Application of SRAP markers in the identification of Stylosanthes guianensis hybrids

C. Q. Huang • G. D. Liu • C. J. Bai • W. Q. Wang • J. Tang

Received: 5 May 2013 / Accepted: 14 June 2014 / Published online: 26 June 2014 - Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2014

Abstract Sequence-related amplified polymorphism (SRAP) is a new molecular marker technology developed based on polymerase chain reaction. The authenticity of 84 progenies of 8 hybrid combinations of Stylosanthes guianensis was identified by SRAP markers to select the true hybrids used in the present study. A total of 35 SRAP primer combinations were selected from the parents of 8 hybrid combinations. The selected polymorphism primer combinations were applied to identify the authenticity of all progenies. The male parents of the primer combinations had specific markers, whereas the female parents did not. 68 progenies exhibited male parent-specific bands, which were identified as true hybrids. The rest of the progenies were considered self-hybrids because of the absence of male parent-specific bands. The results of hybrid identification provided solid evidence for further studies of hybrids and demonstrated SRAP molecular markers as a useful technology for assessing the purity of S. guianensis hybrids.

Keywords Stylosanthes guianensis · Hybrid identification - SRAP markers - Male parent-specific markers

W. Q. Wang - J. Tang

G. D. Liu e-mail: liuguodao2008@163.com

Introduction

The genus Stylosanthes belongs to the family Fabaceae and consists of 48 species that are naturally distributed in the tropical, subtropical, and temperate regions of the Americas, Africa, and Southeast Asia [[1\]](#page-6-0). Each species has rich variations in morphology, physiology, and genetics. These abundant genetic resources establish an important foundation for improved hybrid breeding and morphological characteristics. S. guianensis (Aubl.) Sw. $(2n = 20)$ is the most widespread Stylosanthes species and exhibits remarkable phenotypic variations [[2,](#page-6-0) [3\]](#page-6-0). This species is one of the most important tropical forage legumes currently known and is native to South and Central America and Africa, where it is widely distributed, although not in the equatorial zone [\[2](#page-6-0)]. S. guianensis has been used successfully as a pasture legume in many parts of the tropics and subtropics [[4\]](#page-6-0).

A range of Stylosanthes species was introduced from Australia into tropical southern China in the early 1980s [[5,](#page-6-0) [6](#page-6-0)]. Stylosanthes is well-adapted to the environment of Guangdong and Hainan province. A series of Stylosanthes cultivars has been grown by selective breeding, including S. guianensis cv. Reyan No. 2 in 1991, S. guianensis cv. Reyan No. 5 in 1999, and S. guianensis cv. Reyan No. 20 in 2010. Cross breeding is commonly used to improve the characteristics of Stylosanthes and overcome the time and labor limitations of selective breeding. Thus, the hybridity of new seedlings must be verified at an early stage to assure the uniformity and stability of the field performance and yield of the crop and optimize planting time and costs.

DNA molecular marker technology, which is based on sequence variations of specific genomic regions, provides a powerful tool for hybrid identification and seed verification. This technology has the advantages of time savings,

C. Q. Huang $(\boxtimes) \cdot G$. D. Liu $(\boxtimes) \cdot C$. J. Bai \cdot

Tropical Crops Genetic Resources Institute, Chinese Academy of Tropical Agricultural Sciences/Key Laboratory of Crop Gene Resources and Germplasm Enhancement in Southern China, Ministry of Agriculture, Danzhou 571737, Hainan, China e-mail: huangchunqiong44@163.com

reduced labor consumption, and higher efficiency com-pared with other methods [\[7–11](#page-6-0)].

The main DNA marker techniques currently in application are restriction fragment length polymorphism (RFLP), random amplified polymorphic DNA (RAPD), amplified fragment length polymorphism (AFLP), simple sequence repeat (SSR), inter-simple sequence repeat (ISSR), and sequence-related amplified polymorphism (SRAP). SRAP preferentially amplifies open reading frames, which are coding sequences in the genome. SRAP can disclose numerous co-dominant markers with a large amount of polymorphic loci and allows easy isolation of bands for sequencing. It is based on two-primer amplification. The primers are 17 or 18 nucleotides long and consist of the following elements. Core sequences, which are 13–14 bases long, where the first 10 or 11 bases starting at the $5'$ end, are sequences of no specific constitution (''filler''sequences), followed by the sequence CCGG in the forward primer and AATT in the reverse primer. The core is followed by 3 selective nucleotides at the $3'$ end. The filler sequences of the forward and reverse primers must be different from each other and can be 10 or 11 bases long [[12\]](#page-6-0). This technique can generate more polymorphic fragments that reveal genetic diversity than SSR, ISSR, or RAPD markers [\[13](#page-6-0)]. Ferriol et al. [\[14](#page-6-0)] showed that the information provided by SRAP markers is more consistent with the morphological variability and evolutionary history of the morphotypes than that obtained from AFLP markers. Therefore, SRAP markers are ideal molecular markers for genotype identification, map construction, gene tagging, and genomic and cDNA fingerprinting, such as in the diversity analysis of buffalo grass [\[13](#page-6-0), [15](#page-6-0), [16\]](#page-6-0). Thus far,

Table 1 Hybrid combinations and progenies of S. guianensis

few studies that use SRAP markers for true hybrid identification have been reported.

Many methods for hybrids identification most focused on SSR, RAPD and AFLP molecular markers, few focused of SRAP molecular makers. Considering these advantages, the present study detects true hybrids of S. guianensis using SRAP markers. The specific goals of the study are: (1) to assess the feasibility of the SRAP technique in the study of S. guianensis and (2) to identify true S. guianensis hybrids using SRAP markers.

Materials and methods

Plant materials

Table 1 shows the 84 hybrids generated by 8 hybrid combinations of 12 parents $[1,979(D) \times 109(P),$ $1979(D) \times 106(P)$, $3079(D) \times 45(P)$, $3183(D) \times 96(P)$, $3206(D) \times 16(P)$, $3265(D) \times 16(P)$, $3268(D) \times 16(P)$, and $3321(D) \times 109(P)$] that were used in this study. The female parents were male-sterile. Each hybrids and the parents $(n = 3)$ were grown in 20 cm diameter pots under uniform conditions in the greenhouse of the Tropical Crops Genetic Resources Institute, Chinese Academy of Tropical Agricultural Sciences (Hainan Island).

DNA extraction

Total genomic DNA was isolated according to the modified hexadecyltrimethylammonium bromide (CTAB) DNA extraction procedure described by Huang et al. [[17\]](#page-6-0). The

Table 2 List of the forward and reverse SRAP primers used in the present study

Name	Forward primer $(5'–3')$	Name	Reverse primer $(5'–3')$
Me1	TGAGTCCAAACCGGATA	Em1	GACTGCGTACGAATTAAT
Me ₂	TGAGTCCAAACCGGAGC	Em2	GACTGCGTACGA ATTTGC
Me ₃	TGAGTCCAAACCGGAAT	Em3	GACTGCGTACGAATTGAC
Me ₄	TGAGTCCAAACCGGACC	Em4	GACTGCGTACGAATTTGA
Me ₅	TGAGTCCAAACCGGAAG	Em ₅	GACTGCGTACGAATTAAC
Me7	TGAGTCCAAACCGGTAG	E _m 6	GACTGCGTACGAATTGCA
Me ₈	TGAGTCCAAACCGGTAA	Em7	GACTGCGTACGAATTCGA
Me9	TGAGTCCAAACCGGTCC	Em8	GACTGCGTACGAATTCAA
Me10	TGAGTCCAAACCGGTGC	Em9	GACTGCGTACGAATTCTG
Me11	TGAGTCCAAACCGGT	Em10	GACTGCGTACGAATTAGC

Table 3 The 100 SRAP primer combinations used in the present study

	Me1	Me2	Me ₃	Me4	Me ₅	Me7	Me8	Me9	Me10	Me11
Em1	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10
Em2	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Em3	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
Em4	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40
Em ₅	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50
Em ₆	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60
Em7	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70
Em8	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80
Em9	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90
Em10	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100

quality and quantity of genomic DNA were estimated by measuring A260/A280 using a UV spectrophotometer. The intactness of the genomic DNA was verified by gel electrophoresis [[18](#page-6-0)]. The DNA concentration was adjusted to 50 ng/ μ L to facilitate polymerase chain reaction (PCR) amplification. DNA samples were stored at -20 °C until use.

SRAP PCR amplification

A total of 100 primer combinations, including 10 forward and 10 reverse primers, from Sheng Gong Inc. (Shanghai, China) were tested by PCR (Tables 2, 3) [[12\]](#page-6-0).

Each $25 \mu L$ PCR reaction mixture contained 80 ng of genomic DNA, $0.4 \mu M$ primer, $250 \mu M$ dNTPs, $1.5 \mu M$ $MgCl₂$, 1.5 units of Taq polymerase, and 2.5 µL of $1 \times PCR$ buffer. The mixtures were overlaid with 20–30 µL of mineral oil. DNA amplification was performed using a Thermal Cycler (Bio-Rad S1000 TM , USA)</sup> under the following conditions: initial denaturation at 94 °C for 4 min, followed by 5 cycles of 1 min denaturation at 94 °C, 1 min annealing at 35 °C, and 30 s elongation at 72 °C. Denaturation at 94 °C for 1 min, annealing at 52 °C for 1 min, and elongation at 72 °C for 1 min were conducted in the following 30 cycles. Each cycle ended with an elongation step for 10 min at 72 $^{\circ}$ C. The amplified products were stored at 4° C until analysis. The amplification products were separated by electrophoresis on 1.5 % (w/v) agarose gel in $1.0 \times$ TBE buffer (0.09 mol/L Tris- H_3BO_3 , 0.002 mol/L EDTA, pH 8.0) at a constant voltage of 100 V for approximately 1.5 h. GoldView (0.5 µg/mL) was added to facilitate UV light visualization. Molecular weights were estimated using a 100 bp DNA ladder.

Results

SRAP analysis

The primers were selected for their ability to yield clear, polymorphic, and reproducible patterns of amplification. Polymorphisms observed between male and female parents were used as markers to assess the purity of the hybrids. Only 35 of the 100 SRAP primer combinations tested generated multiple fragments between the 8 hybrid combinations of 12 parents (Table [4](#page-3-0)), 75 were rejected for failing to produce amplification or displaying monomorphic patterns. These 35 primer combinations were chosen for further analysis on the basis of their capability to facilitate good amplification. SRAP analysis results in

Table 4 The 35 SRAP primer combinations used in the present study

Code	Primer combinations	Code	Primer combinations	Code	Primer combinations	Code	Primer combinations
01	$Me1-Em1$	95	$Me5$ -Em 10	57	$Me8$ -Em 6	12	$Me2$ -Em 2
41	$Me1-Em5$	07	$Me8$ -Em1	87	$Me8$ -Em 9	92	$Me2$ -Em10
71	$Me1-Em8$	06	$Me7$ -Em1	97	$Me8$ -Em 10	09	$Me10$ -Em1
03	$Me3$ -Em1	16	$Me7$ -Em 2	08	$Me9-Em1$	29	$Me10$ -Em 3
13	$Me3$ -Em2	66	$Me7$ -Em 7	28	$Me9$ -Em 3	39	$Me10$ -Em4
23	$Me3$ -Em 3	46	$Me7$ -Em5	48	$Me9$ -Em5	69	$Me10$ -Em 7
83	$Me3$ -Em 9	56	$Me7$ -Em 6	58	$Me9$ -Em 6	89	$Me10$ -Em 9
14	$Me4$ -Em 2	17	$Me8$ -Em 2	68	$Me9-Em7$		
34	$Me4$ -Em4	47	$Me8$ -Em5	02	$Me2$ -Em1		

Table 5 Filtering results of the primer combinations

Table 5 show that: (1) only 4 (11.43 $\%$) of the 35 primer combinations generated male parent-special markers in hybrid combination 2 (1,979 \times 109), with a total of 4 male parent-special markers; (2) 24 primer combinations (68.57 %) produced male parent-special markers in hybrid combination 4 (1,979 \times 106), with a total of 40 male parent-special markers; (3) 4 primer combinations (11.43 %) produced male parent-special markers in hybrid combination 7 (3,079 \times 45), with a total of 5 male parent-special markers; (4) 3 primer combinations (8.57 %) produced male parent-special markers in hybrid combination 16 $(3,183 \times 96)$, with a total of 3 male parent-special markers; (5) 4 primer combinations (11.43 %) produced male parentspecial markers in hybrid combination 19 (3,206 \times 16), with a total of 5 male parent-special markers; (6) 5 primer combinations (14.29 %) produced male parent-special markers in hybrid combination 21 (3,265 \times 16), with a total of 9 male parent-special markers; (7) 6 primer combinations (17.14 %) produced male parent-special markers in hybrid combination 22 (3,268 \times 16), with a total of 10 male parent-special markers; and (8) 3 primer combinations (8.57 %) produced male parent-special markers in hybrid combination 28 (3,321 \times 109), with a total of 5 male parent-special markers.

Figure [1](#page-4-0) shows that three primer combinations, namely, Me1-Em1, Me3-Em9, and Me4-Em2, could be used to determine hybrid purity because they exhibit polymorphic bands between the male and female parents in hybrid combination 4 (1,979 \times 106).

Hybrid identification

Only the primer combinations that amplified male parentspecific bands of each hybrid were considered to verify hybrid purity. Table [6](#page-4-0) shows the following: (1) Primer combination Me1Em8 verifies that 2-01 is a true hybrid whereas 2-07 is not a true hybrid in hybrid combination 2 $(1,979 \times 109)$. (2) Primer combination Me4-Em2 can verify hybrid purity in hybrid combination four $(1,979 \times 106)$ because it exhibits two bands (950 and 1,450 bp) in the progenies, which are specific to the respective male parents in all cases. The 9 progenies of hybrid combination 4 $(1,979 \times 106)$ have 1 or 2 male-special bands except for 4-08. Thus, these progenies may be verified as true hybrids

Fig. 1 Polymorphic bands of SRAP primer combinations between parents in hybrid combination 4 (1,979 \times 106) Note: M: 50 bp ladder marker; the arrowhead indicates the polymorphic bands in the male parent; the odd numbers represent male parents, whereas the even

numbers signify female parents. The primer combinations were Me1- Em1, Me1-Em5, Me1-Em8, Me3-Em1, Me3-Em2, Me3-Em3, Me3- Em9, Me4-Em2, Me4-Em4, and Me5-Em10

Name of hybrid combinations	Numbers of the hybrids	Primer combinations	True hybrids	Total numbers of the true hybrids	
2	\overline{c}	Me1-Em8 $2 - 01$		1	
4	10	Me4-Em2	4-01, 4-02, 4-03, 4-09, 4-11, 4-12, 4-13, $4-15, 4-16$	9	
7	6	$Me5$ -Em 10	$7-01,7-18$	2	
16	$\overline{4}$	Me1-Em8	16-04, 16-06, 16-07, 16-08	4	
19	11	$Me5$ -Em 10	19-07	1	
21	28	Me9-Em1	21-01, 21-02, 21-03, 21-04, 21-05, 21-14, 21-16, 21-19, 21-20, 21-22, 21-23, 21-28, 21-29, 21-31, 21-32, 21-37, 21-40, 21-41, 21-44, 21-46, 21-51, 21-52, 21-53, 21-54, 21-60, 21-69, 21-70, 21-71	28	
22	18	$Me5$ -Em 10	22-01, 22-03, 22-04, 22-06, 22-07, 22-09, 22-10, 22-11, 22-12, 22-13, 22-14, 22-15, 22-16, 22-17, 22-18, 22-19, 22-20, 22-21	18	
		Me10-Em7	22-01, 22-03, 22-04, 22-06, 22-07, 22-09, 22-10, 22-11, 22-12, 22-13, 22-14, 22-15, 22-16, 22-17, 22-18, 22-19, 22-20, 22-21		
		Me8-Em1	22-01, 22-03, 22-04, 22-06, 22-07, 22-09, 22-10, 22-11, 22-12, 22-19, 22-20, $22 - 21$		
		Me4-Em2	22-01, 22-03, 22-04, 22-06, 22-07, 22-09, 22-10, 22-11, 22-12, 22-13, 22-14, 22-15, 22-16, 22-17, 22-18, 22-19, 22-20, 22-21		
28	5	Me8-Em9	28-01, 28-03, 28-04, 28-05, 29-07	5	
		$Me5$ -Em 10	28-01, 28-03, 28-04, 28-05, 29-07		
Total	84			68	

Table 6 Hybrid identification results

(4-01, 4-02, 4-03, 4-09, 4-11, 4-12, 4-13, 4-15, 4-16). Hybrid 4-08 is not a pure hybrid (Fig. [2](#page-5-0)). (3) Two progenies are pure hybrids (7-01, 7-18), whereas 4 progenies (7-03, 7-08, 7-17, 7-19) are not true hybrids in hybrid combination 7 $(3,079 \times 45)$. Hybrid purity may be verified by Me5Em10. (4) Four progenies in hybrid combination 7 (3,079 \times 45) are pure hybrids (16-04, 16-06, 16-07, 16-08), as verified by Me1Em8. (5) Only 19-07 is a true hybrid in hybrid

Fig. 2 SRAP patterns obtained from hybrid combination 4 $(1,979 \times 106)$, as determined by the Me4-Em2 primer combination. Note: M: standard DNA (50 bp ladder marker). Lanes 1–10: fragments from hybrids; the arrowhead indicates male parent-specific markers. The hybrids obtained include 4-01, 4-02, 4-03, 4-08, 4-09, 4-11, 4-12, 4-13, 4-15, 4-16

combination 19 (3,206 \times 16). All other progenies are not true hybrids (19-06, 19-07, 19-08, 19-09, 19-10, 19-11, 19-12, 19-13, 19-14, 19-15,19-16), as verified by Me5Em10. (6) Twenty-eight progenies of hybrid combination 21 $(3,265 \times 16)$ are true hybrids $(21-01, 21-02, 21-03, 21-04,$ 21-05, 21-14, 21-16, 21-19, 21-20, 21-22, 21-23, 21-28, 21-29, 21-31, 21-32, 21-37, 21-40, 21-41, 21-44, 21-46, 21-51, 21-52, 21-53, 21-54, 21-60, 21-69, 21-70, 21-71); these findings may be verified by Me9Em1. (7) Eighteen progenies in hybrid combination 22 (3,268 \times 16) are true hybrids (22-01, 22-03, 22-04, 22-06, 22-07, 22-09, 22-10, 22-11, 22-12, 22-13, 22-14, 22-15, 22-16, 22-17, 22-18, 22-19, 22-20, 22-21), as verified by Me5Em10, Me10Em7, Me8Em1, and Me4Em2. (8) Five progenies in hybrid combination $28(3,321 \times 109)$ are true hybrids (28-01, 28-03, 28-04, 28-05, 29-07), as verified by Me5Em10 and Me8Em9.

Discussion

Identification of hybrid authenticity is important in crossbreeding. The rapid and accurate identification of hybrid authenticity is an important basis of cross-breeding. However, not all types of markers are suitable and or feasible for identification and characterization of the hybrids. Traditionally, grow-out trails (GOTs) has been widely applied to hybrid identification in a variety of crops, which involve growing a representative sample of the seed followed by analysis of several morphological characteristics in different developmental stages. However, GOTs is time-consuming and costly, and requires extensive use of land. Furthermore, GOTs is easily affected by growing conditions which making the determination difficult [[19\]](#page-6-0). Isozyme electrophoresis technologies also have been employed for hybrid identification, but the limitation of this method is their failure to detect polymorphisms in closely related lines. Thus, more sensitive methods are necessary to test and determine hybrid purity. This has shifted the focus to DNA-based molecular markers.

With the advantages of time- and resource-saving, less labor-consumption and more precision, molecular markers are becoming vital tools for cultivar identification and seed quality control in many crops. Recently, several molecular markers, such as SSR [\[19–21](#page-6-0)], RAPD [\[10](#page-6-0), [22,](#page-6-0) [23\]](#page-6-0), ISSR [\[24](#page-6-0), [25](#page-6-0)], and AFLP [\[26\]](#page-6-0) have been extensively used for the identification of hybrids. However, studies that use SRAP for true hybrid identification have rarely been reported. The present study developed a method to identify S. guianensis hybrids. The authenticity of 84 progenies of 8 hybrid combinations of S. guianensis was identified by SRAP markers. Sixty-eight (80.95 %) progenies exhibited male parent-specific bands and were thus identified as true hybrids. These true hybrids could be used for map construction and cross-breeding in S. Guianensis.

This study is the first to apply DNA markers to identify the purity of S. guianensis hybrids. A new, simple, and low-cost method was presented in this study. The proposed method may be used in S. guianensis breeding programs worldwide. Our experimental results indicate that SRAP technology is a powerful and efficient approach for hybrid identification. Several studies that employ the SRAP technique to assess the genetic diversity of several crops, such as Pennisetum purpureum Schumach [[27\]](#page-6-0), Lactuca sp. [\[28](#page-6-0)], Salvia miltiorrhiza Bge [[29\]](#page-6-0), and Cynodon Radiatus [[30\]](#page-6-0), have been published. SRAP markers offer several advantages over other available molecule techniques, including production of highly specific polymorphic fragments and low requirements of DNA amount and quality.

The SRAP profiles of 84 hybrids and their respective parents show that the SRAP marker technique has good potential application in the identification of S. guianensis hybrids. Potential primers depicting distinct and good polymorphic markers may be used for the identification, registration, and protection of S. guianensis.

Conclusions

This study demonstrates the feasibility of applying SRAP markers to indentify the authenticity of hybrid progenies. A total of 84 progenies were determined. Sixty-eight (80.95 %) of these progenies that exhibited male parent-specific bands were identified as true hybrids. The remaining 16 progenies were self-hybrids because of the absence of male parentspecific bands. These true hybrids will be used for map construction and cross-breeding in S. Guianensis.

Acknowledgments The authors acknowledge the editors and anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments, all of which

helped improve this manuscript. This work was supported by national nonprofit institute research grant of CATAS-TCGRI (No.16300320 14028), the modern agro-industry technology research system (No.CARS-35), and science and technology support program found (No.2011BAD17B01-01-5).

References

- 1. Costa NMS, Ferreira MB (1984) Some Brazilian species of Stylosanthes. In: Stace HM, Edye LA (eds) The biology and agronomy of Stylosanthes. Academic Press, Sydney, pp 53–101
- 2. Williams RJ, Reid R, Schhult ze-Kraft R et al (1984) Natural distribution of Stylosanthes. In: S tace HM, Edye LA (eds) The biology and agronomy of Stylosanthes. Sydney, Academic Press, pp 73–101
- 3. Vieira MLC, Aguiar-perecin MLR, Martins PS (1993) A cytotaxonomic study in twelve Brazilian taxa of Stylosanthes Sw Leguminosae. Cytologia 58:305–311
- 4. Burt RL, Miller CP (1975) Stylosanthes—a source of pasture legumes. Trop grasslands 9:117–123
- 5. Hwang MY, Wun LX, Zhang CZ (1986) The main varieties of forages and their evaluation in Southern China. In: proceedings of an international workshop, Cisarua, Indonesia, 19–23 August, 1985. p.202. (ACIAR Proceedings Series No.12)
- 6. Michalk DL, Fund NP Zhu CM (1993) Improvement of dry tropical rangelands in Hainan Island. Soc Range Manag 46:331–339
- 7. Hu J, Quiros CF (1991) Identification of broccoli and cauliflower cultivars with RAPD markers. Plant Cell Rep 10:505–511
- 8. Mongkolporn O, Dokmaihom Y, Kanchana-Udomkan C et al (2004) Genetic purity test of F1 hybrid Capsicum using molecular analysis. J Hortic Sci Biotechnol 79:449–451
- 9. Dongre A, Parkhi V (2005) Identification of cotton hybrid through the combination of PCR based RAPD, ISSR and microsatellite markers. J Plant Biochem Biotechnol 14:53–55
- 10. Liu LW, Yan W, Gong YQ et al (2007) Assessment of genetic purity of tomato (Lycopersicon esculentum L.) hybrid using molecular markers. Sci Hortic-Amsterdam 115:7–12
- 11. Garg A, Singh AK, Prabhu KV et al (2006) Utility of a fertility restorer gene linked marker for testing genetic purity of hybrid seeds in rice (Oryza sativa L.). Seed Sci Technol 34:9–18
- 12. Li G, Quiros CF (2001) Sequence-related amplified polymorphism (SRAP), a new marker system based on a simple PCR reaction: its application to mapping and gene tagging in Brassica. Theor Appl Genet 103:455–461
- 13. Budak H, Shearman RC, Parmaksiz I et al (2004) Comparative analysis of seeded and vegetative biotype buffalograsses based on phylogenetic relationship using ISSRs, SSRs, RAPDs, and SRAPs. Theor Appl Genet 109:280–288
- 14. Ferriol M, Picó B, Nuez F (2003) Genetic diversity of a germplasm collection of Cucurbita pepo using SRAP and AFLP markers. Theor Appl Genet 107:271–282
- 15. Budak H, Shearman RC, Parmaksiz I (2004) Molecular characterization of buffalograss germplasm using sequence-related amplied polymorphism markers. Theor Appl Genet 108:328–334
- 16. Budak H, Shearman RC, Gaussoin RE et al (2004) Application of sequence-related amplified polymorphism markers for characterization of turfgrass species. HortScience 39:955–958
- 17. Huang CQ, Huang DY, Zhang YF et al (2010) Genetic analysis for 57 accessions of Cynodon dactylon from 17 countries in 6 continents by SRAP markers. Trop grassl 44:274–281
- 18. Dongre AB, Raut MP, Bhandarkar MR et al (2011) Identification and genetic purity testing of cotton F1 hybrid using molecular markers. Indian J Biotechnol 10:301–306
- 19. Wu M, Jia X, Tian L et al (2010) Rapid and reliable purity identification of F1 hybrids of Maize (Zea may L.) using SSR markers. Maize Genomics Genet 1:1–4
- 20. Wang J, Zhong GY, Chin ECL et al (2002) Identification of parents of F1 hybrids through SSR profiling of maternal and hybrid tissue. Euphytica 124:29–34
- 21. Akhare AA, Sakhare SB, Kulwal PL et al (2008) RAPD profile studies in Sorghum for identification of hybrids and their parents. Int J Integr Biol 3:18–24
- 22. Hulya I (2003) RAPD markers assisted varietal identification and genetic purity test in pepper, Capsicum annuum. Sci Hortic-Amsterdam 97:211–218
- 23. Gomea SM, Denwar NN, Ramasubramanian T et al (2008) Identification of Peanut hybrids using microsatellite markers and horizontal polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis. Peanut Sci 35:123–129
- 24. Dongre AB, Raut MP, Bhandarkar MR et al (2011) Identification and genetic purity testing of cotton F1 hybrid using molecular markers. Indian J Biotechnol 10:301–306
- 25. Lo Bianco C, Fernándea JA, Migliaro D et al (2011) Identification of F1 hybrids of artichoke by ISSR markers and morphological analysis. Mol Breed 27:157–170
- 26. Lubell JD, Brand MH, Lehrer JM (2008) AFLP identification of Berberis thunbergii cultivars, inter-specific hybrids, and their parental species. J Hortic Sci Biotechnol 83:55–63
- 27. Xie XM, Zhou F, Zhang XQ et al (2009) Genetic variability and relationship between MT-1 elephant grass and closely related cultivars assessed by SRAP markers. J Genet 88:281–290
- 28. van Treuren R, van Hintum ThJL (2009) Comparison of anonymous and targeted molecular markers for the estimation of genetic diversity in ex situ conserved Lactuca. Theor Appl Genet 119:1265–1279
- 29. Song ZQ, Li XF, Wang HG et al (2010) Genetic diversity and population structure of Salvia miltiorrhiza Bge in China revealed by ISSR and SRAP. Genetica 138:241–249
- 30. Huang CQ, Zhang YF, Liu GD et al (2012) Genetic diversity of Cynodon Radiatus assessed by sequence-related amplified polymorphism markers. Biochem Syst Ecol 40:56–61