





Genetic diversity refers to the variation of <u>genes</u> within species, that is, the heritable variation within and between populations of organisms. In the end, all variation resides in the sequence of the four <u>base pairs</u> that compose the DNA molecule and, as such, constitute the genetic code. Other kinds of genetic diversity can also be identified at all levels of organisation in the nucleus, including the amount of DNA per cell, chromosome number and <u>DNA</u> structure.

The generation of new genetic variation occurs continuously in individuals through chromosomal and gene mutations, which, in organisms with sexual reproduction, are propagated by recombination. Genetic variation is also influenced by selection. The consequences of these phenomena are changes in gene and <u>allele</u> frequencies that account for the evolution of populations. Similar situations can occur through artificial selection such as breeding.



Plant <u>genetic resources</u> comprise the present genetic variation that is potentially useful for the future of humankind. These resources include traditional varieties, <u>landraces</u>, commercial cultivars, <u>hybrids</u>, and other plant materials developed through breeding; wild relatives of crop species; and others that could be used in the future for either agriculture or environmental benefits. Hence, plant genetic resources should be conserved, with the ultimate reason being to eventually use them as a source of potentially useful genetic variation.



To conserve and use genetic variation, it should first be assessed, that is, the extent and its distribution need to be determined. Variation can be evaluated on the phenotypic and genotypic levels. Assessment of phenotypic variation focuses on morphological traits—those characteristics that define the shape and appearance of a set of individuals. Some of these traits can be considered as 'genetic' if their presence in related individuals is heritable and not dependent on the environment, meaning that they are associated with a particular DNA sequence.

Assessment of genotypic variation is at the level of the DNA molecule responsible for transmitting genetic information. The DNA molecule is composed of <u>nucleotides</u>, which are organised in a <u>double-helix</u> configuration in increasing levels of complexity up to the chromosomal units.



A <u>genetic marker</u> is a measurable <u>character</u> that can detect variation in either a <u>protein</u> or DNA sequence. A difference, whether phenotypic or genotypic, may act as a genetic marker if it identifies characteristics of an individual's genotype and/or phenotype, and if its inheritance can be followed through different generations.

A genetic trait may not have necessarily observable consequences on an individual's performance. Sometimes, however, this trait may be linked to, or correlated with, other traits that are more difficult to measure and do affect the individual's performance. In such cases, these unobservable genetic traits may be used as genetic markers for the linked traits because they indirectly indicate the presence of the characteristics of interest. The two measures can be correlated, using an analysis of inheritance and studying the distribution of the characteristics in both parents and offspring.





Traditionally, diversity within and between populations was determined by assessing differences in morphology. These measures have the advantage of being readily available, do not require sophisticated equipment and are the most direct measure of phenotype, thus they are available for immediate use, an important attribute. However, morphological determinations need to be taken by an expert in the species, they are subject to changes due to environmental factors and may vary at different developmental stages and their number is limited.



To overcome the limitations of morphological traits, other markers have been developed at both the protein level (phenotype) and the DNA level (genotype). Protein markers are usually named 'biochemical markers' but, more and more, they are mistakenly considered as a common class under the so-called 'molecular markers'.

Protein markers (seed storage proteins and <u>isozymes</u>) are generated through <u>electrophoresis</u>, taking advantage of the migrational properties of proteins and <u>enzymes</u>, and revealed by histochemical stains specific to the enzymes being assayed.

Detecting polymorphisms—detectable differences at a given marker occurring among individuals—in protein markers is a technique that shares some of the advantages of using morphological ones. However, protein markers are also limited by being influenced by the environment and changes in different developmental stages. Even so, isozymes are a robust complement to the simple morphometric analysis of variation.

![](_page_9_Figure_0.jpeg)

DNA polymorphisms can be detected in nuclear and organellar DNA, which is found in mitochondria and chloroplasts. Molecular markers concern the DNA molecule itself and, as such, are considered to be objective measures of variation. They are not subject to environmental influences; tests can be carried out at any time during plant development; and, best of all, they have the potential of existing in unlimited numbers, covering the entire genome.

Many different types of molecular markers with different properties exist, as we show below.

![](_page_10_Figure_0.jpeg)

A good marker is:

- *Polymorphic*, that is, it is variable among individuals. The degree of polymorphism detected depends on the technology used to measure it.
- *Reproducible in any laboratory experiment*, whether within experimental events in the same laboratory or between different laboratories performing identical experiments.
- <u>Codominant.</u> Depending on the type of application, the selected technology must be able to detect the marker's different forms, distinguishing between homozygotes and heterozygotes (codominant inheritance). A heterozygous individual shows simultaneously the combined genotype of the two homozygous parents.
- *Evenly distributed throughout the genome*. The more distributed and dense genome coverage is, the better the assessment of polymorphism.
- *Discriminating*, that is, able to detect differences between closely related individuals.
- Not subject to environmental influences. The inference of a marker's genotype should be independent of the environment in which the individual lives or its developmental stage.
- *Neutral.* The allele present at the marker <u>locus</u> is independent of, and has no effect on, the selection pressure exerted on the individual. This is usually an assumption, because no data are usually available to confirm or deny this property.
- *Inexpensive*. Easy, fast and cheap in detecting across numerous individuals. If possible, the equipment should be of multipurpose use in the experiment.

Markers	Number	Codominant	Polymorphism	Locus Specificity	Technicity	Cost
Isozymes	< 90	Yes	Low	Yes	Low	Low
RFLP	Unlimited	Yes	Medium	Yes	High	Medium
RAPD	Unlimited	No	Medium	No	Low	Low
DAF	Unlimited	No	Very high	No	Low	Low
AP-PCR	Unlimited	No	Very high	No	Low	Low
Microsatellites	Unlimited	Yes	Very high	Yes	Low <sup>a</sup>	Low <sup>a</sup>
SCAR	Unlimited <sup>b</sup>	Yes/no	Low/medium	Yes	Medium	Low
CAPS	Unlimited <sup>b</sup>	Yes	Low/medium	Yes	Medium	Low
ISSR	Unlimited	No	High	Yes	Low/medium	Low/medium
AFLP	Unlimited	No	High	No	Medium	Medium
Sequencing	Unlimited	Yes	High	Yes/no	High	High
EST	Unlimited	Yes	Low/medium	Yes	Medium	Medium
SNP	Unlimited	Yes	Very high	Yes	High	High

Here we compare major techniques that use biochemical and molecular markers to identify genetic diversity. Criteria used to assign levels within each column (yes/no, low/ medium/high, etc.) are based on experience and results described in the literature. We cannot provide a number, or even a range, for each item and its technology because results are highly dependent on the species under study. However, the table gives an objective notion of how techniques can be compared among themselves for a given species and the items in the columns.

<u>RFLP</u>	Restriction fragment length polymorphism
<u>RAPD</u>	Random amplified polymorphic DNA
DAF	DNA amplification fingerprinting
<u>AP-PCR</u>	Arbitrarily primed polymerase chain reaction
<u>SCAR</u>	Sequence-characterised amplified region
<u>CAPS</u>	Cleaved amplified polymorphic sequence
<u>ISSR</u>	Inter-simple sequence repeat
<u>AFLP</u>	Amplified fragment length polymorphism
EST	Expressed sequence tag
SNP	Single nucleotide polymorphism

# Costs: how major technologies differ

Procedure	Item	Est. costs (USD, 2002), 96 samples	RFLP	SSR	RAPD	AFLP	Comments
DNA extractions	10		5.40- 101.40	5.40	5.40	5.40	96 microp <mark>reps vs. 96</mark> large preps
	Centrifuge and/or microcentrifuge tubes	2.40					
	Or, 96-well plate	3.50				and the second	
	Or, 50-ml <mark>tubes (large</mark> preps)	24.00					1999
	Extraction buffer	2.00-50.00				hard	96 micropreps vs. 96 large preps
	Misc. supplies (alcohol, lysis buffer,tips, etc.)	1.00-25.00	15	XX	a second		-
Agarose electrophoresis			23.00	[23.00]	23.00	[23.00]	[] = optional, quality checking only
	Agarose	10.00 (2 gels)			a second second		
	Running buffer	13.00 (2 gels)			100		
Acrylamide gel electrophoresis				1.50	1.50	A. Series	14 Million
AN AR	Acrylamide	0.75 (1 gel)		BAR DAY	13 Ca 14 S (		A STATE OF A STATE
	Urea	0.75 (1 gel)					
and the second second	Running buffer	_a			12.		
Sequencing gel electrophoresis			No.	4.06		4.06	
	Fluorescent primers	2.56	A SALAN AND		C. States		
	Gel ( <i>see</i> Acrylamide gel electrophoresis)	1.50	-	1.50			
Ethidium bromide method of visualisation			0.20-2.00	0.20-2.00	0.20-2.00		
	Ethidium bromide						
	Photograph of gel	0.20-2.00 (2 gels)	Ster	Maria and		S. S. N	High-density paper vs. polaroid

<sup>a</sup> - = negligible cost.

Continued on slide 14

### Costs: how major technologies differ (continued)

Procedure	Item	Est. costs (USD, 2002), 96 samples	<b>RFLP</b> <sup>a</sup>	SSR	RAPD	AFLP	Comments
PCR	1			74.30	74.30	74.30	N. AN
	Taq p <mark>olym</mark> erase	50					1.5 U/rxn. <mark>\$\$ will</mark> drop sharply when patent ends
and the second second second	dNTPs	24					and the second second
CALL AND AND A	primers	0.30-0.40			and the second second		
and the second se	PCR buffer with MgCl <sub>2</sub>					31	
Restriction enzyme digests			0.30-30.00			hear	
	Enzymes	0.30-30.00				Total (	~10 units/sample, highly variable prices
Southern blotting			30.50	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	100 Jak		
SUST:	Buffers (HCI, NaOH)	4 (2 gels)	and the second second		and the second		
5.4 / S.S.	Nylon membrane	24 (2 gels)		1000	19. A.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Cost is reduced with every reuse of the filter
	Whatman paper	2.50 (2 gels)			1. States and the		Automation of the
Hybridisation			3.35				Hybridising one probe to 96 samples
and the second second second	Buffer	_b				Cases 1	
	ST DNA (or other blocker)	0.30	Sec.				
	LS labelling mix	0.30	1000		Sec. And Sec.	A.	
	Radioisotope (32P)	2.50		and the second se			- A Star Barris
	Miscellaneous reagents, tubes	0.25	-	1260			
TOTUO			00 75 400 05	05 40 440 00	101 10 100 00	00 70 400 70	
IDIALS			62.75-190.25	85.16-110.26	104.40-106.20	83.76-106.76	
(per 96 samples)		No.	(MAS vs. mapping)		1 - 6 - 8	1210	

<sup>a</sup> = PCR not needed for the RFLP procedure. Probes can be PCR'd to save time, minimal cost <sup>b</sup> - = negligible cost

#### **Costs: estimates of general costs**

Procedure	Item	Cost (USD, 2002 est.)	Approx. cost per sample (USD, 2002, est.)	Comments
DNA extractions				
	Centrifuge and/or microcentrifuge tubes	\$25/1000	0.075	
The second s	Or, 96-well plate	\$3.50	0.04	
	Extraction buffer	(\$2/litre)	0.02-0.50	microprep vs.large prep
	Tris	\$270/5 Kg		
and the second second second	Sorbitol	\$70/5 Kg		
	Misc. (EDTA, etc.)			A STATE AND A STAT
	Misc. supplies (alcohol, lysis buffer, tips,etc.)		0.01-0.25	
	Drill and pestle (optional)	\$100		a second s
	Genogrinder (optional)	\$8000		
	Leaf crusher (optional)	\$500		
Agarose electrophoresis	19. 20			
	Agarose	\$365/500g	0.11	6 g/gel, ~40 samples/gel
	Running buffer (Tris, EDTA, NaAc)	\$6.50/litre	0.05	
	Horizontal gel system	\$400		
	Power supply	\$400 (2 outlets)		
Acrylamide gel electrophoresis				~96 samples/gel
	Acrylamide	\$30/100 ml		
and a second second	Urea	\$42/500 g		
M. C. C. C. L. M. C. L	Vertical gel system	\$1000		
ALCONTRACTOR AND A CONTRACTOR A	Power supply	\$400 (2 outlets)		
	Gel dryer	\$1500		
Sequencing gel electrophoresis				
	Fluorescent primers	\$40/1500 samples	0.03	
	Gel	\$3		
	Size standards	\$12/gel		
	Software for gel analysis	< \$100,000		
	Sequencing gel equipment	\$100,000	and the second second	

Continued on slide 16

The costs presented here assume that a basic laboratory is available and set up with glassware, plasticware, heater/stirrers, pH meter, balance, refrigerator, freezer, distilled water, pipettes and tips, centrifuge.

These costs vary between countries, and have been calculated according to U.S. prices. Because costs in many countries will be higher, the ones shown here should be taken as indicative and used to compare different technologies and alternative equipment.

15

## Costs: estimates of general costs (continued)

Procedure	Item	Cost (USD, 2002, est.)	Approx. cost per sample (USD, 2002, est.)	Comments
Ethidium bromide method of visualisation	/ Banara Bill			
	Ethidium bromide	\$100/10 g	_a	Can be reused, to last a long time
	Transilluminator	\$1000-\$2000		
	Photography equipment	\$3000-12,000		Highly variable system types
	Photograph of gel	\$0.10-\$1.00	0.0025-0.025	High-density paper vs. polaroid; ~40 samples/gel
PCR				AND
	Thermocycler	\$7000-\$23,000		96-well - tetrad (four 96-well plates)
	Taq polymerase	\$170/500 units	0.51	1.5 U/rxn. \$\$ will drop sharply when patent ends
	dNTPs	\$250/set of 4	0.25	
	Primers	\$15-\$25	0.0025-0.0042	
4.R.	PCR buffer with MgCl <sub>2</sub>		N	
Restriction enzyme digests				
and the	Enzymes	\$0.003-\$0.30/unit	0.03-3.00	~10 units/sample, highly variable prices
	Incubator	\$500-\$1000		
Southern blotting				
	Buffers (HCI, NaOH)	\$1.00/litre (avg.)		
	Nylon membrane	\$180/roll	6.00/filter (20x10cm)	
	Whatman paper	\$124/pack 100 large sheets	-	
NO.	Blotting system (sponges, tray)	\$15		
Hybridisation		NY STREET		
	Buffer			
	ST DNA (or other blocker)	\$306/10 g	0.30	0.15 ml. 1 ml used/50 ml hybrid'n buffer
	LS labelling mix	\$125/50 unit	0.30	
	Shaking incubator	\$2500	1. 1. 200	
	Radioisotope ( <sup>32</sup> P)	\$120/100 µl	2.40	
	Misc. reagents		TRANK OF T	
	Environmental expenses			
	Waste removal	\$500∧month		
	Shielding	\$300/\station		

<sup>a</sup> - = negligible cost

![](_page_16_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Figure_0.jpeg)

#### **Basic references**

- Ayad, W.G., T. Hodgkin, A. Jaradat and V. Ramanatha Rao. 1997. Molecular genetic techniques for plant genetic resources. Report of an IPGRI workshop, 9-11 October 1995, Rome. IPGRI, Rome.
- Brown, S.M. and S. Kresovich. 1996. Molecular characterization for plant genetic resources conservation. Pp. 85-93 in Genome Mapping in Plants (H. Paterson, ed.). R.G. Landes Company, Georgetown, TX.
- Karp, A., K.J. Edwards, M. Bruford, S. Funk, B. Vosman, M. Morgante, O. Seberg, A. Kremer, P. Boursot, P. Arctander, D. Tautz and G.M. Hewitt. 1997. Molecular technologies for biodiversity evaluation: opportunities and challenges. Nature Biotechnol. 15:625-628.
- Karp, A., S. Kresovich, K.V. Bhat, W.G. Ayad and T. Hodgkin. 1997. Molecular tools in plant genetics resources conservation: a guide to the technologies. Technical Bulletin No. 2. IPGRI, Rome.

![](_page_19_Figure_0.jpeg)