Hybrid purity assessment in *Eucalyptus* F₁ hybrids using microsatellite markers
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Abstract The worldwide expansion of hybrid breeding and clonal forestry is to meet the demands of paper pulp and bioenergy. Although India was one of the pioneers in hybrid production of eucalypts only recently the hybrid clonal forestry is gaining momentum. Inter-specific hybrids are being produced to exploit the hybrid vigor of F₁ individuals. Quality control genotyping for hybrid purity and parentage confirmation at the early stage is one of the essential criteria for clonal propagation and field trials for the assessment of growth performance. Eucalyptus being a obligatory outcrossed species with potential to self pollination, possibilities of pollen contamination are high. Hence, in the present study, *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* × *E. tereticornis* inter-specific hybrids were genotyped using 25 fluorescent labeled microsatellite markers available in public domain. Multiplex loading of PCR products was performed successfully for most of the microsatellite loci. Hybrid purity index was calculated and parentage was confirmed. Hybrid purity values ranged from 85 to 100% showed the efficiency of controlled pollination techniques. A subset of six fully informative simple sequence repeats was identified for routine quality control genotyping for these hybrids. Detection of non-essential genotypes observed among the hybrid seedlings proved the significance of hybrid purity tests and the false hybrids were removed at the seedling stage. The hybrids with proven hybridity will be used for generation of genetic linkage, discovery of quantitative trait loci and the individuals with high productivity can enter into mass clonal multiplication.
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Introduction

Hybrid forestry in eucalypts is a success story and currently several eucalypt growing countries are adopting hybrid breeding for industrial plantations. The greatest advance in industrial plantation forestry has undoubtedly been in the clonal deployment of F₁ hybrid genotypes. Clonal propagation and hybrid breeding have become a powerful combination of tools for the improvement of production and wood quality in eucalypts (Grattapaglia and Kirst 2008). Reports on controlled inter-specific hybrid eucalypts production and their importance in genetic improvement were available since 1960 in India for the commercially important species like *Eucalyptus camaldulensis*, *Eucalyptus tereticornis* and *Eucalyptus grandis* (Venkatesh and Kedharnath 1965; Venkatesh and Sharma 1977, 1979). However, eucalypts breeding program in India mainly focused on improvement of pure species (Varghese et al. 2009) which is obviously a prerequisite for hybrid development. Many earlier hybrid selections in Congo and Brazil were from sporadic hybrids identified from open pollinated seed orchards and later shifted to planned attempts for production of inter-specific hybrids (Potts and Dungey 2004). The Indian land race of *E. tereticornis* (Mysore gum) was evolved from natural hybrid and suffers from hybrid breakdown or inbreeding depression, necessitating the production of targeted crosses for hybrid vigor. A combination of complementary traits from *E. grandis* and *E. urophylla* has great potential for expanding genetic diversity, for improving pulp properties and for introducing...
adventitious rooting traits in F₁ hybrids. Subsequently, in India attempts are being made to generate inter-specific crosses among *E. camaldulensis*, *E. tereticornis* and *E. grandis* with phenotypically characterized parents (http://ifgtb.icfre.gov.in/news&events/Eucalypts%20Hybrid%20Breeding%20programme.pdf). Such hybrids are essential to map genes controlling various economically important traits for early screening of hybrid progenies with the right combination of desirable characteristics and many other molecular genetic studies. Further, many countries working eucalypt breeding programs also contemplate on marker assisted selection (MAS) in eucalypts, which would aid indirect selection of difficult traits at early stage without waiting for next generation. Thus, MAS speeds up the process of conventional breeding and facilitates improvement of traits which is difficult through conventional breeding. Hybridity validation at the seedling stage is one of the essential criteria for inter-specific hybrid production and establishment of true segregating population. The hybrid authentication procedures identify the pollen contamination, out crossing with foreign pollens and physical admixtures during seed handling at storage and nursery raising stages. Thus use of individuals with erroneous hybridity results in segregation of the traits, lower yields and genetic deterioration of clones. Further, exploitation of heterosis in eucalypts requires sustained production of F₁ hybrids and management of hybrid identity during clonal propagation.

Quality control (QC) genotyping is an important aspect in eucalypt improvement program, however, no well-established methods available for implementation in hybrid breeding program. The use of DNA markers particularly Simple Sequence Repeats (SSRs) are useful for a variety of molecular breeding applications because of their codominance, abundance, high genome coverage and multi allelic nature. SSRs are the most suitable markers for hybrid purity assessment as the heterozygosity of the hybrids can be easily determined by the presence of alleles from both the parents used for controlled pollination. They are already a proven tool for hybrid authentication or hybrid purity assessment and parentage confirmation in many crop species (Bohra et al. 2011). Indeed, molecular markers-based hybrid purity tests have been developed and are in routine use in many crop species such as rice (Yashitola et al. 2002; Sundaram et al. 2008), maize (Asif et al. 2006), cotton (Selvakumar et al. 2010) and safflower (Naresh et al. 2009). Similar to food crops, in forest trees also inter-specific hybrids are generated routinely through hybridization and the heterotic individuals are selected for clonal propagation and mass multiplication (Nikles and Griffin 1992; Stanton et al. 2010). SSRs were recommended for species and hybrid identification, certification of controlled crosses in species such as *Populus* (Rajora and Rahman 2001), *Tsuga* (Bentz et al. 2002), *Picea* (Narendrula and Nkongolo 2012) and *Pinus* (Elliott et al. 2006). Recently, in eucalypts, reasonably good numbers of SSR markers become available (Brondani et al. 2006; Acuna et al. 2012; He et al. 2012; Faria et al. 2010) and these SSRs can be used for developing molecular marker based hybrid purity test. Hence, the objectives of this study were to identify SSR markers for confirmation of parentage and hybrid purity tests in *E. tereticornis* × *E. camaldulensis* and identify a subset of highly informative SSR markers for routine and low-cost quality control genotyping.

**Materials and methods**

**Plant material**

Juvenile leaves were collected from the parent trees of *E. camaldulensis* (Clone 7) and *E. tereticornis* (Clone 88) developed through the breeding program of Institute of Forest Genetics and Tree Breeding (IFGTB), Coimbatore. In the case of F₁ inter-specific hybrids (*E. camaldulensis* × *E. tereticornis*), the juvenile leaves were collected from 6-month-old plants. Genomic DNA was extracted from 100 mg of the plant sample using Qiagen DNeasy Plant Mini Kit™. The extracted DNA quality of each sample was assessed using 0.8 % agarose gel and the quantity of DNA was confirmed using Picodrop spectrophotometer (Picodrop microlitre spectrophotometer version 3.01, UK) and DNA concentrations were normalized at 10 ng/μl.

**Polymerase chain reaction (PCR)**

SSR locus specific forward primer was designed with a 5’-end M13 tail (5’TGT AAA ACG ACG GCC AGT-3’) as reported by Schuelke (2000). Initially, to identify the polymorphic SSRs between the parents, 53 SSR markers located on the 11 linkage groups selected from the SSR set developed and mapped by Brondani et al. (2006) from *E. grandis* and one loci from *E. grandis* mapped by Thamarus et al. (2004) were considered. PCR amplification was carried out in 10 μl volume with 10 × buffer containing 100 mM Tris–HCl (pH 8.3), 500 mM KCl and 15 mM MgCl₂, 0.4 pmol of each forward (M13 tailed) and reverse primer, 1 U of Taq DNA polymerase, and 100 μM of each dNTPs and 20 ng of template DNA. The PCR amplification was carried out for 5 min at 94 °C, 30 cycles of 1 min at 94 °C, 60 or 30 s at the primer specific annealing temperature, 2 min at 72 °C, and 15 min at 72 °C for final extension. Annealing temperatures varied from 48 to 60 °C, to amplify specific microsatellite marker. PCR
products were size-separated using an 5 % denaturing polyacrylamide (PAGE) gels of size 21 × 50 cm (Sequigen GT System, BIO-RAD, USA) containing 7 M urea and 1 × TBE buffer, and visualized by silver staining. SSR loci showing polymorphism between parents were used for genotyping of the F₁ hybrid population. PCR amplification was carried out in 10 µl volume with 10 × buffer containing 100 mM Tris–HCl (pH 8.3), 500 mM KCl and 15 mM MgCl₂, 125 µM dNTP mix, 0.1 pmol of M13 tailed forward primer, 0.4 pmol of reverse primer and 0.2 pmol of fluorescently labeled [6-FAM™, NED®, VIC®, or PET® (Applied Biosystems, CA, USA)], 10 ng of template DNA and 1 U of Taq DNA polymerase. The touchdown PCR program used was as follows: initial denaturation at 94 °C for 5 min, then 30 cycles of 94 °C for 45 s, annealing temperature varying from 48 to 60 °C for 30 s and 72 °C for 1 min and an elongation step at 72 °C for 15 min. After these cycles, an additional round of 20 cycles with 94 °C for 30 s, annealing of labeled M13 at 50 °C for 45 s and 72 °C for 45 s, and final extension of 72 °C for 30 min.

PCR products were diluted specifically for each dye wherein an aliquot of 1 µl of fluorescently labeled PCR product was mixed with 0.2 µl of GeneScan™ 600-LIZ-Size® Standard V2.0. (Applied Biosystems) and 8.8 µl of Hi-Di formamide (Applied Biosystems). The mixture was electroinjected in ABI 3500 genetic analyzer (Applied Biosystems). Data obtained after 45 min of injection were analyzed with Genemapper™ software version 4.1 (Applied Biosystems) and exported as data table.

Multiplexing in the form of multiloading was carried out by mixing two or three SSRs amplified with different fluorescent dye or two SSRs having different fragment sizes amplified with same dye (Tables 1, 2). While loading more than one PCR product, the concentration of the each product was adjusted (0.5 or 1.0 µl) to avoid off-scale peaks. Only two loci were loaded singly.

Statistical analysis

The allele size data obtained from the Genemapper for all loci were analyzed using Powermarker software to estimate Polymorphic Information Content (PIC). Hybrid purity assessment was carried out wherein the SSR allele data for the hybrid seeds were recorded as “A” [allele of male parent (E. tereticornis)], “B” [allele of female parent

| S. no. | Microsatellite | Repeat motif | Annealing temperature (in °C) | Size (bp) | Fluorochrome¹ |
|-------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------|---------------|
| 1     | Embra12       | (AG)₂₂       | 59                            | 130–150  | VIC           |
| 2     | Embra36       | (AG)₁₉       | 55                            | 150–170  | FAM¹         |
| 3     | Embra98       | (AG)₈(G)(AG)₃AA… (GA)₂₀ | 56 | 240–270 | FAM³         |
| 4     | Embra122      | (GA)₂₆       | 56                            | 230–280  | FAM⁴         |
| 5     | Embra147      | (AG)₈t       | 56                            | 184–210  | FAM          |
| 6     | Embra89       | (CT)₁₇       | 54                            | 300–310  | FAM³         |
| 7     | Embra33       | (AG)₁₉       | 58                            | 125–160  | FAM³         |
| 8     | Embra101      | (AG)₁₂(A)(AG)₈ | 55 | 130–155 | FAM³         |
| 9     | Embra227      | (GA)₁₃       | 62                            | 305–340  | FAM⁴         |
| 10    | Embra206      | (GA)₈AA(GA)₁₁ | 57 | 305–335 | FAM          |
| 11    | Embra6        | (AG)₁₉       | 58                            | 140–155  | FAM⁴         |
| 12    | Embra186      | (GA)₂₇       | 58                            | 160–190  | NED          |
| 13    | Embra20       | (AG)₁₉       | 59                            | 145–170  | PET          |
| 14    | Embra58       | (AG)₂₀       | 59                            | 155–180  | VIC          |
| 15    | Embra213      | (CT)₁₇       | 53                            | 220–240  | PET          |
| 16    | Embra28       | (AG)₂₅       | 56                            | 190–210  | FAM          |
| 17    | Embra97       | (CT)₂₁       | 58                            | 130–150  | NED          |
| 18    | Eg16          | (GA)₁₂(TGA)₂ | 60                            | 245–260  | FAM          |
| 19    | Embra179      | (GA)₁₀       | 56                            | 145–160  | VIC          |
| 20    | Embra303      | (CT)₂₀       | 56                            | 270–300  | NED          |
| 21    | Embra53       | (AG)₁₇GT(A)₅ | 60                            | 130–150  | NED          |
| 22    | Embra304      | (GA)₃₅(GGA)₄ | 54                           | 225–245  | VIC          |
| 23    | Embra52       | (AG)₂T(A)₂₆  | 56                            | 120–160  | VIC          |
| 24    | Embra18       | (AG)₁₃GG(A)₁₉ | 52  | 130–140 | NED          |
| 25    | Embra167      | (TC)₁₉       | 48                            | 120–140  | FAM          |

¹ Fluorochrome with same letters was multiplexed together for electrophoresis

Table 1 Details of SSR loci used for genotyping of eucalypt hybrids
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Table 2 Combination SSR loci used for multiplex loading of SSR-PCR

| S. no. | Fluorochrome |
|--------|--------------|
|        | FAM | NED | VIC | PET |
| 1      | Eg16 |     |     |     |
| 2      | –   | Embra97 |     | Embra304 |
| 3      | –   | Embra53 | Embra179 |     |
| 4      | Embra167 | Embra303 |     |     |
| 5      | Embra28 | Embra120 | – | Embra20 |
| 6      | –   | Embra186 | Embra12 | Embra213 |

Results and discussion

In agricultural crops, hybrid genetic purity is a routine exercise and DNA markers are often used for quality control genotyping (Wu et al. 2006; Selvakumar et al. 2010; Mbanjo et al. 2012; Semagn et al. 2012). In forest tree species, intentional hybrid breeding is restricted to few species like eucalypts (Potts and Dungey 2004; Dickinson et al. 2013), *Acacia* (Griffin et al. 2010), *Populus* (Yu et al. 2001) and *Pinus* (Cappa et al. 2013). Hybrid seed production in eucalypts is generally takes the advantage of the natural protandry and controlled pollination (CP) is usually carried out by hand emasculation and pollination. During this process, the genetic purity of the F₁ seeds is significantly affected by foreign pollen or self pollen. The high cost of performing CP activity and relatively low seed production coupled with large scale clonal propagation of specific hybrids demands the quality control for parentage. Unlike agricultural crops, in tree species, Grow Out Tests (GOTs) for morphological assessment cannot be practiced due to the long duration. The DNA markers such as SSRs could be of excellent choice for hybridity confirmation in eucalypts, which has good resources of SSRs. Hybrid purity assessment would also support the stringent intellectual property requirements for variety registration under plant protection of varieties and farmer’s right authority of India (PPV & FRA); and the SSR marker technologies have already been in use for accurate identification of eucalypts in Brazil wherein for eucalypts clonal protection requests are accompanied by a multilocus DNA profile (DNA fingerprint) of 15–20 microsatellite markers that were recommended based on several aspects such as robustness, polymorphic information content and general availability in the public domain (Grattapaglia 2007) and South Africa (http://www.forestry.co.za/application-of-plant-breeders-rights/).

Preliminary results showed that among the 53 SSR loci analyzed, 25 loci were suitable for further studies and remaining 28 loci showed either large number of non-essential genotypes or no amplification products with more than 20 % of F₁ individuals. These 28 loci required further standardization in fluorescent labeled PCR and hence discarded for further analysis. The details of SSR loci and the information on PCR amplification status, genotype pattern, hybrid purity index and the polymorphic information content for each locus is given in Table 3. Among the selected 25 loci, the SSR primer set Eg16 could not amplify 16 F₁ individuals and EMBRA303 produced maximum number of (27) non-essential genotypes, i.e., non-specific PCR products. The PIC values were ranging from 0.4 to 0.8.

Steenkamp et al. (2003) made an attempt to detect putative hybrids in commercially propagated eucalyptus using 5S rDNA sequence, however, it appears to be unsuitable for constructing species-specific PCR-primers because of the variable sites in the 5S repeat. Similarly, Cupertino et al. (2009) used six SSRs for parentage analysis in multiple hybrid families of eucalypts and found pollen contamination and mislabeling thus warranting parentage confirmation for all controlled crosses. In the present study, hybrid purity assessment was carried out for the F₁ hybrid progenies obtained from *E. camaldulensis* × *E. tereticornis* using the EMBRA SSR markers. The fragment analysis was performed as a multi-loading assay, analyzing two or three loci simultaneously that was labeled by different fluorescence dyes or with loci of different fragment sizes amplified with single fluorescence dye (Fig. 1). This could increase the amount of information generated per assay, and reduced consumable costs. Cost effective genotyping by fluorescence allowed more rapid data collection in many plant breeding experiments compared to earlier methods such as those based on radioactive isotopes and silver staining (Guichoux et al. 2011). Hybrid

\[
\text{Purity index (%) = } \frac{\text{Number of true hybrids( containing alleles of both the parents) } \times 100}{\text{Total number of hybrid seeds tested} \quad \text{}}
\]
purity values for all 25 loci were >85.0% and few loci showed up to 10 non-essential genotypes.

Selection of a set of SSRs for hybrid quality control in clonal propagation

To identify a set of informative markers that could be used for routine genotyping of hybrids for QC, minimum number of SSR loci was determined based on the parentage confirmation and amplification pattern. Subset of six fully informative SSRs with four different alleles (Table 3) would be sufficient to verify the hybridity and for quality control during clonal multiplication of these hybrids. Use of fluorescent-based SSR genotyping in hybrid purity assessment generates specific and accurate data for hybrid identification and subsequently when these hybrids enter clonal propagation chain these SSR markers could be useful in confirming the identity.

**Table 3** Hybrid purity index and polymorphic information content of different SSR loci used for genotyping *Eucalyptus* mapping population

| Marker name | Genotype of parents | Number of individuals | Lacking amplified product | Amplified product | Having allele from parent A | Having allele from parent B | Identified as hybrid | Non-essential genotypes (%) | PIC  |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|------|
| Embr12      | abxac               | 4                     | 100                       | 0                | 0                          | 100                        | 100.00              | 0.5                          |      |
| Embr36      | abxcd               | 4                     | 100                       | 0                | 0                          | 100                        | 100.00              | 0.7                          |      |
| Embr98      | abxcd               | 5                     | 99                        | 0                | 0                          | 98                         | 98.99               | 0.6                          |      |
| Embr132     | abxcg               | 1                     | 103                       | 0                | 2                          | 101                        | 98.06               | 0.5                          |      |
| Embr147     | abxcg               | 2                     | 102                       | 2                | 0                          | 100                        | 98.04               | 0.6                          |      |
| Embr89      | abxa                | 5                     | 99                        | 0                | 0                          | 97                         | 97.98               | 0.4                          |      |
| Embr33      | abxb                 | 6                     | 98                        | 0                | 0                          | 96                         | 97.96               | 0.5                          |      |
| Embr101     | abxa                 | 2                     | 102                       | 0                | 0                          | 101                        | 99.02               | 0.5                          |      |
| Embr227     | abxcd               | 8                     | 96                        | 0                | 2                          | 94                         | 97.92               | 0.7                          |      |
| Embr206     | abxbc               | 6                     | 98                        | 0                | 0                          | 98                         | 100.00              | 0.5                          |      |
| Embr96      | abxcd               | 5                     | 99                        | 3                | 0                          | 95                         | 95.96               | 0.7                          |      |
| Embr186     | abxcd               | 8                     | 96                        | 2                | 0                          | 94                         | 97.92               | 0.5                          |      |
| Embr20      | abxcd               | 2                     | 102                       | 2                | 0                          | 100                        | 98.04               | 0.7                          |      |
| Embr58      | abxcd               | 13                    | 91                        | 0                | 2                          | 89                         | 97.80               | 0.7                          |      |
| Embr213     | abxcd               | 3                     | 101                       | 1                | 0                          | 100                        | 99.01               | 0.7                          |      |
| Embr28      | abxcd               | 3                     | 101                       | 6                | 0                          | 90                         | 89.11               | 0.8                          |      |
| Embr97      | aaxbb                | 14                    | 90                        | 2                | 2                          | 85                         | 94.44               | 0.4                          |      |
| Eg16        | abxa                 | 16                    | 88                        | 0                | 0                          | 88                         | 100.00              | 0.6                          |      |
| Embr179     | abxbc               | 13                    | 91                        | 0                | 0                          | 91                         | 100.00              | 0.6                          |      |
| Embr305     | abxcd               | 8                     | 96                        | 2                | 0                          | 90                         | 93.75               | 0.8                          |      |
| Embr303     | abxcd               | 8                     | 96                        | 2                | 0                          | 93                         | 96.88               | 0.7                          |      |
| Embr304     | abxcd               | 8                     | 96                        | 0                | 1                          | 95                         | 98.96               | 0.5                          |      |
| Embr52      | abxcd               | 14                    | 90                        | 0                | 2                          | 78                         | 86.67               | 0.8                          |      |
| Embr158     | abxbd                | 12                    | 92                        | 1                | 0                          | 85                         | 92.39               | 0.6                          |      |
| Embr167     | abxcd               | 8                     | 96                        | 1                | 0                          | 95                         | 98.96               | 0.7                          |      |

* Loci marked in bold form a subset for hybrid confirmation and quality control genotyping in clonal propagation

**Conclusion**

Generally, *F₁* hybrids contain DNA from both the parents and SSR markers identified both male and female parent–specific markers allowing differentiation of true eucalypts hybrids from selfed individuals and outcrossed individuals with foreign pollen. Presence of non-essential genotypes observed among the hybrid seedlings established the importance of hybrid purity tests and those false hybrids could be removed at the early stage of multiplication. The SSR marker information developed through this study will be of immense help for hybrid eucalypts industry to select appropriate marker combinations and assess hybrid purity of the clones. Other possible applications of hybrid purity assessment include development of genetic linkage maps, quantitative analysis of economically important traits, and marker assisted selection where true and pure hybrids are essential.
Acknowledgments The authors acknowledge B. Nagarajan, A. Mayavel, S. Chakravarthi, S.P. Subramani, S. Shanmugam, V. Chinnadurai for producing the hybrid seeds. Dr. Sivakumar has raised the hybrid seeds in nursery. V.K.W. Bachpai and M. Ganesan has field planted the F1 hybrids for further assessment. Authors are grateful to Dr. N. Krishna Kumar, Director, IFGTB for his constant support to carry out this study. The Department of Biotechnology, Government of India is acknowledged for the financial support. The authors, Subashini and Shanmugapriya acknowledge the Indian Council of Forestry Research and Education, Dehradun for proving research fellowship. The authors certify that no actual or potential conflict of interest in relation to this article exists.

Open Access This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits any use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and the source are credited.

References

Acuna CV, Villalba PV, García M, Pathauer P, Hopp HE et al (2012) Microsatellite markers in candidate genes for wood properties and its application in functional diversity assessment in Eucalyptus globules. Electronic J Biotech 15:0717–3458
Asif M, Ur-Rahman M, Yusuf Z (2006) Genotyping analysis of six maize (Zea mays L.) hybrids using DNA fingerprinting technology. Pak J Bot 38:1425–1430
Bentz SE, Riedel LGH, Pooler MR, Townsend AM (2002) Hybridization and self-compatibility in controlled pollinations of eastern North American and Asian hemlock (Tsuga) species. J Arboric 28:200–205
Bohra A, Dubey A, Saxena RK, Pennetsa RV, Poornima KN, Kumar N, Farmer AD et al (2011) Analysis of BAC-end sequences (BESs) and development of BES-SSR markers for genetic mapping and hybrid purity assessment in pigeonpea (Cajanus spp.). BMC Plant Biol 11:56

Fig. 1 Electropherogram of SSRs obtained with software Genemapper. Female parent E. camaldulensis (a), Male parent E. tereticornis (b) and F1 Hybrid amplified with locus EMBRA186 (c). Multi-loading of three loci amplified with different fluorescent dye EMBRA12 (VIC), EMBRA186 (PET) and EMBRA213 (NED) in a single capillary (d)
Brondani RPV, Williams ER, Brondani C, Grattapaglia D (2006) A microsatellite-based consensus linkage map for species of Eucalyptus and a novel set of 230 microsatellite markers for the genus. BMC Plant Biol 6:20
Cappa EP, Martin Marcó D, Nikles G, Ian S (2013) Last performance of Pinus elliottii, Pinus caribaea, their F1, F2 and backcross hybrids and Pinus taeda to 10 years in the Mesopotamia region, Argentina. New For 44:197–218
Cupertino FB, Leal JB, Vidal PO, Gaiotto FM (2009) Parentage testing of hybrid full-sib families of Eucalyptus with microsatellites. Scan J For Res 24:2–7
Dickinson GR, Wallace HM, Lee DJ (2013) Reciprocal and advanced generation hybrids between Corymbia citriodora and C. torelliana: forestry breeding and the risk of gene flow. An For Sci 70:1–10
Elliott FG, Shepherd MJ, Henry RJ (2006) Verification of interspecific pine hybrids using paternally inherited chloroplast microsatellites. For Genet 12(2):81–87
Faria DA, Mamani EMC, Pappas MR, Pappas GJ Jr, Grattapaglia D (2010) A selected set of EST-derived microsatellites, polymorphic and transferable across 6 species of Eucalyptus. J Hered. doi:10.1093/jhered/esp024
Grattapaglia D (2007) Marker-assisted selection in Eucalyptus. In: Guimarães E, Ruane J, Scherf B, Sonnino A, Dargie J (eds) Marker-assisted selection: current status and future perspectives in crops, livestock, forestry and fish. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, p 252
Grattapaglia D, Kirst M (2008) Eucalyptus applied genomics: from gene sequences to breeding tools. New Phytol 179:911–929
Griffin AR, Tran Duc V, Harbard JL, Wong CY, Brooker C, Vaillancourt RE (2010) Improving controlled pollination methodology for breeding Acacia mangium Willd. New For 40:31–142
Guichoux E, Lagache L, Wagner S, Chaumeil P, Lepais O et al (2011) Current trends in microsatellite genotyping. Mol Ecol Res 11:591–611
He X, Wang Y, Li F, Weng Q, Li M, Xu L, Shi J et al (2012) Development of 198 novel EST-derived microsatellites in Eucalyptus (Myrtaceae). Am J Bot 99(4):e134–e148
Mbanjo EGN, Mouelle AS, Oben JE, Nyine M, Dochez C et al (2012) Development of expressed sequence tags-simple sequence repeats (EST-SSRs) for Musa and their applicability in authentication of a Musa breeding population. Afr J Biotech 11:13546–13559
Narendrula R, Nkongolo K (2012) Genetic variation in the genus. BMC Plant Biol 6:20
Potts BM, Dungey HS (2004) Interspecific hybridization of Eucalyptus: key issues for breeders and geneticists. New For 27:115–138
Rajora OP, Rahman MH (2001) Microsatellite DNA markers and their usefulness in poplars, and conservation of microsatellite DNA loci in Salicaceae. genetic response of forest systems to changing environmental conditions. For Sci 70:105–115
Schuelke M (2000) An economic method for the fluorescent labelling of PCR fragments. Nat Biotechnol 18:233–234
Selvakumar P, Ravikesavan R, Gopikrishnan A, Thiyagu K, Preetha S, Manikanda Boopathi N (2010) Genetic purity analysis of cotton (Gossypium spp.) hybrids using SSR markers. Seed Sci Technol 38:358–366
Semagn K, Beyene Y, Makumbi D, Mugo S, Prasanna BM, Magorokosho C, Atlin Gary et al (2012) Quality control genotyping for assessment of genetic identity and purity in diverse tropical maize inbred lines. Theor Appl Genet 125:1487–1501
Stanton BJ, Neale DB, Li S (2010) Populus breeding: from the classical to the genomic approach. Genet Genomics Populus 8:309–348
Steenkamp ET, Van der Nest MA, Wingfield BD, Wingfield MJ (2003) Detection of hybrids in commercially propagated Eucalyptus using 5S rDNA sequences. For Genet 10:195–206
Sundaram RM, Naveenkumar B, Biradar SK, Balachandran SM, Mishra B, Ilyasahmed M, Virakattamath BC et al (2008) Identification of informative SSR markers capable of distinguishing hybrid rice parental lines and their utilization in seed purity assessment. Euphytica 163:215–224
Thamaras KA, Groom K, Bradley A, Raymond CA, Schimleck LR, Williams ER, Moran GF (2004) Identification of quantitative trait loci for wood and fibre properties in two full-sib pedigrees of Eucalyptus globulus. Theor Appl Genet 109:856–864
Varghese M, Kamalakannan R, Harwood CE, Lindgren D, Mcdonald MW (2009) Changes in growth performance and fecundity of Eucalyptus camaldulensis and E. tereticornis during domestication in southern India. Tree Genet Genom 5:629–640
Venkatesh CS, Sedharnath S (1965) Genetic improvement of Eucalyptus in India. Silvae Genet 14:141–176
Venkatesh CS, Sharma VK (1977) Hybrid vigour in controlled interspecific cosses of Eucalyptus tereticornis × E. camaldulensis. Silvae Genet 26:121–124
Venkatesh CS, Sharma VK (1979) Comparison of a Eucalyptus tereticornis × E. grandis controlled hybrid with a E. grandis × E. tereticornis putative natural hybrid. Silvae Genet 28:127–131
Wu M, Jia X, Tian L, Lv B (2006) Rapid and reliable purity identification of F1 hybrids of Maize (Zea may L.) using SSR markers. Mol Plant Breed 4:381–384
Yashitola J, Thirumurugan T, Sundaram RM, Naseerullah MK, Ramesha MS, Sarma NP, Sonti RV (2002) Assessment of purity of rice hybrids using microsatellite and STS markers. Crop Sci 42:1369–1373
Yu Q, Tigerstedt PMA, Haapanen M (2001) Growth and phenology of hybrid aspen clones (Populus tremula L. × Populus tremuloides Michx.). Silva Fenn 35:15–25