.0	10	0.40 ***
$ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Agwin 140 Xawin 120	203 2BI	19	р С	CT/CA	5	0.05	140 - 108 128 - 160	4.0	10	0.19 ***
	Xowm 526	2BL	76	n	CT	6	0.50	120-100 140-156	3.6	6	0.33 ***
	Xgwm 619	2BL	106	p D	CT	5	0.59	142–168	6.5	10	0.48 ***
	Xgwm 5	3AL	4	P C	TC/GT/GA	7	0.77	156–174	3.0	4	0.36 ***
	Xgwm 155	3AL	64	р	СТ	3	0.35	127-130	1.5	2	0.36 ***
	Xgwm 162	3AL	91	i	CA	5	0.54	200-204	2.0	2	0.23 ***
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Xgwm 493	3BS	127	i	CA	3	0.50	138-180	21.0	30	0.34 ***
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Xgwm 389	3BS	118	с	CT/GT	6	0.47	116–132	3.2	6	0.14 *
Xgwm 2473BL132pGA100.76 $137-195$ 5.8200.25 $235$ Xgwm 6104AL17iGA60.78 $154-170$ 3.260.38 $***$ Xgwm 6174AL40pCA60.75 $157-173$ 2.890.28 $****$ Xgwm 6164AL85pGA30.57 $188-198$ 5.080.28 $****$ Xgwm 3684BS7pTA60.75 $252-282$ 5.2100.42 $****$ Xgwm 165-4B4BL16pGA60.73 $252-266$ 2.840.39 $***$ Xgwm 644BL50pGA100.70 $174-248$ 8.0200.27 $***$ Xgwm 7044BL50pGA100.70 $174-248$ 8.0200.27 $***$ Xgwm 7155AS29iGA20.100.76 $136-138$ 2.020.04 $ns$ Xgwm 7155AS29iGA40.50118-1344.7100.39 $***$ Xgwm 7155AS29iGA30.20135-1434.060.00 $ns$ Xgwm 7155AS29iGA30.20135-1434.060.00 $ns$ $xgwm$ Xgwm 7155AS29iGA20.10 </td <td>Xgwm 566</td> <td>3BL</td> <td>4</td> <td>с</td> <td>CA/GA/TA</td> <td>3</td> <td>0.47</td> <td>126-134</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>6</td> <td>0.18 **</td>	Xgwm 566	3BL	4	с	CA/GA/TA	3	0.47	126-134	4.0	6	0.18 **
Agwm 1004AAsspGA20.01188–1935.03.00.07188Xgwm 6374AL40pCA60.48154–1703.260.28****Xgwm 6374AL40pCA60.75157–1732.890.28****Xgwm 6374AL8BS7pTA60.75252–2825.2100.42****Xgwm 5134BL8pCA40.60150–1562.020.27****Xgwm 5144BL16pGA60.73252–2662.840.39****Xgwm 2514BL30pCA40.5796–1187.3160.10 nssXgwm 3045AS29pCT60.67198–2102.440.26****Xgwm 1545AS29pGT60.67198–2102.440.26****Xgwm 1545AS29pGT60.67198–2102.440.26****Xgwm 1545AS15iGA20.10136–1382.020.04nsXgwm 1545AL19pGT60.67198–2102.38.40.10nsXgwm 2915AL150pCA40.50193–2075.380.0	Xgwm 247	3BL	132	р	GA	10	0.76	137-195	5.8	20	0.23 ***
Agem 0104AL171CA000.4313-172.200.28****Xgwm 1604AL85pGA30.57188-1985.080.28****Xgwm 3134BL8pTA60.75252-2825.2100.42****Xgwm 3134BL8pCA40.60150-1562.020.27****Xgwm 64BL16pGA60.73252-2662.840.39****Xgwm 644BL50pGA100.70174-2488.0200.27****Xgwm 3045AS29pCT60.67198-2102.440.26****Xgwm 1555AS29pGT60.67198-2102.440.26****Xgwm 1565AL19pGT60.69288-3206.8240.11nsXgwm 1565AL19pGT60.69288-3206.8240.11nsXgwm 2155AL130pCA40.50193-2075.380.03nsXgwm 2215AL150pCA50.70140-1666.5180.22***Xgwm 2155AL150pCA50.70140-1666.5180.22***<	Agwm 105-4A Vaum 610	4A5 4A1	8 17	p	GA	6	0.07	188-195	5.0	5	0.07 ns
Agmm 1604AL40pGA30.57157-152.3650.20***Xgwm 3684BS7pTA60.75252-2825.2100.42***Xgwm 3684BL16pGA60.73252-2662.840.39***Xgwm 165-4B4BL16pGA60.73252-2662.840.39***Xgwm 2514BL30pGA100.70174-2488.0200.27***Xgwm 3045AS29pGT60.67198-2102.440.26***Xgwm 3045AS29iGA20.10136-1382.02.00.04 nsXgwm 1545AS15iGA20.10136-1382.02.00.04 nsXgwm 1565AL19pGT60.69288-3206.8240.11 nsXgwm 1565AL133pCA50.70140-1666.5180.22 ***Xgwm 5445BS37cCT/CA60.70228-2627.2180.33***Xgwm 5455BL0pGA10.63151-2338.4200.23***Xgwm 5455BL0pGA10.63151-2338.42022<***Xgwm 5455BL0	<b>Agwm 610</b> Yawm 637	4AL 4AI	17	l n	GA CA	6	0.48	157 173	5.2 2.8	0	0.38 ***
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Xown 160	4AL	85	P n	GA	3	0.75	188_198	5.0	8	0.28 ***
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Xgwm 368	4BS	7	Р р	TA	6	0.75	252-282	5.2	10	0.42 ***
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Xgwm 513	4BL	8	p	CA	4	0.60	150-156	2.0	2	0.27 ***
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Xgwm 165-4B	4BL	16	p	GA	6	0.73	252-266	2.8	4	0.39 ***
Xgwm 64BL50pGA100.70174-2488.0200.27*** $Xgwm 304$ 5AS29pCT60.67198-2102.440.26*** $Xgwm 155$ 5AS29iGA20.10136-1382.020.04 ns $Xgwm 156$ 5AL19pGT60.69288-3206.8240.11 ns $Xgwm 639-5A$ 5AL60pGA30.20135-1434.060.00 ns $Xgwm 126$ 5AL133pCA40.50193-2075.380.03 ns $Xgwm 234$ 5BS37cCT/CA60.70128-2627.2180.33 $Xgwm 213$ 5BL0pGA110.63151-2338.4260.33 $Xgwm 435$ 5BL0pGA70.59124-1848.3320.28 $Xgwm 435$ 5BL0pGA70.59124-1848.3320.28 $Xgwm 435$ 5BL74cCA/TA40.52149-18311.3280.22 $Xgwm 435$ 5BL74cCA/TA40.52149-18311.3280.22 $Xgwm 435$ 5BL74cCA/TA40.52149-18311.3280.22 $Xgwm 435$ 5BL74cCA/TA4 <td>Xgwm 251</td> <td>4BL</td> <td>30</td> <td>p</td> <td>CA</td> <td>4</td> <td>0.57</td> <td>96-118</td> <td>7.3</td> <td>16</td> <td>0.10 ns</td>	Xgwm 251	4BL	30	p	CA	4	0.57	96-118	7.3	16	0.10 ns
Xgwm 3045AS29pCT60.67198-2102.440.26 *** $Xgwm 415$ 5AS29iGA20.10136-1382.020.04 ns $Xgwm 154$ 5AS15iGA40.54118-1344.7100.39 *** $Xgwm 156$ 5AL19pGT60.69288-3206.8240.11 ns $Xgwm 639-5A$ 5AL60pGA30.20135-1434.060.00 ns $Xgwm 226$ 5AL133pCA40.50193-2075.380.03 ns $Xgwm 234$ 5BS12cCT/CA60.70228-2627.2180.33 *** $Xgwm 544$ 5BS12cCT/CAT100.799174-2042.760.33 *** $Xgwm 67$ 5BL0pGA70.59124-1848.3320.28 *** $Xgwm 695$ 5BL0pGA70.59124-1848.3320.28 *** $Xgwm 408$ 5BL74cCATTA40.52149-18311.3280.22 *** $Xgwm 408$ 5BL74cCATTA40.52149-18311.3280.22 *** $Xgwm 67$ 6AL31cCT/GT50.57104-14710.8370.12 ns $Xgwm 675$ 6AS67pGA<	Xgwm 6	4BL	50	р	GA	10	0.70	174–248	8.0	20	0.27 ***
Xgwm 4/55AS291 $GA$ 20.10136-1382.020.04 ns $Xgwm 156$ 5AL19pGT60.69288-3206.8240.11 ns $Xgwm 639-5A$ 5AL60pGA30.20135-1434.060.00 ns $Xgwm 126$ 5AL133pCA40.50193-2075.380.03 ns $Xgwm 291$ 5AL150pCA50.70140-1666.5180.22 ** $Xgwm 234$ 5BS37cCT/CA60.70228-2627.2180.33 *** $Xgwm 213$ 5BL0pGA110.63151-2338.4260.33 *** $Xgwm 67$ 5BL0pGA70.59124-1848.3320.28 *** $Xgwm 67$ 5BL0pGA70.59124-1848.3320.28 *** $Xgwm 67$ 5BL29pGA70.59124-1848.3320.28 *** $Xgwm 67$ 5BL7pGA50.57104-14710.8370.12 ns $Xgwm 67$ 6AL31cCT/GT50.57104-14710.8370.12 ns $Xgwm 67$ 6AL31cCT/GT50.57104-14710.8370.12 ns $Xgwm 680$ 6BS34pCA5 <td>Xgwm 304</td> <td>5AS</td> <td>29</td> <td>р</td> <td>CT</td> <td>6</td> <td>0.67</td> <td>198-210</td> <td>2.4</td> <td>4</td> <td>0.26 ***</td>	Xgwm 304	5AS	29	р	CT	6	0.67	198-210	2.4	4	0.26 ***
Agwm 1545AS151GA40.54118-1344.7100.59 $^{avas}$ Xgwm 639-5A5AL19pGT60.69288-3206.8240.11nsXgwm 639-5A5AL133pGA30.20135-1434.060.00 nsXgwm 2915AL150pCA40.50193-2075.380.03 nsXgwm 2345BS37cCT/CA60.70228-2627.2180.33 $^{***}$ Xgwm 2345BL0pGA310.79174-2042.760.33 $^{***}$ Xgwm 2135BL0pGA110.63151-2338.4260.33 $^{***}$ Xgwm 639-5B5BL0pGA70.59124-1848.3320.28 $^{***}$ Xgwm 639-5B5BL29pGA70.59124-1848.3320.28 $^{***}$ Xgwm 639-5B5BL36pGA50.43172-1822.540.31 $^{***}$ Xgwm 6495BL74cCA/TA40.52149-18311.3280.22 $^{***}$ Xgwm 639-5B5BL367pGA50.57104-14710.8370.12 nsXgwm 5706AL31cCT/GT50.57104-147	Xgwm 415	5AS	29	1	GA	2	0.10	136-138	2.0	2	0.04 ns
Agwm 130SAL19pG100.039 $226-320$ 0.039 $24$ 0.11 lisXgwm 126SAL133pGA30.20135-1434.060.000 nsXgwm 291SAL150pCA40.50193-2075.380.03 nsXgwm 234SBS37cCT/CA60.70140-1666.5180.22 **Xgwm 544SBS12cCT/CA60.70228-2627.2180.33 ***Xgwm 67SBL0pGA110.63151-2338.4260.33 ***Xgwm 67SBL0pCA30.0793-972.020.26 ***Xgwm 67SBL0pGA70.59124-1848.3320.28 ***Xgwm 639-5BSBL36pGA50.43172-1822.540.31 ***Xgwm 408SBL74cCA/TA40.52149-18311.3280.22 ***Xgwm 570GAL31cCT/GT50.57104-14710.8370.12 nsXgwm 518GBS34pCA50.66150-1623.040.38 ***Xgwm 518GBS33cCT/CA40.65128-1404.080.48 ***Xgwm 680GBS0cCT/CA40.62 </td <td>Agwm 154 Vaum 156</td> <td>5A5 5A1</td> <td>15</td> <td>1</td> <td>GA</td> <td>4</td> <td>0.54</td> <td>118-134</td> <td>4.7</td> <td>10</td> <td>0.39</td>	Agwm 154 Vaum 156	5A5 5A1	15	1	GA	4	0.54	118-134	4.7	10	0.39
Agwm 02-65AL30pGA30.2013-1+34.000.003 nsXgwm 2915AL150pCA40.50193-2075.380.003 nsXgwm 2345BS37cCT/CA60.70228-2627.2180.33 ***Xgwm 5445BS12cCT/CA60.70228-2627.2180.33 ***Xgwm 2135BL0pGA110.63151-2338.4260.33 ***Xgwm 675BL0pCA30.0793-972.020.26 ***Xgwm 695BL29pGA70.59124-1848.3320.28 ***Xgwm 639-5B5BL36pGA50.43172-1822.540.31 ***Xgwm 6405BL74cCA/TA40.52149-18311.3280.22 ***Xgwm 6405BL74cCA/TA40.52149-18311.3280.22 ***Xgwm 5706AL31cCT/GT50.57104-14710.8370.12 nsXgwm 1696AL50pGA50.66150-1623.040.38 ***Xgwm 1736BS7cCT/CA40.64167-1794.080.50 ***Xgwm 6806BS0cCT/CA40.64 <td>Xgwm 130 Xgwm 630-5A</td> <td>5AL</td> <td>60</td> <td>р р</td> <td>GA</td> <td>3</td> <td>0.09</td> <td>135 1/3</td> <td>0.8</td> <td>24 6</td> <td>0.11  IIS</td>	Xgwm 130 Xgwm 630-5A	5AL	60	р р	GA	3	0.09	135 1/3	0.8	24 6	0.11  IIS
Agem 1291SAL150pCA50.70140-1666.5180.22 ** $Xgem 234$ 5BS37cCT/CA60.70228-2627.2180.33 *** $Xgem 544$ 5BS12cCT/GT100.79174-2042.760.33 *** $Xgem 213$ 5BL0pGA110.63151-2338.4260.33 *** $Xgem 67$ 5BL0pCA30.0793-972.020.26 *** $Xgem 639-5B$ 5BL29pGA70.59124-1848.3320.28 *** $Xgem 639-5B$ 5BL29pGA50.43172-1822.540.31 *** $Xgem 459$ 6AS67pGA60.64115-18211.4260.22 *** $Xgem 459$ 6AS67pGA60.64115-18211.4260.24 *** $Xgem 570$ 6AL31cCT/GT50.57104-14710.8370.12 ns $Xgem 518$ 6BS34pCA50.66150-1623.040.38 *** $Xgem 518$ 6BS7cCT/CA40.64167-1794.080.50 *** $Xgem 518$ 6BS7cCT/CA40.64167-1794.080.58 *** $Xgem 630$ 6BS7cCT/C	Xowm 126	5AL	133	р р	CA	4	0.20	193 - 207	53	8	0.00  ns
$X_{gwm} 234$ $5BS$ $37$ $c$ $CT/CA$ $6$ $0.70$ $228-262$ $7.2$ $18$ $0.33$ *** $X_{gwm} 544$ $5BS$ $12$ $c$ $CT/GT$ $10$ $0.79$ $174-204$ $2.7$ $6$ $0.33$ *** $X_{gwm} 213$ $5BL$ $0$ $p$ $GA$ $11$ $0.63$ $151-233$ $8.4$ $26$ $0.33$ *** $X_{gwm} 67$ $5BL$ $0$ $p$ $CA$ $3$ $0.07$ $93-97$ $2.0$ $2$ $0.26$ *** $X_{gwm} 499$ $5BL$ $29$ $p$ $GA$ $7$ $0.59$ $124-184$ $8.3$ $32$ $0.28$ $***$ $X_{gwm} 499$ $5BL$ $29$ $p$ $GA$ $7$ $0.59$ $124-184$ $8.3$ $32$ $0.28$ $***$ $X_{gwm} 408$ $5BL$ $74$ $c$ $CA/TA$ $4$ $0.52$ $149-183$ $11.3$ $28$ $0.22$ $***$ $X_{gwm} 408$ $5BL$ $74$ $c$ $CA/TA$ $4$ $0.52$ $149-183$ $11.3$ $28$ $0.22$ $***$ $X_{gwm} 459$ $6AS$ $67$ $p$ $GA$ $6$ $0.64$ $115-182$ $11.4$ $26$ $0.24$ $***$ $X_{gwm} 570$ $6AL$ $31$ $c$ $CT/GT$ $5$ $0.57$ $104-147$ $10.8$ $37$ $0.12$ ns $X_{gwm} 518$ $6BS$ $34$ $p$ $CA$ $5$ $0.66$ $150-162$ $3.0$ $4$ $0.38$ $***$ $X_{gwm} 60$	Xgwm 291	5AL	150	p D	CA	5	0.70	140–166	6.5	18	0.22 **
Xgwm 5445BS12cCT/GT100.79174–2042.760.33 *** $Xgwm 213$ 5BL0pGA110.63151–2338.4260.33 *** $Xgwm 67$ 5BL0pCA30.0793–972.020.26 **** $Xgwm 639$ 5BL29pGA70.59124–1848.3320.28 **** $Xgwm 639$ -5B5BL36pGA50.43172–1822.540.31 *** $Xgwm 639$ -5B6AS67pGA60.64115–18211.4260.24 *** $Xgwm 495$ 6AS67pGA60.64115–18211.4260.24 *** $Xgwm 570$ 6AL31cCT/GT50.57104–14710.8370.12 ns $Xgwm 518$ 6BS34pCA50.66150–1623.040.38 *** $Xgwm 680$ 6BS7cCT/CA40.64167–1794.080.50 **** $Xgwm 60$ 7AS52pCA50.62188–2208.0180.27 *** $Xgwm 60$ 7AS52pCA50.62188–2208.0180.27 *** $Xgwm 60$ 7AS52pCA50.62188–2208.0180.27 *** $Xgwm 60$ 7AS52pCA	Xgwm 234	5BS	37	r C	CT/CA	6	0.70	228-262	7.2	18	0.33 ***
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Xgwm 544	5BS	12	c	CT/GT	10	0.79	174-204	2.7	6	0.33 ***
Xgwm 675BL0pCA30.07 $93-97$ 2.020.26 *** $Xgwm 499$ 5BL29pGA70.59 $124-184$ 8.3320.28 *** $Xgwm 639-5B$ 5BL36pGA50.43 $172-182$ 2.540.31 *** $Xgwm 408$ 5BL74cCA/TA40.52 $149-183$ 11.3280.22 *** $Xgwm 459$ 6AS67pGA60.64 $115-182$ 11.4260.24 *** $Xgwm 570$ 6AL31cCT/GT50.57 $104-147$ 10.8370.12 ns $Xgwm 169$ 6AL50pGA50.66 $150-162$ 3.040.38 *** $Xgwm 193$ 6BS7cCT/CA40.64 $167-179$ 4.080.50 *** $Xgwm 680$ 6BS3cGT/GA80.77 $130-152$ 3.160.51 *** $Xgwm 60$ 7AS52pCA50.62 $188-220$ 8.0180.27 *** $Xgwm 60$ 7AS52pCA50.62 $188-220$ 8.0180.27 *** $Xgwm 377-7A$ 7AS21pCA50.62 $188-220$ 8.0180.27 *** $Xgwm 60$ 7AS52pCA50.62 $188-220$ 8.0180.27 *** $Xgwm 60$ 7AS52 </td <td>Xgwm 213</td> <td>5BL</td> <td>0</td> <td>р</td> <td>GA</td> <td>11</td> <td>0.63</td> <td>151-233</td> <td>8.4</td> <td>26</td> <td>0.33 ***</td>	Xgwm 213	5BL	0	р	GA	11	0.63	151-233	8.4	26	0.33 ***
Xgwm 4995BL29pGA70.59124-1848.3320.28 *** $Xgwm 639-5B$ 5BL36pGA50.43172-1822.540.31 *** $Xgwm 408$ 5BL74cCA/TA40.52149-18311.3280.22 *** $Xgwm 459$ 6AS67pGA60.64115-18211.4260.24 *** $Xgwm 570$ 6AL31cCT/GT50.57104-14710.8370.12 ns $Xgwm 518$ 6BS34pCA50.66150-1623040.38 *** $Xgwm 193$ 6BS7cCT/CA40.64167-1794.080.50 *** $Xgwm 680$ 6BS0cGT/GA80.77130-1523.160.51 *** $Xgwm 60$ 7AS52pCA50.62188-2208.0180.27 *** $Xgwm 60$ 7AS52pCA50.62188-2208.0180.27 *** $Xgwm 773-7A$ 7AS21pCA40.50179-1914.060.17 * $Xgwm 332 a$ 7AL48pGA70.47170-2248.7160.38 ***Xgwm 332 a7AL48pGA70.47170-2248.7160.38 ***Xgwm 332 a7AL48pGA </td <td>Xgwm 67</td> <td>5BL</td> <td>0</td> <td>р</td> <td>CA</td> <td>3</td> <td>0.07</td> <td>93–97</td> <td>2.0</td> <td>2</td> <td>0.26 ***</td>	Xgwm 67	5BL	0	р	CA	3	0.07	93–97	2.0	2	0.26 ***
Xgwm 639-5BSBL36pGA5 $0.43$ $1/2-182$ $2.5$ $4$ $0.31$ *** $Xgwm 408$ SBL74cCA/TA $4$ $0.52$ $149-183$ $11.3$ $28$ $0.22$ *** $Xgwm 459$ 6AS67pGA6 $0.64$ $115-182$ $11.4$ $26$ $0.24$ *** $Xgwm 570$ 6AL31cCT/GT5 $0.57$ $104-147$ $10.8$ $37$ $0.12$ $ns$ $Xgwm 518$ 6BS34pCA5 $0.66$ $150-162$ $3.0$ $4$ $0.38$ *** $Xgwm 193$ 6BS7cCT/CA4 $0.64$ $167-179$ $4.0$ $8$ $0.50$ *** $Xgwm 680$ 6BS0cGT/GA8 $0.77$ $130-152$ $3.1$ $6$ $0.51$ *** $Xgwm 60$ 7AS52pCA5 $0.62$ $188-220$ $8.0$ $18$ $0.27$ *** $Xgwm 60$ 7AS52pCA5 $0.62$ $188-220$ $8.0$ $18$ $0.27$ *** $Xgwm 773-7A$ 7AS21pCA4 $0.50$ $179-191$ $4.0$ $6$ $0.17$ * $Xgwm 332$ 7AL48pGA7 $0.47$ $170-224$ $8.7$ $16$ $0.38$ *** $Xgwm 332$ 7AL48pGA7 $0.47$ $170-224$ $8.7$ $16$ $0.35$ ***<	Xgwm 499	5BL	29	р	GA	7	0.59	124–184	8.3	32	0.28 ***
Agwm 408SBL74CCA/TA4 $0.32$ $149-183$ $11.3$ $28$ $0.22$ $0.24$ Xgwm 4596AS67pGA6 $0.64$ $115-182$ $11.4$ $26$ $0.24$ $***$ Xgwm 5706AL31cCT/GT5 $0.57$ $104-147$ $10.8$ $37$ $0.12$ nsXgwm 5186BS34pCA5 $0.54$ $185-203$ $4.5$ $8$ $0.11$ nsXgwm 1936BS7cCT/CA4 $0.64$ $167-179$ $4.0$ $8$ $0.50$ $***$ Xgwm 886BS3cGT/GA8 $0.77$ $130-152$ $3.1$ $6$ $0.51$ $***$ Xgwm 6806BS0cGT/GA4 $0.65$ $128-140$ $4.0$ $8$ $0.48$ $***$ Xgwm 607AS52pCA5 $0.62$ $188-220$ $8.0$ $18$ $0.27$ $***$ Xgwm 607AS52pCA5 $0.62$ $188-220$ $8.0$ $18$ $0.27$ $***$ Xgwm 773-7A7AS21pCA4 $0.50$ $179-191$ $4.0$ $6$ $0.17$ $*$ Xgwm 2827AL48pGA7 $0.47$ $170-224$ $8.7$ $16$ $0.38$ $***$ Xgwm 332 a7AL48pGA5 $0.44$ $206-240$ $7.7$ $15$ $0.35$ $***$ Xgwm 332 b </td <td>Xgwm 639-5B</td> <td>SBL</td> <td>36</td> <td>р</td> <td>GA CA/TA</td> <td>5</td> <td>0.43</td> <td>1/2-182</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>4</td> <td>0.31 ***</td>	Xgwm 639-5B	SBL	36	р	GA CA/TA	5	0.43	1/2-182	2.5	4	0.31 ***
Agwm 439OASO/pOAOO/ $113-182$ $11.4$ $20$ $0.24$ $113-182$ Xgwm 570GAL31cCT/GT5 $0.57$ $104-147$ $10.8$ $37$ $0.12$ nsXgwm 169GAL50pGA5 $0.54$ $185-203$ $4.5$ 8 $0.11$ nsXgwm 518GBS34pCA5 $0.64$ $150-162$ $3.0$ $4$ $0.38$ $***$ Xgwm 193GBS7cCT/CA $4$ $0.64$ $167-179$ $4.0$ $8$ $0.50$ $***$ Xgwm 88GBS3cGT/GA $8$ $0.77$ $130-152$ $3.1$ $6$ $0.51$ $***$ Xgwm 680GBS0cGT/GA $4$ $0.65$ $128-140$ $4.0$ $8$ $0.48$ $***$ Xgwm 607AS52pCA $5$ $0.62$ $188-220$ $8.0$ $18$ $0.27$ $***$ Xgwm 773-7A7AS21pCA $4$ $0.50$ $179-191$ $4.0$ $6$ $0.17$ $*$ Xgwm 2827AL48pGA7 $0.47$ $170-224$ $8.7$ $16$ $0.38$ $***$ Xgwm 332 $a$ 7AL48pGA $5$ $0.44$ $206-240$ $7.7$ $15$ $0.35$ $***$	Xgwm 408 Xgwm 450	SBL	/4 67	C D	CA/IA GA	4	0.52	149-183	11.5	28	0.22 ***
Xgwm 570 $GAL$ $51$ $C$ $CHAT$ $53$ $6.57$ $104-147$ $10.6$ $57$ $6.12$ $11$ $Xgwm$ 578 $GBS$ $50$ $p$ $GA$ $5$ $0.54$ $185-203$ $4.5$ $8$ $0.11$ $ns$ $Xgwm$ 518 $GBS$ $34$ $p$ $CA$ $5$ $0.66$ $150-162$ $3.0$ $4$ $0.38$ $***$ $Xgwm$ 88 $GBS$ $7$ $c$ $CT/CA$ $4$ $0.64$ $167-179$ $4.0$ $8$ $0.50$ $***$ $Xgwm$ 88 $GBS$ $3$ $c$ $GT/GA$ $8$ $0.77$ $130-152$ $3.1$ $6$ $0.51$ $***$ $Xgwm$ 680 $GBS$ $0$ $c$ $GT/GA$ $4$ $0.65$ $128-140$ $4.0$ $8$ $0.48$ $***$ $Xgwm$ 60 $7AS$ $52$ $p$ $CA$ $5$ $0.62$ $188-220$ $8.0$ $18$ $0.27$ $***$ $Xgwm$ 60 $7AS$ $52$ $p$ $CA$ $4$ $0.50$ $179-191$ $4.0$ $6$ $0.17$ $*$ $Xgwm$ 773-7A $7AS$ $21$ $p$ $CA$ $4$ $0.50$ $179-191$ $4.0$ $6$ $0.17$ $*$ $Xgwm$ 282 $7AL$ $48$ $p$ $GA$ $7$ $0.47$ $170-224$ $8.7$ $16$ $0.38$ $***$ $Xgwm$ 332 $a$ $7AL$ $48$ $p$ $GA$ $5$ $0.44$ $206-240$ $7.7$ $15$ $0.35$ $***$ $Xgwm$ 332 $a$ $7AL$	Xawm 570	6AI	31	P	CT/GT	5	0.04	$104 \ 147$	10.8	20	0.24 ns
Xgwm 103 $GRL$ $30$ $p$ $GR$ $3$ $GRL$ $30$ $105$	Xown 169	6AL	50	n	GA	5	0.57	185_203	4 5	8	0.12 ns
$X_{gwm}$ $I_{93}$ $GBS$ $7$ $c$ $CT/CA$ $4$ $0.64$ $167-179$ $4.0$ $8$ $0.50$ *** $X_{gwm}$ $88$ $GBS$ $3$ $c$ $GT/GA$ $8$ $0.77$ $130-152$ $3.1$ $6$ $0.51$ *** $X_{gwm}$ $680$ $GBS$ $0$ $c$ $GT/GA$ $4$ $0.64$ $167-179$ $4.0$ $8$ $0.50$ *** $X_{gwm}$ $680$ $GBS$ $0$ $c$ $GT/GA$ $4$ $0.65$ $128-140$ $4.0$ $8$ $0.48$ *** $X_{gwm}$ $219$ $GBL$ $40$ $i$ $GA$ $6$ $0.69$ $154-188$ $6.0$ $10$ $0.26$ *** $X_{gwm}$ $273$ $7A$ $7AS$ $21$ $p$ $CA$ $4$ $0.50$ $179-191$ $4.0$ $6$ $0.17$ * $X_{gwm}$ $573$ - $7A$ $7AS$ $21$ $p$ $CA$ $4$ $0.50$ $179-191$ $4.0$ $6$ $0.17$ * $X_{gwm}$ $276$ $7AL$ $28$ $p$ $CT$ $8$ $0.62$ $101-135$ $4.9$ $10$ $0.17$ * $X_{gwm}$ $322$ $7AL$ $48$ $p$ $GA$ $7$ $0.47$ $170-224$ $8.7$ $16$ $0.38$ *** $X_{gwm}$ $332$ $a$ $7AL$ $48$ $p$ $GA$ $5$ $0.44$ $206-240$ $7.7$ $15$ $0.35$ *** $X_{gwm}$ $332$ $a$ $7AL$ $48$ $p$ <t< td=""><td>Xgwm 518</td><td>6BS</td><td>34</td><td>p D</td><td>CA</td><td>5</td><td>0.66</td><td>150-162</td><td>3.0</td><td>4</td><td>0.38 ***</td></t<>	Xgwm 518	6BS	34	p D	CA	5	0.66	150-162	3.0	4	0.38 ***
Xgwm 886BS3cGT/GA80.77130-1523.160.51 *** $Xgwm 680$ 6BS0cGT/GA40.65128-1404.080.48 *** $Xgwm 219$ 6BL40iGA60.69154-1886.0100.26 *** $Xgwm 60$ 7AS52pCA50.62188-2208.0180.27 *** $Xgwm 573-7A$ 7AS21pCA40.50179-1914.060.17 * $Xgwm 276$ 7AL28pCT80.62101-1354.9100.17 * $Xgwm 332$ 7AL48pGA70.47170-2248.7160.38 *** $Xgwm 332$ 7AL48pGA50.44206-2407.7150.35 *** $Xgwm 332$ $A$ 7AL48pGA30.13188-1985080.29 ***	Xgwm 193	6BS	7	r C	CT/CA	4	0.64	167–179	4.0	8	0.50 ***
Xgwm 6806BS0cGT/GA40.65128-1404.080.48 *** $Xgwm 219$ 6BL40iGA60.69154-1886.0100.26 *** $Xgwm 60$ 7AS52pCA50.62188-2208.0180.27 *** $Xgwm 573-7A$ 7AS21pCA40.50179-1914.060.17 * $Xgwm 276$ 7AL28pCT80.62101-1354.9100.17 * $Xgwm 282$ 7AL48pGA70.47170-2248.7160.38 *** $Xgwm 332$ 7AL48pGA50.44206-2407.7150.35 *** $Xgwm 332$ $Xgum 332$ $Xgum$	Xgwm 88	6BS	3	с	GT/GA	8	0.77	130-152	3.1	6	0.51 ***
Xgwm 2196BL40iGA6 $0.69$ $154-188$ $6.0$ $10$ $0.26$ $***$ Xgwm 607AS52pCA5 $0.62$ $188-220$ $8.0$ $18$ $0.27$ $***$ Xgwm 573-7A7AS21pCA4 $0.50$ $179-191$ $4.0$ 6 $0.17$ $*$ Xgwm 2767AL28pCT8 $0.62$ $101-135$ $4.9$ $10$ $0.17$ $*$ Xgwm 2827AL48pGA7 $0.47$ $170-224$ $8.7$ $16$ $0.38$ $***$ Xgwm 332 a7AL48pGA5 $0.44$ $206-240$ $7.7$ $15$ $0.35$ $***$ Xgwm 332 b7AL48pGA3 $0.13$ $188-198$ $5.0$ $8$ $0.29$ $***$	Xgwm 680	6BS	0	c	GT/GA	4	0.65	128-140	4.0	8	0.48 ***
Xgwm 60       7AS       52       p       CA       5       0.62       188-220       8.0       18       0.27 ***         Xgwm 573-7A       7AS       21       p       CA       4       0.50       179-191       4.0       6       0.17 *         Xgwm 276       7AL       28       p       CT       8       0.62       101-135       4.9       10       0.17 *         Xgwm 282       7AL       48       p       GA       7       0.47       170-224       8.7       16       0.38 ***         Xgwm 332 a       7AL       48       p       GA       5       0.44       206-240       7.7       15       0.35 ***         Xgwm 332 b       7AL       48       p       GA       3       0.13       188-198       5.0       8       0.29 ***	Xgwm 219	6BL	40	i	GA	6	0.69	154–188	6.0	10	0.26 ***
Xgwm 5/3-/A       7AS       21       p       CA       4       0.50       179-191       4.0       6       0.17 *         Xgwm 276       7AL       28       p       CT       8       0.62       101-135       4.9       10       0.17 *         Xgwm 282       7AL       48       p       GA       7       0.47       170-224       8.7       16       0.38 ***         Xgwm 332 a       7AL       48       p       GA       5       0.44       206-240       7.7       15       0.35 ***         Xgwm 332 b       7AL       48       p       GA       3       0.13       188-198       5.0       8       0.29 ***	Xgwm 60	7AS	52	р	CA	5	0.62	188-220	8.0	18	0.27 ***
Agwm 2/0       /AL       28       p       C1       8       0.62       101–135       4.9       10       0.17*         Xgwm 282       7AL       48       p       GA       7       0.47       170–224       8.7       16       0.38 ***         Xgwm 332 a       7AL       48       p       GA       5       0.44       206–240       7.7       15       0.35 ***         Xgwm 332 b       7AL       48       p       GA       3       0.13       188–198       5.0       8       0.29 ***	Xgwm 573-7A	7AS	21	р	CA	4	0.50	179–191	4.0	6	0.17 *
Agwm 202       / AL       48       p       GA       /       0.4/       1/0-224       8./       16       0.38 ***         Xgwm 332 a       7AL       48       p       GA       5       0.44       206-240       7.7       15       0.35 ***         Xgwm 332 b       7AL       48       p       GA       3       0.13       188-198       5.0       8       0.29 ***	Xgwm 276	/AL	28	p		87	0.62	101-135	4.9	10	U.1/*
Agwin 332 $\mu$ TAL       40       p       OA       5 $0.44$ $200-240$ $7.7$ 15 $0.55$ Xgwm 332 $\mu$ TAL       48       p       GA       3 $0.13$ $188-198$ $5.0$ $8$ $0.29$ ***	Agwm 282	/AL 7AI	48 48	p	GA	1 5	0.47	170-224	8./ 77	10	0.38 ***
	Xgwm 332 h	7AL	48	р Р	GA	3	0.13	188-198	5.0	8	0.29 ***

SSR loci	Map position <sup>a</sup>	Distance from centromere	Repeat class <sup>b</sup>	Motif	Allele number	DI	Allele size range	Allele s differer	size nces	Correlation coefficient <sup>c</sup>
	Chrom.	cM			n		bp	Mean	Max.	
Xgwm 537	7BS	43	с	CA/TA	7	0.71	203-223	2.7	4	0.26 ***
Xgwm 573-7B	7BS	33	р	CA	4	0.68	218-224	2.0	2	0.32 ***
Xgwm 46	7BS	18	i	GA	8	0.58	171-189	2.6	4	0.39 ***
Xgwm 297	7BS	5	с	GT/GA	5	0.49	164-174	3.0	4	0.27 ***
Xgwm 302	7BL	23	р	GA	12	0.77	220-380	13.3	40	0.41 ***
Xgwm 577	7BL	105	c	CA/TA	8	0.74	136-222	12.3	38	0.44 ***
Xgwm 611 a	7BL	114	i	GA	10	0.80	150-180	3.3	8	0.33 ***
Xgwm 611 b	7BL	114	i	GA	5	0.64	142-158	4.0	8	0.44 ***

<sup>a</sup> Map position of SSR loci is as reported in Röder et al. 1998, except for *Xgwm 619* (Korzun et al. 1999) and *Xgwm 332-b* and *Xgwm 611-b* (Peng et al. 2000)

<sup>b</sup> p: perfect repeats, c: compound repeats, i: imperfect repeats, as indicated by Röder et al. (1998) for Chinese Spring bread wheat <sup>c</sup> Correlation coefficients computed between the similarity matrix based on each microsatellite locus and the similarity matrix based on all the 70 loci analysed

\*, \*\*, \*\*\*: significant at P 0.05, P 0.01 and P 0.001, respectively; ns: not significant

**Fig. 1** Scatterplot of diversity index (DI) values as a function of allele number for the 70 SSR loci analysed across the 58 durum wheat accessions. Mean and maximum theoretical DI values have also been plotted



similar mutational and evolutionary features (Murray 1996), data from these two repeat classes were pooled and compared with polymorphism features of perfect repeats. No significant differences were found between simpleperfect and irregular repeats (t test) as to the mean number of alleles per locus (5.7 and 5.6, respectively) and mean DI values (0.54 and 0.59, respectively). However, the two main classes differed as to their variances in diversity values: variances in allele number per locus and DI values were lower within irregular repeats than within simpleperfect repeats (variances equal to 4.11 and 6.47, P =0.11, F test, for the number of alleles per locus and 0.022 and 0.042, P = 0.035, for DI values, respectively). In particular, most of the SSR loci with a low polymorphism content (i.e. with two to three alleles) were found among the simple-perfect repeat loci. Among irregular repeats, compound repeats (17 loci) showed the lowest variances for polymorphism indices (i.e. 3.62 for the number of alleles per locus and 0.014 for DI values).

Simple-perfect, imperfect and compound repeats did not differ significantly (*F* test) as to the allele-size variation within the locus (mean values equal to 5.3, 6.0 and 6.0 bp, respectively). Simple-perfect repeats included 25 GA, 14 CA and 1 TA repeats. GA and CA groups showed a fairly similar mean number of alleles per locus (6.1 and 5.0, respectively; P = 0.06, *t* test) and DI values (0.51 and 0.58, respectively; P = 0.14); however, GA repeats, as compared to CA repeats, showed a notably higher variance for number of alleles (9.24 as compared to 1.54, respectively) and for DI values (0.049 and 0.028, respectively).

As compared to the 33 dinucleotide SSRs of the A genome, the 36 SSRs mapping in the B genome had a higher mean number of alleles (5.2 and 6.1, respectively; P = 0.05, t test) and a significantly higher mean DI value (0.50 and 0.61, respectively; P = 0.01, t test).

In order to assess whether the chromosome position affected the polymorphism level, the 69 dinucleotide repeats were assigned to two groups according to their distance from the centromere (see Dvorák et al. 1998) and were compared for polymorphisms. The 18 proximal loci (with distance from centromere  $\leq 10$  cM) had a slightly lower mean polymorphism content, yet not significantly different than that of the 51 distal loci (mean number of alleles: 5.1 vs 5.9, P = 0.10, and mean DI value: 0.51 vs 0.58, P = 0.13, t test, respectively). Correlation values between the distance of loci from the centromere and the polymorphism level were low (r values equal to 0.07 and 0.13 as to the number of alleles and DI values, respectively), and correlations did not improve even considering the relative distance from the centromere.

#### Assessment of genetic similarities by SSR loci

Genetic similarity (GS) estimates of all possible (1,653) pairs of accessions ranged from 0.15 (Russello SG7 vs Aconchi 89) to 1.0 (Vitron vs Vitromax), with a mean value of 0.44. GS estimates for the B genome data (mean GS = 0.38) were notably lower than those obtained with the A genome data (mean GS = 0.49).

Coefficients of correlation between the similarity matrices generated by each locus and the reference matrix obtained from all marker data ranged from 0.00 to 0.51, with a mean of 0.30 (Table 2). Some loci (e.g. Xgwm193, Xgwm268 and Xgwm619) with a mean number of alleles ranging from four to five were characterized by correlation values with the reference matrix (r = 0.48– 0.50) higher than those (r = 0.23 - 0.34) of other loci (e.g. Xgwm136, Xgwm213 and Xgwm247) that ranked at the top for allelic richness (up to 11 alleles/SSR). A core set of 20 highly informative WMS primer combinations (amplifying 23 high quality Xgwm loci evenly distributed on the wheat map) has been selected among those tested (Table 2). The genetic diversity values obtained with this core-set of markers showed a correlation value with the genetic diversities obtained from all loci equal to 0.91.

## Rare- and founder-allele distribution: contribution of founders to the genetic diversity of modern varieties

GS values among a group of key-genotypes (the old Mediterranean accessions Russello SG7, Saragolla and Inrat 69, and the group of ten founders) are reported in Table 3. Russello SG7, Saragolla and Inrat 69 showed the lowest levels of similarity when compared with all the ten important founders of the modern gene pool. Russello SG7 had a genetic profile clearly different from those of the ten founders (GS values ranging from 0.16 to 0.28),

<b>Table 3</b> C (45 cvs) ar	contribution of SSR-ba	n of found sed geneti	ler genoty c similari	ypes to the ity (GSij)	elite durum values amon	n germplasm ig three acce	herein an ssions (co	lalysed 9- olumns ha	-17). Mean ( ive been rep	<b>3S</b> values oorted	(column 1	8) of each	founder §	genotypes v	s all the 4	5 elite cul	tivars
Founder	Year of release	Novel alleles <sup>a</sup> No.	Genetic accounts foundati genotype	variation ed for by on es	Russello SG7	Saragolla	Inrat 69	Cappelli	Capeiti 8	Appulo	Valnova	Valforte	Creso	Mexicali 75	Karim	Latino	Mean GS
			$q_{c}^{b}$	o%c													
Cappelli	1915	72	41.5	44.1	0.28	0.55	0.49										0.42
Capeiti 8	1940	33	11.2	25.4	0.25	0.41	0.43	0.54									0.38
Appulo	1964	6	1.1	10.9	0.24	0.38	0.41	0.56	0.75								0.35
Valnova	1975	29	15.2	42.5	0.22	0.37	0.30	0.55	0.40	0.45							0.51
Valforte	1980				0.22	0.37	0.33	0.56	0.43	0.47	0.92						
Creso	1974	23	7.7	22.9	0.25	0.33	0.33	0.46	0.41	0.36	0.38	0.39					0.45
Mexicali 75	1975	14	5.0	24.9	0.16	0.31	0.25	0.40	0.32	0.38	0.62	0.65	0.41				0.50
Karim	1983	21	7.6	26.7	0.20	0.22	0.29	0.35	0.30	0.21	0.38	0.41	0.51	0.49			0.49
Latino	1982				0.24	0.25	0.30	0.33	0.24	0.23	0.31	0.34	0.46	0.39	0.85		
Altar 84	1984	14	2.5	12.2	0.16	0.27	0.23	0.31	0.24	0.21	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.56	0.44	0.44	0.46
Total		215	91.8	209.6													
<sup>a</sup> Number c	of novel all	eles first i	ntroduce	d in the ge	rmplasm by	each founde	r; alleles d	contributed	by Valnova	and Valfo	rte and by	Karim and	Latino h	ave been po	oled, resp	ectively, e	due to
the high g	enetic sim	ilarities of	f these ge	notypes										I	I		
Calculate	d over all			IVesugaled													
<sup>c</sup> Calculate	d over the	specific l	loci carry	ring the ne	vel alleles												

while Saragolla and Inrat 69 showed moderate similarity only with the oldest Mediterranean founder Cappelli (GS values of 0.55 and 0.49, respectively). Among founders, Cappelli showed moderate similarities as to all the other founders subsequently introduced (GS ranging from 0.31 to 0.56). In contrast, Capeiti 8 and Appulo founders showed similarities with the recently released modern founders (i.e. Mexicali 75, Karim-Latino and Altar 84, with values ranging from 0.21 to 0.38) lower than those observed for Cappelli (from 0.31 to 0.40).

The recent founders (Valnova-Valforte, Creso, Mexicali 75, Karim-Latino and Altar 84) were moderately related (mean GS = 0.45). As expected from pedigree information, Valnova and Valforte, selected within the same breeding program, were very similar to each other (GS = 0.92). In keeping with the pedigree information, a clear genetic relationship was also detected between Valnova-Valforte and Mexicali 75 (mean GS = 0.63). The first important founders characterised by the modern plant type, i.e. Valnova-Valforte and Creso, were only moderately related (mean GS = 0.36), while medium levels of similarity were observed among the more recently released CIMMYT founders (Mexicali 75, Karim and Altar 84), with similarities ranging from 0.44 (Karim-Altar 84) to 0.49 (Karim-Mexicali 75).

Out of the 394 different alleles detected in the 58 accessions, 168 alleles (43% of the total) were classified as rare alleles, due to their low frequency across accessions (i.e. <5%, Russell et al. 2000). Rare alleles were found across all chromosomes (data not reported). Russello SG7, Saragolla and Inrat 69 showed a richness in rare alleles (35, 20 and 19, respectively), differently from Cappelli and Capeiti 8 (with only five and four rare alleles, respectively) that, while belonging to the same Mediterranean germplasm pool of Saragolla and Inrat 69, are instead recognized as important "founder-genotypes" of the modern gene pool herein analysed.

After excluding the three landrace-derived accessions, which did not contribute notably to the foundation of the modern elite germplasm, a total of 342 different alleles were detected, 112 of which (32.4%) were classified as rare. The ten founders contributed a total of 215 alleles (62.8%), with only 21 considered as rare alleles, and 92.7% of the total molecular variation detected in the 45 modern cvs traced back to these alleles. A large portion (41.5%) of the molecular variation detected among the 45 modern cvs can be traced back to alleles present in the oldest founder (true ancestor) Cappelli (Table 3). In the modern germplasm, these Cappelli-like alleles were detected throughout the A and B genomes at most of the loci analysed. The 33 alleles differentiating Capeiti 8 (Cappelli/Eiti) from Cappelli accounted for 11.2% of the total genetic variation among modern varieties.

When considering specific alleles possibly introduced in the modern germplasm for the first time by each of the relevant founders, the highest contribution to the total genetic variation present in the modern germplasm can be attributed to Cappelli (see Table 3), which is also the oldest among the founders considered in this study. This

notwithstanding, important more recent founders such as Valnova-Valforte and Karim-Latino showed mean GS values with modern cvs (GS = 0.51 and 0.49, respectively) higher than that detected for Cappelli (GS = 0.42). The level of diffusion in the modern germplasm of the novel alleles contributed by these outstanding varieties was comparable to that of the Cappelli-like alleles (Table 3).

## Principal coordinate analyses

Genetic relationships among the 58 accessions were investigated by means of principal coordinate analysis (PcoA; Fig. 2). The first (PCo1) and second (PCo2) principal coordinates accounted for 16.0 and 9.2% of the total variation, respectively, while the third coordinate (data not shown) accounted for a further 6.9% of the variation, bringing the total explained variation up to 32.3%.

Based on the known pedigree information, five main groups of genotypes can be identified in the diagram, highlighted by encircling the most diverse genotypes within each of the five main groups. Group 1 includes genotypes all related to the old germplasm from the Mediterranean basin, mainly northern Africa and southern Italy. This group was positioned in the lower right corner of quadrant IV showing a restricted and scarcely overlapping nature of diversity as regards to the majority of the modern cvs. Mean genetic similarity values pointed out that Saragolla, Inrat 69 and particularly Russello SG7 were the most diverse accessions (mean GS of Russello SG7 with the other 57 cvs = 0.22).

PCo1 revealed a clear differentiation of the more recent CIMMYT-derived cvs (subgroups 2C and 2D), clustered on the left side of the diagram, from the gene pools positioned on the right side of the diagram, i.e. the old Mediterranean accessions (group 1) and the subgroups of cultivars related to the former CIMMYT-derived founders, namely Valnova-Valforte and Creso (subgroup 2A and 2B, respectively).

PCo2 effectively separated cvs of group 1 (quadrant IV) from the two closely related founders Valnova-Valforte, positioned in quadrant III together with some derived cvs (Mexicali 75 and Grazia). An important group of modern successful varieties (Fortore, Gargano, Ofanto, Platani and Simeto) well-adapted to Southern Italy are positioned between the parents Valnova-Valforte and Capeiti 8-Appulo, respectively, while being classified closer to the former ones. PCo2 effectively separated Creso from the Valnova-Valforte founders and the related groups.

The results of PCoA indicate that, among groups of modern cvs, the most notable variation pertains to the group of varieties somehow related to the "Val"-founders. Cvs of subgroups 2C and 2D, identified by the corresponding outstanding CIMMYT-related materials Karim-Latino (JO/AA//FG derived cvs) and Altar 84, overlapped in a restricted diversity area in the middle-left portion of the diagram. The two breeding lineages are clearly

Fig. 2 Associations among the 58 durum wheat accessions as revealed by principal coordinate analysis. Principal coordinate 1 and 2 have been depicted. Convex hulls were drawn around the most diverse cultivars related to each of five main breeding groups or gene pools. Group 1: the old Mediterranean germplasm; group 2A: Valnova-Valforte related cvs; group 2B: Creso-related cvs; group 2C: "JO/AA//FG"-related cvs; group 2D: Altar 84-related cvs; group 2E: US-related cvs. The thick line encircles the most diverse of the ten foundationgenotypes



distinguished only by PCo3. The small subgroup 2E includes Italian (Ionio and Zenit) and French (Neodur) cvs having a common origin, tracing back to the North Dakota germplasm (cvs Edmore and Vic). The main founders were generally positioned near to the borders of the diagram, thus accounting for a large portion of the total variation, while a number of modern varieties of mixed origin were spread across the centre of the diagram.

## Discussion

#### Variability of SSR loci

The 69 selected dinucleotide Xgwm loci with an additional trinucleotide locus (*Taglut*) provide an effective "genotyping set" (Macaulay et al. 2001) due to their high quality, informativeness and genome coverage. The mean number of allelic variants per locus (5.63), the mean DI value (0.56) and the average  $GS_{ij}$  among accessions (0.44) indicate a level of diversity similar to that reported by SSR-based studies in other small grain cereals, in particular bread wheat. In fact, in the European elite bread wheat germplasm assessed for variation at *Xgwm* loci, Plaschke et al. (1995) and Stachel et al. (2000) found from 5.2 to 6.2 alleles and genetic similarities of approximately 0.40, analysing different gene pools. Manifesto et al. (2001) profiled Argentine elite bread wheat cvs with ten SSRs selected for high polymorphism and observed a variation in allele number and DI per locus similar to that revealed in the durum accessions of our study, while in a large pool of elite European bread wheat cvs (500 cvs), recently analysed with SSRs, the average number of alleles per locus resulted in 10.5 (Röder et al. 2002).

The potential of SSRs for detecting polymorphism in *Triticum* was clearly shown by Huang et al. (2002), who detected 18.1 allelic variants per SSR locus among bread wheat accessions from the Gatersleben germplasm collection.

In durum wheat, a genetic diversity study in cultivated materials was reported by Sorrells et al. (1995) and by Autrique et al. (1996), who used RFLPs (restriction fragment length polymorphisms) to analyse a collection of 113 accessions including landraces and advanced materials (mainly from the CIMMYT/ICARDA breeding program). In these studies, RFLPs detected an average of 4.3 variants per probe and classified most of the improved materials in a unique subcluster separated from the majority of the landrace accessions; improved materials were also characterised by a relatively low diversity level (mean Nei's genetic diversity equal to 0.21). Only recently, SSRs have been exploited to investigate genetic relationships in cultivated durum wheat: Dograr et al. (2000), using seven dinucleotide SSRs, identified from

five to 13 different alleles per locus and an overall mean DI of 0.76 across Turkish cvs, while Eujail et al. (2002) reported a mean of 5.5 alleles per locus with 11 *Xgwm* loci used to screen 64 durum accessions with a broad genetic basis (including landraces, varieties and breeding lines, mainly chosen among those previously analysed by Autrique et al. 1996).

As compared to results reported with durum landraces and/or populations of wild emmer wheat *Triticum dicoccoides* Korn, our as well as other studies evidenced a lower genetic diversity in cultivated tetraploid wheats. In fact, in a sample of Ethiopian tetraploid wheats (26 *Triticum durum* and *T. turgidum* landraces), 12 *Xgwm* loci revealed 7.9 alleles per locus (Messele 2001), while Fahima et al. (2002) reported a mean of 18 allelic variants per locus in wild emmer wheat populations profiled with 20 *Xgwm* loci.

The correspondence between the level of diversity observed in our survey and in the study of Eujail et al. (2002), as revealed by the analysis of the results from the seven Xgwm loci common to both studies (the correlation values calculated for the number of alleles and for the DI values were equal to 0.64 and 0.57, disregarding the contrasting results observed for the Xgwm169 locus) is most likely due to the relatedness of the modern durum wheat materials assayed in both studies. A moderate correlation (r = 0.56) was also found over 11 common Xgwm loci between the number of alleles detected in our study, mainly including modern varieties, and that reported by Messele et al. (2001) in Ethiopian durum landraces. These results indicate that the polymorphism level of microsatellite loci is rather stable across different durum wheat gene pools. Loci with a relatively high polymorphism (more than 5-6 allelic variants) in this study should thus be considered as valuable and informative marker loci, suitable for further molecular studies targeting the durum wheat germplasm.

Dinucleotide repeats with a low number of allelic variants and/or a low relative DI value could possibly mark chromosome regions where selection for agronomically valuable alleles reduced the genetic diversity. Chromosome regions characterised by a low variation at neutral loci were also observed in similar SSR-based surveys in barley (Russell et al. 2000) and wheat (Stachel et al. 2000; Huang et al. 2002). In our study, the relatively high frequency of microsatellites with a lower than expected genetic diversity due to their high allelic imbalance could be attributed to the presumably high linkage disequilibrium level typical of the elite modern gene pool, particularly in self-pollinating species like durum wheat (Nordborg et al. 2002). Moreover, recent database analyses on the abundance and relative distribution of microsatellite loci, carried out on different plant species including rice, maize and wheat (Morgante et al. 2002), pointed out that even dinucleotide repeats show a significant association with the non-repetitive, gene-rich DNA fraction of plant genomes and are especially frequent in the regulatory untranslated portions of the transcribed regions of the genome (5' and 3' UTRs). Most

of the Xgwm loci have been obtained from the hypomethylated, gene-rich portion of the wheat genome (Röder et al. 1998); Morgante et al. (2002), in their extensive database evaluation, reported that GA/CA repeats, similar to those used in this survey, were found at higher frequencies in EST regions as compared to genomic regions. It should be possible to obtain further insights on the human-driven evolution of the durum wheat germplasm by profiling with such SSRs a wider range of historical ancestor-genotypes, in a retrospective genetic diversity analysis. The molecular characterisation of the main durum wheat cultivars, landraces, ancestor genotypes and also accessions which did not significantly contribute to the foundation of the modern germplasm with the less variable SSRs found in this study should allow for the comparison of the gene-diversity values and allelic frequencies among different gene pools that presumably underwent different selection pressures. This approach is currently being explored in maize, barley and wheat in projects aiming at the molecular and phenotypic characterization of wide germplasm collections (Russell et al. 2000; Vigouroux et al. 2002). Some interesting examples of microsatellite loci with marked differences in polymorphism content when assessed in different durum wheat gene pools were identified comparing our results with those of Eujail et al. (2002; e.g. the Xgwm 169 locus) and Messele (2001, e.g. Xgwm357).

#### Features of dinucleotide repeats

As microsatellite loci are characterised by peculiar mutation mechanisms (Goldstein and Schlötterer 1999; Chambers and MacAvoy 2000), a better knowledge about their mutation pattern and rate would be valuable for data analysis and interpretation. A concern about using SSRs in diversity analyses relates to the possible occurrence of allelic homoplasy (i.e. alleles with similar size but originated by different mutation events), a phenomenon leading to misinterpretations and/or overestimations of relatedness. The frequency of homoplasy is expected to be higher for microsatellite markers than for other marker classes (Murray 1996). The highly polymorphic dinucleotide repeats have shown a complex mutation process that varies greatly among loci (Macaubas et al. 1997; Colson and Goldstein 1999; Barrier et al. 2000) and that cannot exclusively be ascribed to polymerase slippage events, considered as the major factors responsible for allelic homoplasy (Murray 1996; Estoup and Cornuet 1999). In order to limit the possible bias due to homoplasy, we have focused on dinucleotide repeat loci rather than trinucleotide loci: in fact, the molecular variation revealed by trinucleotide SSRs, as compared to dinucleotides, is usually lower (Cho et al. 2000; Scott et al. 2000) and more strictly adherent to the step-wise mutation model (Murray 1996). Trinucleotides were thus considered to be less suited to perform a genetic diversity study in a set of related accessions such are those herein considered.

Recent genetic diversity and phylogenetic analyses in maize based on SSRs revealed their complex mutation patterns using genetic distances based on the proportion of shared alleles rather than measures of genetic distance related to the stepwise assumption (Matsuoka et al. 2002a, b). Allele size information (such as the variation of allele size differences among alleles within a locus) highlights the level of complexity of the mutational processes at the microsatellite locus. A number of loci tested in our survey were characterised by a high-allele size variation and our results agree with those of Huang et al. (2002) in bread wheat. These SSRs possibly identify loci where mutational mechanisms other than replication slippage in the core repeat may have occurred, or loci with a high mutation rate. Thus, dinucleotide loci with a relatively high allele size variation should be preferentially considered in order to minimize the occurrence of homoplasy events (Murray 1996); however, the use of dinucleotides with high-allele size variations requires high accuracy in the molecular analysis.

#### Polymorphism level as related to chromosome location

An overall reduction in polymorphism is expected in the low recombining, pericentromeric regions, especially in self-fertilizing species and even more so in elite modern materials which have experienced strong foundation effects and have undergone repeated cycles of selection. Dvorák et al. (1998) profiled six Aegilops species with RFLPs in order to study the relation between map position, recombination rates and gene diversity: they observed a significant correlation between the gene diversity and the coefficient of exchange (an estimate of the local recombination rate), particularly in pericentromeric loci within 10 cM from the centromeres, which showed low recombination levels and diversity values. Our results, using microsatellite loci, do not support this finding and are more in line with the report of Ramsay et al. (2000) with SSRs in barley. These authors suggested that the relatively high mutation rate of SSRs might have counterbalanced the reduction of neutral variation due to selection effects occurring on the pericentromeric regions with lower recombination levels. No obvious reduction of diversity in these regions was also observed by Tenaillon et al. (2001) in maize. However, as underlined by Dvorák et al. (1998) and by Tenaillon et al. (2001), the recombination rate along chromosomes is highly variable and difficult to be precisely determined in cereals, particularly in wheat (Gill et al. 1996a, b).

# *Polymorphism level of the different dinucleotide repeat classes*

In this study, the set of dinucleotide repeats sampled covered all the three main microsatellite classes, namely simple-perfect, compound and imperfect repeats, with relative proportions of each class similar to those previously reported by Röder et al. (1998) for a large set of these dinucleotide repeats. According to such findings, simple-perfect repeats were more frequently assayed in the A genome, compound repeats were preferentially represented in the B genome, while imperfect repeats were more uniformly distributed among genomes. Among simple-perfect repeats, GA motifs were preferentially chosen over CA motifs, in keeping with the observations reported in wheat and maize (Ma et al. 1996; Röder et al. 1998; Morgante et al. 2002). Although our results did not show significant differences in the average polymorphism among the three classes, compound and imperfect repeats appear as more valuable markers, because of their lower variance in allele number and DI value (especially compound repeats). In fact, the preferential use of compound and imperfect repeats should reduce the risks of sampling loci characterised by a low average number of repeats (short microsatellites) which in general correlates with low diversity levels. However, it should be noted that the compound repeats used herein were mostly from the B genome (Röder et al. 1998).

Contrasting results have been reported on the variability of complex, irregular repeats, which are expected to show a higher portion of invariant markers and a lower mean mutation rate and polymorphism as a consequence of the stabilizing effect of the array interruptions (Taylor et al. 1999). However, Colson and Goldstein (1999) reported different results. Notably, among the 12 imperfect loci assayed herein, a rather low level of diversity was only detected for Xgwm415, while among the 17 compound dinucleotides only two loci showed a number of alleles lower than four. Guyomarc'h et al. (2002), characterising bread wheat cvs with a recently developed set of D-genome specific dinucleotide SSRs, did not find significant differences between compound and simple microsatellites as to their mean polymorphism level, and even the presence of interruptions within the core-repeats did not negatively affect the polymorphism level. Among perfect repeats, the CA group appeared to be characterised by an overall more uniform level of polymorphism than the GA group; in this case, no interference effects should be attributed to the genome, since the two groups were homogeneously distributed across the A and B genomes. Among perfect repeats, CA motifs thus seem to be the best choice for diversity analyses, at least in the set of germplasm herein analysed.

## Polymorphism level of the A and B genomes

The higher values of genetic diversity obtained with the SSRs mapping to the B genome reflect the higher polymorphism level of these loci as compared to those on the A genome. A higher polymorphism level of the B genome was already detected in wheat, as indicated by the higher than average number of RFLP, AFLP and SSR markers mapping in the B genome (Marino et al. 1996; Röder et al. 1998; Lotti et al. 2000; Nachit et al. 2001). Peng et al. (2000) in a high-resolution *T. durum*  $\times$  *T.* 

dicoccoides map found that the B genome chromosomes had a significantly higher density of AFLP polymorphisms as compared to the A genome. A number of cytogenetic and molecular investigations pointed out that the B genome is the most differentiated and divergent from the ancestral donors among the three wheat genomes (Zohary and Feldman 1962; Blake et al. 1999; Huang et al. 2002; Zhang et al. 2002). In a survey for RFLP polymorphisms across six *Aegilops* species, Dvorák et al. (1998) found the lowest allele frequency and the highest gene diversity in the cross-fertilizing Aegilops speltoides (the most-likely donor of the wheat B genome, among the Sitopsis species). This could account for the higher diversity content of the B genome as compared to the A genome, especially in terms of mean DI value, rather than of the mean number of alleles. Also, the B genome chromosomes appear to be relatively rich, as compared to the A genome ones, in various classes of repetitive DNA, particularly microsatellites (Gerlach and Peacock 1980; Cuadrado and Schwarzacher 1998). Stachel et al. (2000) and Huang et al. (2002), in similar surveys of Xgwm dinucleotide loci on bread wheat, did not show marked differences in the overall genetic diversity of the A and B genomes; however, as compared to our study, a lower number of loci (28 and 24 respectively) was assayed in the former studies.

Patterns of molecular variation among the elite durum wheat germplasm

In general, the hierarchical subdivision of the germplasm herein analysed with SSRs agreed with the pedigree information. The comparison of the profiles of Russello SG7, Saragolla and Inrat 69, the three old accessions representative of the native Mediterranean germplasm, with those of the 45 modern cvs does not support an appreciable inheritance of the allele signatures found in the ancient germplasm locally cultivated before the introduction of modern breeding practices. However, such germplasm should be considered as a valuable source for recovering potentially valuable genetic diversity, in particular for grain quality and tolerance to biotic and abiotic stresses.

The reduction of the genetic diversity which occurred at the foundation of the modern gene pool is evident from the observation that as few as two important ancestors (namely Cappelli and Eiti), directly derived from landraces of different origin (Bozzini et al. 1998), accounted for a relevant portion of the total diversity present in the subsequent founders and in the modern germplasm. Within the main breeding groups identified by the CIMMYT-derived founders, molecular similarities higher than those expected from co-ancestries were observed between each of the main recent founders and the corresponding modern derived cvs, as in the cases of the founders Valnova-Valforte, Creso, Latino-Karim and Altar 84. These results could possibly be ascribed to high selection pressures coupled with the adoption of breeding schemes (e.g. the pedigree method) that do not allow for extensive recombination, as suggested by a similar study in barley (Graner et al. 1994). Selection will reduce the correlation between molecular and pedigree-based estimates (Lynch 1988). Particular marker alleles, contributed by each of the main founders, tagged chromosome regions preferentially selected over time, thus resulting in strong allelic imbalances at the corresponding marker loci and in stratification of the germplasm considered.

The durum wheat germplasm herein analysed appears well-differentiated and structured in a few, well-identified, main breeding groups. In particular, molecular, pedigree and published data regarding breeding and statistics of durum wheat in Italy pointed out the relative narrow genetic basis of materials cultivated in Italy during the first "breeding era" (until the mid-'70s), which was dominated by a few genotypes of Mediterranean origin with superior quality and adaptive characteristics over the mostly diverse local populations. In the following decades, the cultivated pool was enriched by a continuous flow of new and genetically diverse innovative materials (to a large extent different from the native and locally adapted Mediterranean germplasm), which broadened the genetic bases of the elite gene pool, as effectively shown by PCoA.

## Conclusive remarks

The observation that a substantial amount of the total genetic variability present in the modern germplasm could be accounted for by alleles introduced with a limited number of founders is in line with the findings of Autrique et al. (1996), who reported a reduction of the genetic basis of modern durum wheat as compared to the native landrace gene pool locally cultivated. In that study, 85% of the total number of restriction fragments detected among improved varieties traced back to 11 ancestral accessions. In spring barley, 72% of the variation could be traced to alleles found in only 12 old accessions (Russell et al. 2000). Similar results were reported in other studies assessing the cultivated gene pools of barley and maize (Allard 1996, 1999) and were interpreted as the consequences of the purifying selection occurred over breeding cycles.

The modern elite durum germplasm has substantially retained the variability entered by a few outstanding and well-differentiated founders released through breeding cycles. More importantly, our results clearly indicate that the variability has increased over the last two decades. It should also be noticed that this recent broadening is an ongoing process.

Despite the limited amount of genetic variation that could be ascribed to the "rare allelic variants" in the elite gene pool surveyed herein, a noticeable number of different rare alleles were detected (32% of the total number of allelic variants), which indicates that a large number of plant introductions actually contributed to the genetic bases of this germplasm. Similar results were also observed in the SSR-based survey of spring barley cultivated in Northern Europe (Russell et al. 2000).

During the '80s and the '90s, the introduction in the main breeding programs conducted in the Mediterranean countries of new elite and genetically diversified germplasm from CIMMYT and North America led to the release of a new generation of modern varieties adapted to the Mediterranean basin that mark new progresses as to yield potential, yield stability and semolina quality. An association mapping approach exploiting a detailed fingerprinting and phenotyping of the elite germplasm, combined with a retrospective analysis, should lead to the identification of genomic regions valuable as selection targets for agronomically and qualitatively important traits.

Acknowledgements Research was supported by the University of Bologna, Italy, RFO Project. Contribution of the Interdepartmental Centre for Biotechnology, University of Bologna.

#### References

- Allard RW (1996) Genetic basis of the evolution of adaptedness in plants. Euphytica 92:1–11
- Allard RW (1999) History of plant population genetics. Annu Rev Genet 33:1–27
- Autrique E, Nachit MM, Monneveux P, Tanksley SD, Sorrells ME (1996) Genetic diversity in durum wheat based on RFLPs, morphophysiological traits, and coefficient of parentage. Crop Sci 36:735–742
- Blake NK, Lehfeldt BR, Lavin M, Talbert LE (1999) Phylogenetic reconstruction based on low copy DNA sequence data in an allopolyploid: the B genome of wheat. Genome 42:351–360
- Barrett BA, Kidwell KK (1998) AFLP-based genetic diversity assessment among wheat cultivars from the Pacific Northwest. Crop Sci 38:1261–1271
- Barrier M, Friar E, Robichaux R, Purugganan M (2000) Interspecific evolution in plant microsatellite structure. Gene 241:101– 105
- Bozzini A, Corazza L, D'Egidio MG, Di Fonzo N, La Fiandra D, Pogna NE, Poma I (1998) Durum Wheat (*Triticum turgidum* spp. *durum*). In: Scarascia Mugnozza GT, Pagnotta MA (eds) Italian contribution to plant genetics and breeding. Viterbo, Italy, 181–194
- Brajcich P, Pfeiffer W, Autrique E (1986) Durum wheat: names, parentages, pedigrees and origins. International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center, Mexico, D.F.
- Chambers GK, MacAvoy ES (2000) Microsatellites: consensus and controversy. Comparative Biochem Physical Part B 126:455– 476
- Cho YG, Ishii T, Temnykh S, Chen X, Lipovich L, McCouch SR, Park WD, Ayres N, Cartinhour S (2000) Diversity of microsatellites derived from genomic libraries and GenBank sequences in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). Theor Appl Genet 100:713–722
- Colson I, Goldstein DB (1999) Evidence for complex mutations at microsatellite loci in *Drosophila*. Genetics 152:617–627
- Cuadrado A, Schwarzacher T (1998) The chromosomal organization of simple sequence repeats in wheat and rye genomes. Chromosoma 107:587–594
- Devos K, Penner G, Lee S (1995) Characterization of loci containing microsatellite sequences among Canadian wheat cultivars. Genome 38:1037–1040
- Dograr N, Akin-Yalin S, Akkaya MS (2000) Discriminating durum wheat cultivars using highly polymorphic simple sequence repeat DNA markers. Plant Breed 119:360–362

- Donini P, Stephenson P, Bryan GJ, Koebner RMD (1998) The potential of microsatellites for high throughput genetic diversity assessment in wheat and barley. Genet Res Crop Evol 45:415–421
- Donini P, Cooke RJ, Reeves JC (2000a) Molecular markers in variety and seed testing. In: Arencibia AD (ed) Plant genetic engineering: towards the third millennium. Elsevier Science, pp 27–34
- Donini P, Law JR, Koebner RMD, Reeves JC, Cooke RJ (2000b) Temporal trends in the diversity of UK wheats. Theor Appl Genet 100:912–917
- Dvorák J, Luo MC, Yang ZL (1998) Restriction fragment length polymorphism and divergence in the genomic regions of high and low recombination in self-fertilizing and across-fertilizing Aegilops species. Genetics 148:423–434
- Estoup A, Cornuet JM (1999) Microsatellite evolution: inferences from population data. In: Goldstein DB, Schlötterer C (eds) Microsatellites. Evolution and applications. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 55–65
- Eujail ME, Sorrells M, Baum P, Wolters W, Powell W (2002) Isolation of EST-derived microsatellite markers for genotyping the A and B genomes of wheat. Theor Appl Genet 10:399–407
- Fahima T, Röder MS, Grama A, Nevo E (1998) Microsatellite DNA polymorphism divergence in *Triticum dicoccoides* accessions highly resistant to yellow rust. Theor Appl Genet 96:187– 195
- Fahima T, Röder MS, Wendehake K, Kirzhner VM, Nevo E (2002) Microsatellite polymorphism in natural populations of wild emmer wheat, *Triticum dicoccoides*, in Israel. Theor Appl Genet 104:17–29
- Gerlach WL, Peacock WJ (1980) Chromosomal locations of highly repeated DNA sequences in wheat. Heredity 44:269–276
- Gill KS, Gill BS, Endo TR, Boyko EV (1996a) Identification and high-density mapping of gene-rich regions in chromosome group 5 of wheat. Genetics 143:1001–1012
- Gill KS, Gill BS, Endo TR, Boyko EV (1996b) Identification and high-density mapping of gene-rich regions in chromosome group 1 of wheat. Genetics 144:1883–1891
- Goldstein DB, Schlötterer C (1999) (eds) Microsatellites. Evolution and applications. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK
- Gower JC (1966) Some distance properties of latent root and vector methods used in multivariate analysis. Biometrika 53:325–338
- Graner A, Ludwig WF, Melchinger AE (1994) Relationships among european barley germplasm. II. Comparison of RFLP and pedigree data. Crop Sci 34:1199–1205
- Gupta PK, Varshney RK, Sharma PC, Ramesh B (1999) Molecular markers and their applications in wheat breeding. Plant Breed 118:369–390
- Guyomarc'h H, Sourdille P, Charmet G, Edwards KJ, Bernard M (2002) Characterisation of polymorphic microsatellite markers from *Aegilops tauschii* and transferability to the D-genome of bread wheat. Theor Appl Genet 104:1164–1172
- Hoisington D, Khairallah M, Reeves T, Ribaut JM, Skovmand B, Taba S, Warburton M (1999) Plant genetic resources: what can they contribute toward increased crop productivity? Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 96:5937–5943
- Huang S, Sirikhachornkit S, Su X, Faris J, Gill B, Haselkorn R, Gornicki P (2002) Genes encoding plastid acetyl-CoA carboxylase and 3-phosphoglycerate kinase of the *Triticum Aegilops* complex and the evolutionary history of polyploid wheat. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 99:8133–8138
- Huang XQ, Börner A, Röder MS, Ganal MW (2002) Assessing genetic diversity of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) germplasm using microsatellite markers. Theor Appl Genet DOI 10.007/ s00122-002-0959-4
- Ishii T, McCouch SR (2000) Microsatellites and microsynteny in the chloroplast genomes of *Oryza* and other *Gramineae* species. Theor Appl Genet 100:1257–1266
- Kantety RV, La Rota M, Matthews DE, Sorrells ME (2002) Data mining for simple sequence repeats in expressed sequence tags from barley, maize, rice, sorghum and wheat. Plant Mol Biol 48:501–510

- Koebner RMD, Powell W, Donini P (2001) The contribution of current and forthcoming DNA molecular marker technologies to wheat and barley genetics and breeding. In: Janick J (ed) Plant breeding reviews. John Wiley and Sons, Volume 21, pp 181–220
- Korzun V, Röder MS, Wendehake K, Pasqualone A, Lotti C, Ganal MW, Blanco A (1999) Integration of dinucleotide microsatellites from hexaploid bread wheat into a genetic linkage map of durum wheat. Theor Appl Genet 98:1202–1207
- Le Buanec B (1999) Plant breeding, biodiversity and yield stability. In: ISTA Secretariat (ed) Proc 1999 World Seed Conference. Agrobios, India, pp 99–114
- Lotti C, Salvi S, Pasqualone A, Tuberosa R, Blanco A (2000) Integration of AFLP markers into an RFLP-based map of durum wheat. Plant Breed 119:393–401
- Lu H, Bernardo R (2001) Molecular marker diversity among current and historical maize inbreds. Theor Appl Genet 103:613–617
- Lynch M (1988) Estimation of relatedness by DNA fingerprinting. Mol Biol Evol 5:584–599
- Ma ZQ, Röder M, Sorrells ME (1996) Frequencies and sequence characteristics of di-, tri-, and tetra-nucleotide microsatellites in wheat. Genome 39:123–130
- Macaubas C, Jin L, Hallmayer J, Kimura A, Mignot E (1997) The complex mutation pattern of a microsatellite. Genome Res 7:635–641
- Macaulay M, Ramsay L, Powell W, Waugh R (2001) A representative, highly informative 'genotyping set' of barley SSRs. Theor Appl Genet 102:801–809
- Manifesto MM, Schlatter AR, Hopp HE, Suarez EY, Dubcovski J (2001) Quantitative evaluation of genetic erosion in wheat using molecular markers. Crop Sci 41:682–690
- Marino CL, Nelson JC, Lu YU, Sorrells ME, Leroy P, Tuleen NA, Lopes CR, Hart GE, Lu YH (1996) Molecular genetic maps of the group 6 chromosomes of hexaploid wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L. em. Thell). Genome 39:359–366
- Matsuoka Y, Mitchell SE, Kresovich S, Goodman M, Doebley J (2002a) Microsatellites in *Zea* – variability, patterns of mutations, and use for evolutionary studies. Theor Appl Genet 104:436–450
- Matsuoka Y, Vigouroux Y, Goodmann MM, Sanchez JG, Buckler E, Doebley J (2002b) A single domestication for maize shown by multilocus microsatellite genotyping. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 99:6080–6084
- Melchinger AE, Graner A, Singh M, Messmer M (1994) Relationships among European barley germplasm. I. Genetic diversity among winter and spring cultivars revealed by RFLPs. Crop Sci 34:1191–1199
- Messele T (2001) Multidisciplinary approach in estimating genetic diversity of Ethiopian tetraploid wheat (*Triticum turgidum* L.) landraces. PhD thesis, Wageningen University, The Netherlands
- Morgante M, Hanafey M, Powell W (2002) Microsatellites are preferentially associated with nonrepetitive DNA in plant genomes. Nature Genet 30:194–200
- Mumm RH, Dudley JW (1994) A classification of 148 U.S. maize inbreds. I. Cluster analysis based on RFLPs. Crop Sci 34:842– 851
- Murray BW (1996) The estimation of genetic distance and population substructure from microsatellite allele frequency data. http://helix.biology.mcmaster.ca/brent/brent.html
- Nachit M, Picard E, Monneveux P, Labhilili M, Baum M, Rivoal R (1998) An international durum wheat improvement programme for the Mediterranean basin. Cahiers-Agric 7:510–515
- Nachit MM, Elouafi I, Pagnotta MA, El Saleh A, Iacono E, Labhilili M, Asbati A, Azrak M, Hazzam H, Benscher D, Khairallah M, Ribaut JM, Tanzarella OA, Porceddu E, Sorrells ME (2001) Molecular linkage map for an intraspecific recombinant inbred population of durum wheat (*Triticum turgidum* L. var. *durum*). Theor Appl Genet 102:177–186
- Nordborg M, Borevitz JO, Bergelson J, Berry CC, Chory J, Hagenblad J, Kreitman M, Maloof JN, Noyes T, Oefner PJ,

Stahl EA, Weigel D (2002) The extent of linkage disequilibrium in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Nature Genet 30:190–193

- Pecetti L, Annicchiarico P (1998) Agronomic value and plant type of Italian durum wheat cultivars from different eras of breeding. Euphytica 99:9–15
- Peng J, Korol AB, Fahima T, Röder M, Ronin YI, Li YC, Nevo E (2000) Molecular genetic maps in wild emmer wheat, *Triticum dicoccoides*: genome-wide coverage, massive negative interference, and putative quasi-linkage. Genome Res 10:1509– 1531
- Pfeiffer WH, Sayre KD, Reynolds MP (2000) Enhancing genetic grain yeld potential and yeld stability in durum wheat. In: Royo C, Di Fonzo N, Nachit MM, Araus JL (eds) Durum wheat improvement in the Mediterranean region: new challenges. Proc Sem Zaragoza, Spain, 12–14 April, 2000. Options Méditerranéennes 40:83–94
- Plaschke J, Ganal MW, Röder MS (1995) Detection of genetic diversity in closely related bread wheat using microsatellite markers. Theor Appl Genet 91:1001–1010
- Powell W, Machray GC, Provan J (1996) Polymorphism revealed by simple sequence repeats. Trends Plant Sci 1:215–222
- Prasad M, Varshney RK, Roy JK, Balyan H, Gupta PK (2000) The use of microsatellites for detecting DNA polymorphism, genotype identification and genetic diversity in wheat. Theor Appl Genet 100:584–592
- Ramsay L, Macaulay M, degli Ivanissevich S, MacLean K, Cardle L, Fuller J, Edwards KJ, Tuvesson S, Morgante M, Massari A, Maestri E, Marmiroli N, Sjakste T, Ganal M, Powell W, Waugh R (2000) A simple sequence repeat-based linkage map of barley. Genetics 156:1997–2005
- Röder MS, Plaschke J, Koenig SU, Börner A, Sorrels ME, Tanksley SD, Ganal MW (1995) Abundance, variability and chromosomal location of microsatellites in wheat. Mol Gen Genet 246:327–333
- Röder MS, Korzun V, Wendehake K, Plaschke J, Tixier MH, Leroy P, Ganal MW (1998) A microsatellite map of wheat. Genetics 149:2007–2023
- Röder MS, Wendehake K, Korzun V, Bredemeijer G, Laborie D, Bertrand L, Isaac P, Rendell S, Jackson J, Cooke RJ, Vosman B, Ganal MW (2002) Construction and analysis of a microsatellite-based database of European wheat varieties. Theor Appl Genet 106:67–73
- Rohlf FJ (1997) NTSYS-pc version 2.0. Exeter Press, East Setauket, New York, USA
- Rosegrant MW, Sambilla MA, Gerpacio RV, Ringler C (1997) Illinois World Food and Sustainable Agriculture Program Conference. Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA
- Royo C, Di Fonzo N, Nachit MM, Araus JL (eds) (2000) Durum wheat improvement in the Mediterranean region: new challenges. Proceedings of a Seminar, Zaragoza, Spain, 12–14 April, 2000. Options-Mediterraneennes 40
- Russell JR, Ellis RP, Thomas WTB, Waugh R, Provan J, Booth A, Fuller J, Lawrence P, Young G, Powell W (2000) A retrospective analysis of spring barley germplasm development from "foundation genotypes" to currently successful cultivars. Mol Breed 6:553–568
- Saghai-Maroof MA, Soliman KM, Jorgensen RA, Allard RW (1984) Ribosomal DNA spacer length polymorphism in barley: Mendelian inheritance, chromosomal location and population dynamics. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 83:1757–1761
- Scott KD, Eggler P, Seaton G, Rossetto M, Ablett EM, Lee LS, Henry RJ (2000) Analysis of SSRs derived from grape ESTs. Theor Appl Genet 100:723–726
- Smale M, Reynolds MP, Warburton M, Skovmand B, Trethowan R, Singh RP, Ortiz-Monasterio I, Crossa J, Khairallah M, Almanza M (2001) Dimensions of diversity in CIMMYT bread wheat from 1965 to 2000. Mexico, D.F., CIMMYT
- Smith JSC, Chin ECL, Shu H, Smith OS, Wall SJ, Senior ML, Mitchell SE, Kresovich S, Ziegle J (1997) An evaluation of the utility of SSR loci as molecular markers in maize (*Zea mays* L.). Theor Appl Genet 95:163–173

- Sneath PHA, Sokal RR (1973) Numerical taxonomy. WH Freeman and Co., San Francisco. California, USA
- Soleimani VD, Soleimani BR, Baum DA, Johnson (2002) AFLP and pedigree-based genetic diversity estimates in modern cultivars of durum wheat [*Triticum turgidum* L. subsp. *durum* (Desf.) Husn.]. Theor Appl Genet 104:350–357
- Sorrells ME, Barbosa J, Nachit MM, Ketata H, Autrique E (1995) Relationships among 81 durum genotypes based on RFLPs, gliadins, parentage, and quality traits. In: Di Fonzo N, Kaan F, Nachit M (eds) Durum wheat quality in the Mediterranean region. Proceedings of the Seminar, Zaragoza, Spain, 1993. Options Méditerranéennes, Series A, 22, pp 249–261
- Stachel M, Lelley T, Grausgruber H, Vollmann J (2000) Application of microsatellites in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) for studying genetic differentiation caused by selection for adaptation and use. Theor Appl Genet 100:242–248
- Taylor JS, Durkin JMH, Breden F (1999) The death of a microsatellite: a phylogenetic perspective on microsatellite interruptions. Mol Biol Evol 16:567–572
- Temnykh S, DeClerck G, Lukashova A, Lipovich L, Cartinhour S, McCouch S (2001) Computational and experimental analysis of microsatellites in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.): frequency, length

variation, and genetic marker potential. Genome Res 11:1441–1452

- Tenaillon MI, Sawkins MC, Long AD, Gaut RL, Doebley JF, Gaut BS (2001) Patterns of DNA sequence polymorphism along chromosome 1 of maize (*Zea mays* ssp. *mays* L.). Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 98:9161–9166
- Vigouroux Y, McMullen M, Hittinger CT, Houchins K, Schulz L, Matsuoka Y, Doebley J (2002) Identifing genes of agronomic importance in maize by screening microsatellites for evidence of selection during domestication. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 10.1073/pnas.112324299
- Weir BS (1990) Genetic data analysis. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts
- Zhang W, Qu LJ, Gu H, Gao W, Liu M, Chen J, Chen Z (2002) Studies on the origin and evolution of tetraploid wheats based on the internal transcribed spacer (ITS) sequences of nuclear ribosomal DNA. Theor Appl Genet 104:1099–1106
- Zohary D, Feldman M (1962) Hybridization between amphiploids and the evolution of polyploids in the wheat (*Aegilops-Triticum*) group. Evolution 16:44–61