Molecular phylogeny of Phalaenopsis Blume (Orchidaceae) based on the internal transcribed spacer of the nuclear ribosomal DNA

C. C. Tsai^{1,2}, S. C. Huang³, and C. H. Chou^{2,4}

¹Kaohsiung District Agricultural Improvement Station, Pingtung, Taiwan

²National Pingtung University of Science and Technology, Pingtung, Taiwan

³Floricultural Research Center, Taiwan Agricultural Research Institute, Taichung, Taiwan

4 National Sun Yat-sen University, Kaohsiung, Taiwan

Received July 29, 2003; accepted May 21, 2005 Published online: October 20, 2005 Springer-Verlag 2005

Abstract. The internal transcribed spacer (ITS1, 5.8S rDNA, and ITS2) region of nuclear ribosomal DNA (nrDNA) was sequenced from 53 species, which represent most of the living species diversity in the genus Phalaenopsis (Orchidaceae). A phylogeny was developed for the genus based on the neighbor-joining and maximum parsimony analyses of molecular data. Results of these analyses provided support for the monophyly of the genus Phalaenopsis and concurred in that the genera Doritis and Kingidium should be treated as being parts of the genus Phalaenopsis as suggested by Christenson (2001). Within the genus Phalaenopsis, neither subgenera Aphyllae nor Parishianae were monophyletic, and they were highly clustered with subgenus Proboscidioides plus sections Esmeralda and Deliciosae of subgenus Phalaenopsis based on ITS data. Those species also have the same characters of morphology of four pollinia and similar biogeographies. Furthermore, neither subgenus Phalaenopsis nor Polychilos was monophyletic. Within the subgenus Phalaenopsis, only section *Phalaenopsis* was highly supported as being monophyletic. As for the subgenus Polychilos, only section *Polychilos* was moderately supported as being monophyletic. In conclusion, the present molecular data obtained from the ITS sequence of nrDNA of the genus Phalaenopsis provide valuable information for elucidating the phylogeny of this genus.

Key words: Phalaenopsis, phylogeny, rDNA, internal transcribed spacer.

The genus Phalaenopsis Blume (Orchidaceae), a beautiful and popular orchid, comprises approximately 66 species according to the latest classification of Christenson (2001), who divided this genus into five subgenera, namely Proboscidioides, Aphyllae, Parishianae, Polychilos, and Phalaenopsis. Of these, subgenus Polychilos was subdivided into four sections, namely Polychilos, Fuscatae, Amboinenses, and Zebrinae. In addition, subgenus Phalaenopsis was also subdivided into four sections, namely Phalaenopsis, Deliciosae, Esmeralda, and Stauroglottis.

Species of the genus *Phalaenopsis* are found throughout tropical Asia and the larger islands of the Pacific Ocean. The western distribution of Phalaenopsis is in Sri Lanka and South India. The eastern limit of the range is in Papua New Guinea. To the north, they are distributed in Yunnan Province (southern China) and Taiwan. The southern limit is in northern Australia (Christenson 2001). Different subgenera of Phalaenopsis have distinct geographic distributions. Subgenera Aphyllae, Parishianae, and Proboscidioides are distributed in southern China and India extending to northern Vietnam, Myanmar, and Thailand, respectively. The subgenus Polychilos has a few species distributed as far west as northeastern India, but it is primarily centered in Indonesia and the Philippines (Christenson 2001). Subgenus Phalaenopsis is centered in the Philippines with two species extending to Taiwan (P. aphrodite subsp. formosana and P. equestris) and one wide-ranging species (P. amabilis) found from the Philippines and Indonesia to northern Australia (Christenson 2001).

All *Phalaenopsis* species (with the exception of the natural tetraploid species, P. buyssoni*ana*) have 38 chromosomes $(2n=38)$ (Woodard 1951, Shindo and Kamemoto 1963, Tanaka and Kamemoto 1984, Christenson 2001). Furthermore, the chromosome number of the subtribe Aeridinae (syn. Sarcanthinae) (with only a few exceptions of tetraploid or hexaploid species) is consistent with that of Phalaenopsis (Christenson 2001). Crosses between Phalaenopsis species and other close genera, namely Aerides, Arachnis, Ascocentrum, Doritis, Neofinetia, Renanthera, Rhynchostylis, Vanda, and Vandopsis, also show various degrees of fertility (Sweet 1980).

Based on the number of pollinia, traditional species of Kingidium (which have four pollinia) were segregated from the genus Phalaenopsis (which has two pollinia) (Sweet 1980, Seidenfaden 1988b). Christenson (2001) treated the traditional genus Kingidium as Phalaenopsis and split it into different parts of Phalaenopsis, placing some species into the subgenus Aphyllae (P. braceana, P. minus, and P. taenialis) and some into the section Deliciosae $(P. chibae$ and $P. delicious$ of the subgenus Phalaenopsis. Another group, the P. parishii complex, having four pollinia, was proposed as a segregated genus Grafia, by Hawkes (see Christenson 2001). This complex was first treated as section Parishianae of the genus Phalaenopsis by Sweet (1968). Christenson (2001) agreed with Sweet's treatment and placed this complex in the subgenus Parishianae of Phalaenopsis. Furthermore, the other four-pollinia species, P. lowii, was also placed in the section Proboscidioides of the genus Phalaenopsis (Sweet 1980) and in the subgenus Proboscidioides of the genus Phalaenopsis by Christenson (2001). Shim (1982), however, disagreed with Sweet's concept (1980) and separated sections Proboscidioides, Aphyllae, Parishianae, Polychilos, Zebrinae, Fuscatae, and Amboinenses as the genus Polychilos from a narrowly defined Phalaenopsis. In addition, the genus Doritis was traditionally separated from *Phalaenopsis* because of its pollinium number, lip structure, and adaptations to a terrestrial habitat (Sweet 1980, Seidenfaden 1988a). This group was also treated as the genus Phalaenopsis and placed in the section Esmeralda of the subgenus Phalaenopsis (Christenson 2001).

The internal transcribed spacer (ITS) region of nuclear ribosomal DNA (nrDNA) has provided valuable information for resolving phylogenetic relationships at different taxonomic levels (e.g. Baldwin 1992, 1993; Suh et al. 1993; Sun et al. 1994; Bayer et al. 1996; Cox et al. 1997), particularly at the infrageneric level because of relatively rapid evolutionary rates. In this study, we followed the systematics proposed and references described by Christenson (2001). In order to reconstruct the phylogeny within the genus, the nucleotide sequences of the ITS region of the nrDNA from 53 taxa of Phalaenopsis plus 13 outgroup species were analyzed to address the phylogeny of the genus.

Materials and methods

Taxonomy and nomenclature of Phalaenopsis species in this study followed Sweet (1980) and Christenson (2001). Plant materials used include 53 taxa of the genus Phalaenopsis. In addition, specimens of each of seven related genera, namely Aerides, Ascocentrum, Neofinetia, Renanthera, Rhynchostylis, Vanda, and Vandopsis, which show various degrees of fertility with Phalaenopsis (Sweet 1980), Paraphalaenopsis, which was once treated as Phalaenopsis (see Sweet 1980), as well as of five other genera of the subtribe Aeridinae, namely Amesiella, Gastrochilus, Haraella, Thrixspernum, and Tuberolabium, were selected as outgroup species (Table 1). All leaf material was taken from living plants in the Kaohsiung District Agricultural Improvement Station (KDA-IS) in Taiwan and from the collection of C. C. Tsai. The flower pictures of those species in this study are available from the author (tsaicc@mail.kdais.gov.tw). Using the cetyltrimethylammonium bromide (CTAB) method (Doyle and Doyle 1987), total DNA was extracted from fresh etiolated leaves. Ethanol-precipitated DNA was dissolved in TE (Tris-EDTA) buffer and stored at -20°C. Qiagen (Valencia, CA, USA) columns were used to clean the DNA of samples which was difficult to amplify by PCR. The approximate DNA yields were then determined using a spectrophotometer (model U-2001, Hitachi).

The ITS region, which includes the ITS1, 5.8S rDNA, and ITS2, was amplified by PCR with primers referenced to Tsai and Huang (2001). The protocols for the PCR were as follows: we used a 50-µl mixture containing 40 mM Tricine-KOH (pH 8.7), 15 mM KOAc, 3.5 mM $Mg(OAc)_2$, 3.75 µg/ ml BSA, 0.005% Tween 20, 0.005% Nonidet-P40, four dNTPs (0.2 mM each), primers (0.5 μ M each), 2.5 of Advantage 2 DNA polymerase (Clontech), 10 ng genomic DNA, and a $50-\mu l$ volume of mineral oil. The PCR mixture for amplifying the ITS region included 10% dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) to reduce problems related to the secondary structure and efficiency of PCR primer binding. Amplification reactions were completed in a dryblock with two-step thermal cycles (Biometra). In the first step, the mixture was incubated at 94° C for 3 min, then it underwent 10 cycles of denaturation at 94° C for 45 s, annealing at 58° C for 45 s, and extension at 72°C for 1 min. The second step was carried out by the following process: 30 cycles of denaturation at 94° C for 45 s, annealing at 54° C for 45 s, and extension at 72° C for 1 min, with a final extension for 10 min at 72° C. These PCR products were detected by agarose gel electrophoresis (1.0%, w/v in TBE), stained with 0.5 μ g/ml ethidium bromide, and finally photographed under UV light exposure. The PCR products of ITS sequences from the plant material in this study were recovered using glassmilk (BIO 101, California).

These DNAs were directly sequenced following the method of dideoxy chain-termination using an ABI377 automated sequencer with the Ready Reaction Kit (PE Biosystems, California) of the BigDye[™] Terminator Cycle Sequencing. Sequencing primers were the same as those used for PCR. Each sample was sequenced two or three times to confirm the sequences. These reactions were performed as recommended by the manufacturers.

The sequence alignment was determined using the program Clustal W multiple alignment in BioEdit (Hall 1999). The alignment was then checked, and apparent alignment errors were corrected by hand. Genetic relationships were then determined using the program MEGA version 2.1 (Kumar et al. 2001). The genetic distance matrix was calculated by use of the two-parameter method of Kimura (1980), and then it was used to construct phylogenetic trees using the Neighbor-joining (NJ) method (Saitou and Nei 1987). Maximum parsimony (MP) analyses (Fitch 1971) were done using code modified from the Close-Neighbor-Interchange (CNI) algorithm (Rzhetsky and Nei 1992) in MEGA (Kumar et al. 1993). Bootstrapping (1025 replicates) was carried out to estimate the support for both NJ and MP topologies (Felsenstein 1985, Hillis and Bull 1993). The strict consensus parsimonious tree was then constructed using the program MEGA version 2.1 (Kumar et al. 2001). The aligned data matrix and tree files are available from the author (tsaicc@mail.kdais.gov.tw).

Results

Sequence alignment and ITS characteristics. PCR products of each sample studied were directly sequenced except that of P. viridis. Since the ITS repeat sequences of P. viridis were not homogeneous, the sequences of this species were finally sequenced after T-vector cloning. Three separate clones were selected for sequencing. These three ITS sequences were quite variable. Sequence variation among these three clones ranged from 2.8 to 6.7%. Furthermore, P. cochlearis showed two separate PCR products for the ITS region of PCR amplification. Their lengths were approximately 460 and 700 bp,

Taxa and systematic classification ^a	Geographical distribution	Source	GenBank accession no.
Genus Phalaenopsis Subgenus Proboscidioides			
(Rolfe) E. A. Christ. Phalaenopsis lowii Rchb.f. ^b	Myanmar, and adjacent western Thailand	KDAIS KC-88	AY912236
Subgenus Aphyllae			
(Sweet) E. A. Christ.			
Phalaenopsis wilsonii	China (Sichuan, Yunnan,	KDAIS KC-130	AY912257
Rolfe	and eastern Tibet)		
Phalaenopsis minus (Seidenf.) E. A. Christ.	endemic to Thailand	KDAIS KC-227	AY912241
Phalaenopsis braceana (J. D. Hook.) E. A. Christ.	Bhutan and China	KDAIS KC-289	AY228495
Phalaenopsis honghenensis F.Y.Liu	China (Yunnan)	KDAIS KC-305	AY912229
Subgenus Parishianae			
(Sweet) E. A. Christ.			
Phalaenopsis gibbosa Sweet	Vietnam and Laos	KDAIS KC-52	AY912228
Phalaenopsis lobbii (Rchb.f.) Sweet	India, Bhutan, Myanmar, and Vietnam	KDAIS KC-21	AY912235
Phalaenopsis parishii Rchb.f.	eastern Himalayas, India, Myanmar, and Thailand	KDAIS KC-316	AY912245
Phalaenopsis appendiculata C. E. Carr	Endemic to Malaysia (Malay Peninsula)	KDAIS KC-411	AY912218
Subgenus Polychilos			
(Breda) E. A. Christ.			
Section Polychilos			
(Breda) Rchb.f.			
Phalaenopsis mannii Rchb.f.	northeast India, Nepal, and China to Vietnam	KDAIS KC-22	AY912238
Phalaenopsis cornu-cervi (Breda) Bl. & Rchb.f.	northeast India and the Nicobar Islands to Java and Borneo	KDAIS KC-450	AY912222
Phalaenopsis borneensis Garay	endemic to Borneo	KDAIS KC-109	AF537024
Phalaenopsis pantherina Rchb.f.	endemic to Borneo	KDAIS KC-573	AY912244
Phalaenopsis lamelligera Sweet	endemic to Borneo	KDAIS KC-263	AY912233
Section Fuscatae Sweet			
Phalaenopsis cochlearis Holtt.	Malaysia (Malay Peninsula) and Indonesia (Sarawak)	KDAIS KC-484	AY912221
Phalaenopsis viridis J. J. Sm.	endemic to Indonesia (Sumatra)	KDAIS KC-127	

Table 1. Names of specimens, geographical distribution, source, and GenBank accession numbers for the sequences of the internal transcribed spacer of nuclear ribosomal DNA $\overline{}$

Table 1. (Continued)

^a The systematics of *Phalaenopsis* are based on Christenson (2001).

^b Plant materials were cultivated at the Kaohsiung District Agricultural Improvement Station, Taiwan.

respectively. The sequence of the long PCR product was unique from other Phalaenopsis species as well as the 13 outgroup species studied after phylogenetic analyses based on both the distance method and maximum parsimony method (data not shown). Therefore, the short PCR product of P. cochlearis was selected for analysis in the following study. The short ITS sequence of P. cochlearis showed a 237-bp deletion. Parts of the deleted fragment included the ITS1 region, and parts of it included 5.8S rDNA. The boundaries of the internal transcribed spacers (ITS1 and ITS2) and nrDNA coding regions in the 66 taxa studied were determined by comparison to several published sequences obtained from a range of angiosperms (Takaiwa et al. 1984, 1985; Kiss et al. 1989a; Kiss et al. 1989b; Baldwin 1992). The accession numbers of the 53 species of

the genus Phalaenopsis plus 13 outgroup species are shown in Table 1. The ITS lengths obtained from Phalaenopsis species and outgroup species were similar to those reported from a broad sample of angiosperms (Baldwin et al. 1995). Sequences from the 53 Phalaenopsis species plus 13 outgroup species of related genera were aligned and resulted in 719 characters which were subdivided as follows: the ITS1 spacer region comprised 262 characters among which 165 were variable sites and 113 were potentially parsimony informative sites, the ITS2 spacer region comprised 294 characters among which 154 were variable sites and 109 were potentially parsimony informative sites, and 5.8S rDNA comprised 163 characters among which 16 were variable sites and 8 were potentially parsimony informative sites. The genetic distances among the 53 Phalaenopsis species were in the range of 0.00 between *P. bellina* and *P. violacea* to 0.137 between *P. aphrodite* and *P. viridis* (clone 3) with an average of 0.073 using the 2-parameter method of Kimura (1980) (data not shown).

ITS phylogeny. The phylogenetic tree of regions of the ITS1, 5.8S rDNA, and ITS2 used character state changes which were equally weighted. The phylogenetic tree constructed following the NJ method is shown in Fig. 1. Based on the MP method, the analysis yielded 118 equally parsimonious trees with a length of 911 steps, a consistency index (CI) of 0.50, and a retention index (RI) of 0.76. One of the 118 most parsimonious trees and the strict consensus tree are shown in Figs. 2 and 3, respectively. Bootstrap values higher than 50% are shown below/above the supported branches for both the NJ and MP trees. Among Phalaenopsis species, the NJ tree and

 \blacktriangleleft

the MP strict consensus tree constructed from ITS data were generally congruent. Based on the phylogenetic trees (Figs. 1, 3), none of the outgroup species was nested within the genus Phalaenopsis. This results support that the genus Phalaenopsis as described by Christenson (2001) is a monophylum. Within the genus Phalaenopsis, two major clades were shown. The first clade comprised the subgenus Polychilos and sections Phalaenopsis and Stauroglottis of the subgenus Phalaenopsis (with bootstrap values of 63% in the NJ tree and 59% in the MP strict consensus tree); and the second clade consisted of sections Esmeralda and Deliciosae of the subgenus Phalaenopsis, as well as subgenera Proboscidioides, Parishianae, and Aphyllae (Figs. 1, 3) (with bootstrap values of 83% in the NJ tree and 81% in the MP strict consensus tree).

The monophyly of the subgenus Polychilos was not supported, since parts of the subgenus Phalaenopsis, namely sections Phalaenopsis and Stauroglottis, were nested within the subgenus Polychilos. Within the subgenus Polychilos, only the section Polychilos showed monophyly supported with bootstrap values of 80% in the NJ tree and 61% in the MP strict consensus tree. Parts of section Amboinenses, namely P. hieroglyphica, P. reichenbachiana, P. bastianii, P. pallens, P. lueddemanniana, P. fasciata, and P. pulchra, formed a clade supported with bootstrap values of 99% in both NJ and MP strict consensus trees. In addition, parts of the section Amboinenses, namely P. doweryensis and P. maculata, formed a clade with the section *Fuscatae* supported by bootstrap values of 90% in the NJ tree and 91% in the MP strict consensus tree (Figs. 1, 3).

Furthermore, the monophyly of the subgenus Phalaenopsis was also not supported in this study. Within the subgenus Phalaenopsis,

Fig. 1. Neighbor-joining tree of 53 *Phalaenopsis* species plus 13 outgroups obtained from sequence comparisons of the ITS region of rDNA. Numbers above the internodes indicate bootstrap values from 1025 replicates. Bootstrap values $> 50\%$ are shown on each branch. A solid circle (\bullet) on the tree indicates that this species was traditionally treated as the genus *Doritis*. Solid squares (\blacksquare) on the tree indicate that these species were traditionally treated as the genus Kingidium

the monophyly of the section Phalaenopsis was supported with bootstrap values of 100% in the NJ tree and 99% in MP strict consensus tree. Section Stauroglottis was shown not to be monophyletic. Parts of the section Stauroglottis, namely P. equestris and P. lindenii, showed a sister group relationship to the section Phalaenopsis supported by bootstrap values of 88% in the NJ tree and 67% in the MP strict consensus tree. Furthermore, section Deliciosae was not monophyletic (Figs. 1, 3). Sections Deliciosae and Esmeralda of the subgenus Phalaenopsis were both separated from most species of the subgenus Phalaenopsis, namely sections Phalaenopsis and Stauroglottis. Instead they were to be shown closely related to the subgenera Parishianae, Aphyllae, and Proboscidioides.

In addition, subgenus Parishianae was not shown to be monophyletic either since the bootstrap value in the NJ tree was low $(<50\%)$ (Fig. 1), and its members did not form a clade in the MP strict consensus tree (Fig. 3). Furthermore, there was conflict between the phylogenies of the subgenus Aphyllae depicted by the NJ and MP strict consensus trees based on ITS data. The NJ tree showed it to be monophyletic supported with a moderate bootstrap value (of 68%), but its members did not form a clade in the MP strict consensus tree (Figs. 1, 3). As for the monotypic subgenus Proboscidioides, P. lowii had a sister relationship to the subgenus Aphyllae in NJ tree, and was nested within the subgenus Aphyllae in the MP strict consensus tree (Figs. 1, 3).

Discussion

 \blacktriangleleft

Monophyly of the genus Phalaenopsis

Phalaenopsis pulcherrima was previously treated as a member of the genus Doritis (Seidenfaden 1988a), while members of the section *Deliciosae* of the subgenus *Phalaenop*sis and parts (P. minus, P. braceana, and P. taenialis) of the subgenus *Aphyllae* were treated as parts of the genus Kingidium (Seidenfaden 1988b). Recently, Christenson (2001) presented a generic revision of Phalaenopsis and treated *Doritis* as a synonym of the genus Phalaenopsis based on the high hybrid fertility and similar morphology of microspores between P. pulcherrima (syn. Doritis pulcherrima) and parts (P. lobbii or P. parishii) of Phalaenopsis (Aoyama et al. 1994, Christenson 2001). In addition, the genus *Kingidium* was also treated as a synonym of the genus Phalaenopsis based on the fact that it shares small subsaccate lip bases with parts of Phalaenopsis, namely the subgenus *Aphyllae*, as well as it has four pollinia as have parts of Phalaenopsis, namely the subgenera Proboscidioides, Aphyllae, and *Parishianae* (Christenson 2001). Molecular data from the ITSs of nrDNA showed that outgroup species were not nested within the genus *Phalaenopsis*. In addition, traditional Kingidium and Doritis species were not separated from Phalaenopsis species. Therefore, the monophyly of the genus Phalaenopsis as described by Christenson (2001) was supported in the present study.

Infrageneric relationships within Phalaenopsis

(1) Subgenera Proboscidioides, Aphyllae, and Parishianae

Molecular data from ITS sequences showed that the monotypic subgenus Proboscidioides, namely *P. lowii*, formed a clade with the subgenera *Aphyllae* and *Parishianae* plus the sections *Esmeralda* and *Deliciosae* of subgenus Phalaenopsis. The result is in agreement with the morphological characteristics of this clade, bearing four separate pollinia, as well as with the fact that they are geographically distributed in close proximity to one another (Fig. 4,

Fig. 2. One of 118 most parsimonious trees of 53 *Phalaenopsis* species plus 13 outgroups obtained from sequence comparisons of the ITS region of rDNA. Bootstrap values > 50% are shown on each branch. A solid circle (\bullet) on the tree indicates that this species was traditionally treated as the genus *Doritis*. Solid squares (\bullet) on the tree indicate that these species were traditionally treated as the genus Kingidium

Table 1) (Sweet 1980, Christenson 2001). This four-pollinia clade, namely subgenera Aphyllae and Parishianae, plus the sections Esmeralda and Deliciosae of subgenus Phalaenopsis, is separate from two-pollinia clade, namely subgenus Polychilos and sections Phalaenopsis and Stauroglottis of subgenus Phalaenopsis based on phylogenetic tree derived from ITS data. Based on the biogeography of Phalaenopsis, the four-pollinia clade is separated from the two-pollinia clade by oceans/straits. As for Phalaenopsis species of the Malay Peninsula, the border between the two-pollinia clade and the four-pollinia clade is approximately located at the Isthmus of Kra. This region is a famous phytogeographical break between SE Asia and Malaysia (Van Steenis 1950).

Within the four-pollinia clade, neither subgenus Aphyllae nor Parishianae were monophyletic based on the ITS sequences. Furthermore, the monotypic subgenus Proboscidioides, namely P. lowii, had a close relationship to the subgenus Aphyllae. Therefore, the unique characters in P. lowii, namely the long beak-like rostellum and lateral lobes of the lip in the form of recurved hooks, might have been overemphasized in the systematics of Phalaenopsis proposed by Christenson (2001). In addition, section Deliciosae of the subgenus Phalaenopsis was not monophyletic either.

(2) Subgenus Phalaenopsis

 \blacktriangleleft

This subgenus is subdivided into four sections, namely sections Phalaenopsis, Deliciosae, Esmeralda, and Stauroglottis, based on the Christenson's systematics of Phalaenopsis. This subgenus is characterized by having a single callus (with the exception of the three species of the section *Deliciosae*) and smooth lateral lobes of the lip (Christenson 2001). Monophyly of the subgenus Phalaenopsis was not supported in this study. Excluding sections Deliciosae and Esmeralda of the subgenus

Phalaenopsis, the rest of subgenus Phalaenopsis, namely sections Phalaenopsis and Stauroglottis, formed a monophyletic group supported by moderate bootstrap values based on the ITS sequences. The close relationship between sections Phalaenopsis and Stauroglottis was also supported by morphological characters of sharing similar geographic ranges, small chromosome sizes, and flowers lacking transversely barred patterns (Christenson 2001), RAPD analyses (Chen et al. 1995), and the IGS sequence of 5S rDNA (Kao 2001).

Within subgenus Phalaenopsis, the monophyly of section Phalaenopsis was supported in the study. The section Phalaenopsis bears flowers with broad petals, which are much broader than the sepals. Additionally, they bear prominent, erect, somewhat glossy calli (Christenson 2001). Furthermore, based on geographical distributions (Sweet 1980, Christenson 2001), and molecular data of the intergenic spacer (IGS) of 5S nrDNA (Kao 2001), the monophyly of section Phalaenopsis was supported as well. Monophyly of section Stauroglottis was not supported in this study, since *P. celebensis* was unique from other members of the section Stauroglottis. According to the geographical distribution of this section, *P. celebensis* (distributed in Sulawesi, Indonesia) was also separated from other species of the section Stauroglottis (distributed in the Philippines) (Christenson 2001). Furthermore, section Deliciosae was not shown to be monophyletic based on ITS sequence either.

(3) Subgenus Polychilos

This large subgenus is subdivided into the four sections Polychilos, Fuscatae, Amboinenses, and Zebrinae based on the systematics of Christenson (2001). The subgenus is characterized by having fleshy, long-lasting flowers with two pairs of calli on the lip (biseriate), the lateral lobes of the lip producing a raised tooth along

Fig. 3. The strict consensus parsimonious tree of 53 *Phalaenopsis* species plus 13 outgroups obtained from sequence comparisons of the ITS region of rDNA. Bootstrap values $> 50\%$ are shown on each branch. A solid circle (\bullet) on the tree indicates that this species was traditionally treated as the genus *Doritis*. Solid squares (\bullet) on the tree indicate that these species were traditionally treated as the genus Kingidium

Fig. 4. Correlation between the biogeography and phylogenetic clades among five subgenera of *Phalaenopsis*

the leading edge, and by two pollinia (Christenson 2001). In the present study, the monophyly of subgenus Polychilos was not supported, since parts of the subgenus Phalaenopsis, namely sections Phalaenopsis and Stauroglottis, were nested within subgenus Polychilos. Within subgenus Polychilos, section Polychilos was monophyletic. The result is in agreement with the morphological characters of this section, which features a fleshy flattened rachis (with the exception of *P. mannii*), non-fragrant flowers, petals narrower than sepals, a triseriate callus, a slightly saccate lip base, a transversely lunate mid-lobe of the lip, a lip base continuous with the column foot, and a pair of knee-like projections at the base of the column (Christenson 2001). However, other sections of subgenus Polychilos, namely Amboinenses, Zebrinae, and Fuscatae, were not monophyletic. Based on ITS data, the section Fuscatae and two species of the section Amboinenses, namely P. doweryensis and P. maculata, formed a unique clade and were separated from other members of the subgenus Polychilos. Furthermore, ITS data also revealed no differentiation between sections Amboinenses and Zebrinae. In addition, within section Amboinenses, seven species, namely P. bastianii, P. pallens, P. hieroglyphica, P. reichenbachiana, P. lueddemanniana, P. fasciata, and P. pulchra, distributed in the Philippines, formed a subclade and were separated from other members of the clade. The result is in agreement with the geographical distribution of those species which are distributed in the Philippines (Sweet 1980, Christenson 2001) as well as the traditional classification of seven species (with the exception of P. bastianii, a newly discovered species) which were treated as one species, P. lueddemanniana (see Christenson 2001). Until Sweet (1968, 1969), this highly variable species was fully resolved and treated as different species.

Conclusions

In conclusion, our molecular data offer new perspectives on the phylogeny among species of Phalaenopsis. The ITS region of nrDNA appears to be adequate for resolving infrageneric relationships in this group. The results from this study concurred in that the genera Doritis and Kingidium can be treated as part of the genus Phalaenopsis. Neither subgenus Aphyllae nor Parishianae were monophyletic, and they clustered with subgenus Proboscidioides plus sections *Esmeralda* and *Deliciosae* of subgenus Phalaenopsis. This clade has the same characters of morphology with four pollinia and similar biogeographies. In addition, neither subgenus Phalaenopsis nor Polychilos were monophyletic based on this study. Within subgenus Phalaenopsis, only section Phalaenopsis was highly supported as being monophyletic. As for the subgenus Polychilos, only section Polychilos was moderately supported as being monophyletic. In short, based on ITS data we support the systematics of the genus *Phalaenopsis* on the generic level but not on the subgeneric or sectional levels for most groups as described by Christenson (2001).

This research was supported by funding from the National Science Council, Executive Yuan, R.O.C. We are grateful to Director F. H. Lin for his valuable comments and helpful discussion in the course of the study.

References

- Aoyama M., Kojima K., Kobayashi M. (1994) Morphology of microspores in Phalaenopsis hybrids. Kinki Chugoku Agr. Res. 88: 49–53.
- Baldwin B. G. (1992) Phylogenetic utility of the internal transcribed sequences of nuclear ribosomal DNA in plants: an example from the Compositae. Molec. Phylogenet. Evol. 1: 3–16.
- Baldwin B. G. (1993) Molecular phylogenetics of Calycadenia (Compositae) based on ITS sequences of nuclear ribosomal DNA: chromosomal and morphological evolution reexamined. Amer. J. Bot. 80: 222–238.
- Baldwin B. G., Sanderson M. J., Porter J. M., Wojciechowski M. F., Campbell C.S., Don-

oghue M. J. (1995) The ITS region of nuclear ribosomal DNA: a valuable source of evidence on angiosperm phylogeny. Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. 82: 247–277.

- Bayer R. J., Soltis D. E., Soltis P. S. (1996) Phylogenetic inferences in Antennaria (Asteraceae: Gnaphalieae: Cassiniinae) based on sequences from nuclear ribosomal DNA internal transcribed spacers (ITS). Amer. J. Bot. 83: 516–527.
- Chen W. H., Fu Y. M., Hsieh R. M., Tsai W. T., Chyou M. S., Wu C. C., Lin Y. S. (1995) Application of DNA amplification fingerprinting in the breeding of Phalaenopsis orchid. In: Terzi M., Cella R., Falavigna A. (eds.) Current issues in plant molecular and cellular biology. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston, and London, pp. 341–346.
- Christenson E. A. (2001) Phalaenopsis. Timber Press, Portland, OR.
- Cox A. V., Pridgeon A. M., Albert V. A., Chase M. W. (1997) Phylogenetics of the slipper orchids (Cypripedioideae, Orchidaceae): nuclear rDNA ITS sequences. Pl. Syst. Evol. 208: 197–223.
- Doyle J., Doyle J. (1987) A rapid DNA isolation procedure for small quantities of fresh leaf tissue. Phytochem. Bull. 19: 11–15.
- Felsenstein J. (1985) Confidence limits on phylogenies: an approach using the bootstrap. Evolution 39: 783–791.
- Fitch W. M. (1971) Towards defining the course of evolution: minimum change for a specific tree topology. Syst. Zool. 20: 406–416.
- Hall T. A. (1999) BioEdit: a user-friendly biological sequence alignment editor and analysis program for Windows 95/98/NT. Nucl. Acids Symp. Ser. 41: 95–98.
- Hillis D. M., Bull J. J. (1993) An empirical test of bootstrapping as a method for assessing confidence in phylogenetic analysis. Syst. Biol. 42: 182–192.
- Kao Y. H. (2001) Phylogeny of Phalaenopsis species based on 5S rDNA intergenic sequences. Institute of Botany National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan, Master's thesis. (in Chinese).
- Kimura M. (1980) A simple method for estimating evolutionary rates of base substitution through comparative studies of nucleotide sequences. Molec. Evol. 16: 111–120.
- Kiss T., Kis M., Solymosy F. (1989a) Nucleotide sequence of a 25S rRNA gene from tomato. Nucl. Acids Res. 17: 796.
- Kiss T., Szkukalek A., Solymosy F. (1989b) Nucleotide sequence of a 17S (18S) rRNA gene from tomato. Nucl. Acids Res. 17: 2127.
- Kumar S., Tamura K., Jakobsen I. B., Nei M. (2001) MEGA 2.1: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis software. Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ.
- Rzhetsky A., Nei M. (1992) Statistical properties of the ordinary least-squares, generalized leastsquares, and minimum-evolution methods of phylogenetic inference. J. Molec. Evol. 35: 367– 375.
- Saitou N., Nei M. (1987) The Neighbor-joining method: a new method for reconstructing phylogenetic trees. Molec. Biol. Evol. 4: 406–425.
- Seidenfaden G. (1988a) Doritis. Opera Bot. 95: 31–34.
- Seidenfaden G. (1988b) Kingidium. Opera Bot. 95:182–189.
- Shim P. S. (1982) A new generic classification in the Phalaenopsis complex (Orchidaceae). Malayan Nat. J. 36: 1–28.
- Shindo K., Kamemoto H. (1963) Karyotype analysis of some species of Phalaenopsis. Cytologia 28: 390–398.
- Suh Y., Thien L. B., Reeve H. E., Zimmer E. A. (1993) Molecular evolution and phylogenetic implications of internal sequences of nuclear ribosomal DNA in Winteraceae. Amer. J. Bot. 80: 1042–1055.
- Sun Y., Skinner D. Z., Liang G. H., Hulbert S. H. (1994) Phylogenetic analysis of Sorghum and related taxa using internal transcribed spacers of nuclear ribosomal DNA. Theor. Appl. Genet. 89: 26–32.
- Sweet H. R. (1968) Revision of the genus Phalaenopsis, pt. 2. Amer. Orchid Soc. Bull. 37: 1089–1104.
- Sweet H. R. (1969) Revision of the genus Phalaenopsis, pts. 3 and 4. Amer. Orchid Soc. Bull. 38: 33–43, 225–239.
- Sweet H. R. (1980) The genus Phalaenopsis. The Orchid Digest, Pomona, CA.
- Takaiwa F., Oono K., Sugiura M. (1984) The complete nucleotide sequence of a rice 17S rRNA gene. Nucl. Acids Res. 12: 5441–5448.
- Takaiwa F., Oono K., Sugiura M. (1985) The complete nucleotide sequence of a rice 25S rRNA gene. Gene 37: 255–289.
- Tanaka R., Kamemoto K. (1984) Chromosomes in orchids: counting and numbers. In: Arditti J. (Ed.) Orchid biology: reviews and perspectives. Vol. III. Comstock Publishing, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, N.Y.
- Tsai C. C., Huang S. C. (2001) The internal transcribed spacer of ribosomal DNA as a marker for identifying species and hybrids of the Oncidinae. J. Hort. Sci. Biotech. 76: 674– 680.
- Van Steenis C. G. G. J. (1950) The delimitation of Malaysia and its main plant geographical divisions. Flora Malesiana. Noordhoff-Kolff (Jakarta) 1(1): 70–75.
- Woodard J. W. (1951) Some chromosome numbers in Phalaenopsis. Amer. Orchid Soc. Bull. 20: 356–358.

Addresses of the authors: Chi-Chu Tsai, Kaohsiung District Agricultural Improvement Station, Pingtung 900, Taiwan or National Pingtung University of Science and Technology, Pingtung 912, Taiwan; Sheng-Chung Huang, Floricultural Research Center, Taiwan Agricultural Research Institute, Taichung 413, Taiwan; Chang-Hung Chou (e-mail: choumasa@mail.npust.edu.tw), National Pingtung University of Science and Technology, Pingtung 912, Taiwan or National Sun Yat-sen University, Kaohsiung 804, Taiwan.