Development of EST-PCR Markers for DNA Fingerprinting and Genetic Relationship Studies in Blueberry (Vaccinium, section Cyanococcus)

Lisa J. Rowland,1 Smriti Mehra, Anik L. Dhanaraj, Elizabeth L. Ogden, and Janet P. Slovin
United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Henry A. Wallace Beltsville Agricultural Research Center, Fruit Laboratory, Building 010A, 10300 Baltimore Avenue, Beltsville, MD 20705

Mark K. Ehlenfeldt
United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Blueberry and Cranberry Research Center, 125A Lake Oswego Road, Chatsworth, NJ 08019

ADDITIONAL INDEX WORDS. CAPS markers, cultivar identification, expressed sequence tags, molecular markers, STS markers

ABSTRACT. Because randomly amplified polymorphic DNA (RAPD) is the only type of molecular marker that has been used extensively in blueberry (Vaccinium spp.) for mapping and DNA fingerprinting of cultivars, there is a need to develop a new, robust marker system. Expressed sequence tags (ESTs) produced from a cDNA library, derived from RNA from floral buds of cold acclimated plants, were used to develop EST-PCR markers for blueberry. Thirty clones, picked at random from the cDNA library, were single-pass sequenced from the 5' and 3' ends. Thirty PCR primer pairs were designed from the ends of the best quality sequences that were generated and were tested in amplification reactions with genomic DNA from 19 blueberry genotypes, including two wild selections (the original parents of a mapping population), and 17 cultivars. Fifteen of the 30 primer pairs resulted in amplification of polymorphic fragments that were detectable directly after ethidium bromide staining of agarose gels. Several of the monomorphic amplification products were digested with the restriction enzyme AatI and approximately half resulted in polymorphic-sized fragments (cleaved amplified polymorphic sequences or CAPS markers). The polymorphic EST-PCR and CAPS markers developed in this study distinguished all the genotypes indicating that these markers should have general utility for DNA fingerprinting and examination of genetic relationships in blueberry. Similarity values were calculated based on the molecular marker data, and a dendrogram was constructed based on the similarity matrix. Coefficients of coancestry were calculated for each pair of genotypes from complete pedigree information. A fair correlation between similarity coefficients calculated from marker data and coefficients of coancestry was found.

Blueberry (Vaccinium spp.) is a high value crop which can thrive on acidic, imperfectly drained sandy soils otherwise considered worthless for agricultural crop production. The United States is the world’s leading blueberry producer. However, a survey of blueberry research and extension scientists in the United States has identified lack of winter hardiness and susceptibility to spring frosts as two important genetic limitations of current cultivars (Moore, 1993). The genetic control of these traits is not well understood, and their expression undoubtedly involves the interaction of several components. Therefore, development of genetic linkage maps for blueberry populations suitable for the analysis of quantitative trait loci (QTLs) controlling cold hardiness in the acclimated state, chilling requirement, and related factors is underway (Panta et al., in press; Rowland et al., 1999).

The only type of molecular marker that has been used extensively in blueberry for mapping and DNA fingerprinting of cultivars is randomly amplified polymorphic DNA (RAPD) (Williams et al., 1990). Genetic linkage maps of relatively low density have been developed for four blueberry populations, three diploid (Panta et al., in press; Rowland and Levi, 1994; Rowland et al., 1999) and one tetraploid (Qu and Hancock, 1997). These maps are based primarily on RAPD markers, except that the maps for the diploid testcross populations, segregating for cold hardiness in the cold acclimated state and chilling requirement (described in Rowland et al. (1999) and Panta et al. (in press)), include a few inter-simple sequence repeat (ISSR) PCR markers, in addition to the RAPD markers. RAPD markers have also been used for DNA fingerprinting and for assessing genetic relationships among cultivars and wild selections of the major commercially grown types of blueberries: the highbush (Levi and Rowland, 1997), lowbush (Burgher et al., 2002), and rabbiteye types (Aruna et al., 1993, 1995).

RAPD technology has been widely adopted because it is technically simple, does not require large amounts of DNA, and requires no prior knowledge of the genome being studied. However, RAPD technology has certain drawbacks such as problematic reproducibility among laboratories (Jones et al., 1997), markers that are generally limited to specific populations and therefore unsuitable for comparative mapping studies (Sunnucks, 2000), and markers with a dominant mode of inheritance. Because of these drawbacks, there is a need to develop an alternative DNA marker system for blueberry.

Expressed sequence tag (EST) databases are proving to be valuable sources of genetic markers for mapping, DNA fingerprinting, and population genetic studies for a wide variety of organisms. There are a number of advantages to using EST-based markers for genetic studies. First, they target expressed genes; thus, they should be particularly useful for QTL mapping. If an EST marker is linked to a QTL, it is possible that the gene itself, from which the EST marker was derived, controls the trait in question. Second, because they are derived from gene coding regions, which are more likely to be conserved across populations and species than noncoding regions, EST markers should be useful for comparative mapping studies. Furthermore, EST-based markers have the potential for being codominantly inherited. EST-based markers were originally...
mapped by RFLP analysis. Recently, EST-based PCR markers have been developed for many plants, including several tree species: loblolly pine (Pinus taeda L.) (Tenesen et al., 2001), black spruce [Picea mariana (Mill.) B.S.P.] (Perry and Bousquet, 1998), Norway spruce [Picea abies (L.) Karst.] (Schubert et al., 2001), and sugi (Cryptomeria japonica D. Don) (Tsumura et al., 1997). Generally, amplification using EST-specific primers must be followed by either digestion with restriction enzymes to generate cleaved amplified polymorphic sequences or CAPS markers, heteroduplex analysis, or single-stranded conformational polymorphism (SSCP) analysis to detect polymorphisms (Cato et al., 2001).

As part of our research to better understand the genetic control of cold hardiness in blueberry, we recently began producing ESTs from highbush blueberry using a cDNA library derived from floral buds of cold-acclimated plants. Here, we report the development of 17 PCR primer pairs, derived from ESTs, that result in amplification of polymorphic-sized fragments either directly or after restriction enzyme digestion (CAPS). Furthermore, the fragments are detectable after simple ethidium bromide staining of agarose gels. These polymorphic EST-PCR and CAPS markers were screened across 19 blueberry genotypes, including two wild selections (diploid V. darrowi Camp and diploid V. corymbosum L.), that are the original parents of our mapping population, and 17 cultivars (mostly tetraploid V. corymbosum and hexaploid V. ashei Reade). A dendrogram was constructed based on genetic similarity values calculated for each pair of genotypes, and the correlation between similarity coefficients, calculated from molecular marker data, and coefficients of coancestry was evaluated.

Materials and Methods

PLANT MATERIAL. Nineteen blueberry genotypes, including 17 cultivars and two wild selections (parents of our mapping population), were evaluated in this study. The genotypes are listed in Table 1 along with their species, ploidy levels, and immediate parents. The genotypes were maintained at the USDA/ARS (Beltsville, Md.).

cDNA CLONES, SEQUENCE ANALYSIS, AND PRIMER DESIGN. The cDNA library for EST analysis was constructed in the unidirectional λ cloning vector Uni-ZAP (Stratagene, La Jolla, Calif.) from RNA expressed in floral buds of cold-acclimated plants of the highbush blueberry cultivar Bluecrop (Levi et al., 1999). Plaques were picked from the library at random, and in vivo excision of the pBluescript phagemids (containing the cDNA inserts) was performed according to the manufacturer’s instructions (Stratagene) using the exassist/solar cell system. Plasmid DNA was isolated from bacterial cultures using the Qiaprep Spin Miniprep Plasmid Kit (Qiagen Inc., Valencia, Calif.). Plasmid DNA was quantified spectrophotometrically, digested with EcoRI and XhoI restriction enzymes (New England BioLabs Inc., Beverly, Mass.) to release the inserts, and electrophoresed through 1% agarose gels to verify the presence of inserts and the quantity of DNA. Sizes of the cDNA inserts were estimated from molecular weight standards (1-kb DNA ladder, Invitrogen Life Technologies, Carlsbad, Calif.) included on the gels.

Single-pass nucleotide sequencing of recombinant plasmid DNAs was performed from both ends of the cDNA inserts either by ourselves using an ABI PRISM 310 Genetic Analyzer and Big Dye Terminator Cycle Sequencing Ready Reaction Kit (Perkin-Elmer Applied Biosystems, Foster City, Calif.) or by the University of Maryland, Center for Agricultural Biotechnology-DNA Sequencing Facility (College Park, Md.). For 5’ end sequencing, the M13 reverse primer was used; the M13 (-21) primer was used for 3’ end sequencing. Three clones were completely sequenced from both ends by the University of Florida, DNA Sequencing Core Laboratory (Gainesville, Fla.).

After trimming vector sequences, nucleotide sequences were compared against known gene sequences contained in GenBank (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/BLAST/) using the BLASTN and BLASTX algorithms (Altschul et al., 1990). Primer pairs were designed from sequence data using the P3 website (http://www-genome.wi.mit.edu/cgi-bin/primer/primer3_www.cgi). If sequences were obtained from both 5’ and 3’ ends of the cDNA, forward and reverse primers were designed from sequences near the ends of the cDNA insert. If good sequence data (>300 bases) was obtained from only one end of the cDNA, then both forward and reverse primers were designed as far apart as possible from only that one end. Primers were synthesized by Invitrogen Life Technologies.

GENOMIC DNA EXTRACTION. Young leaves (≈5 g) were collected from greenhouse-grown plants of each of the genotypes used in this study. After collection, leaves were ground with dry ice in a coffee grinder and stored at –70 ºC. DNA was extracted using the CTAB procedure of Doyle and Doyle (1990). DNA concentrations were estimated by agarose gel electrophoresis (1% w/v gel containing 0.5 µg mL⁻¹ ethidium bromide) using known concentrations (15-1000 ng) of uncut lambda DNA (Invitrogen Life Technologies) as standards.

GENERATION OF EST-PCR AND CAPS MARKERS. DNA amplification reactions were performed as described previously (Levi et al., 1993) with minor modifications as described by Stommel et al. (1997). Briefly, amplification reactions were carried out at least twice in 25 µL volumes containing reaction buffer (20 mM NaCl, 50 mM Tris-HCl pH 9, 1% Triton-X-100, 0.1% bovine serum albumin), 1.6 mM MgCl₂, 200 µM each of dATP, dCTP, dGTP, and dTTP, 0.1 µM each of the forward and reverse EST primers, 0.7 units Taq DNA polymerase (Promega, Madison, Wis.), and 25 ng template DNA. DNA was amplified for 40 cycles in an MJ Research (Watertown, Mass.) PTC-100 thermal cycler, programmed for a 40 s denaturation step at 92 ºC, 70 s annealing step at a temperature of 10 ºC below the Tₘ (1.0 M Na⁺) of the primer (forward or reverse) with the lower Tₘ primer used, an initial denaturation at 94 ºC for 2 min, and a final extension step at 72 ºC for 7 min.

DNA amplification products and molecular weight standards (1-kb DNA ladder, Invitrogen Life Technologies) were separated by electrophoresis through 1.4% agarose gels containing 0.5 µg mL⁻¹ ethidium bromide. Some of the monomorphic PCR products were further processed by ethanol precipitation and digestion with the restriction enzyme Ahol (New England BioLabs Inc.). Digestions were performed at 37 ºC for ≥3 h using 10 units of enzyme. DNA fragments were visualized under UV light and photographed using the Eagle Eye still video system (Stratagene).

INHERITANCE OF MARKERS. The EST-PCR and CAPS markers were classified according to their type of inheritance, either predicted or observed. CAPS markers were classified as codominant because that is their predicted mode of inheritance. For those EST primer pairs that amplified multiple fragments (more than two fragments even in the diploid genotypes), the EST-PCR markers were simply classified as being derived from a multigene family. Mode of inheritance was determined when possible for the remaining EST-PCR markers using our diploid mapping populations. The populations have been described previously in detail (Rowland et al., 1999). Briefly, two diploid testcross populations were generated by crossing V. darrowi x V. corymbosum hybrids [Fla4B x W85-20 F_s (#5, #6, and #10)] back to another V. darrowi and another V. corymbosum selection, NJ88-13-15 and W85-23, respectively. Segregation of
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the EST-PCR markers, that were polymorphic between the original parent plants (Fla4B and W85-20), present in at least one of the three F1s (#5,#6, or #10), and absent in at least one of the testcross parents (NJ88-13-15 and W85-23), were followed in the appropriate subpopulations of the mapping populations. The nature of the polymorphism (presence and absence of fragments or different sizes of fragments in the parent plants), whether segregation was observed in the small F1 population (indication of heterozygosity in the original parent plant), and the actual segregation pattern in the appropriate mapping subpopulation were all used to determine the mode of inheritance.

Cloning, Sequencing, and Sequence Similarity Analysis of EST-PCR Products. A selection of EST-PCR amplification products, including both monomorphic and polymorphic fragments, were excised from 1.4% TBE agarose gels and purified using the QIAEX II Gel Extraction Kit according to the manufacturer’s instructions (Qiagen Inc.). Purified fragments were cloned using the pGEM-T Easy Vector System (Promega) according to the directions provided. Presence of inserts in the pGEM-T Easy Vector was confirmed by colony PCR. Sterile, disposable micropipet tips were touched to white colonies and inoculates used in place of genomic DNA in PCR amplifications. Amplifications were performed as described above under the heading Generation of EST-PCR and CAPS Markers except that a 5 min denaturation step at 94 °C was included at the beginning and a 5 min elongation step at 72 °C was added at the end of the PCR program. Single-pass nucleotide sequencing of confirmed recombinant plasmid DNAs was performed from both ends of the inserts using M13 reverse and M13(-21) primers by the University of Maryland, Center for Agricultural Biotechnology-DNA Sequencing Facility. To determine if the sequences of the PCR products were homologous to the sequences of the Bluecrop (BC) 93.7%, Cooper (CP) 70.3%, Bluegold (BG) 85.9%, Duke (DK) 96.1%, Georgiagem (GG) 71.1%, Gulfcoast (GC) 70.3%, Nelson (NL) 96.9%, Patriot (PT) 71.9%, Sierra (SA) 47.6%, Sunrise (SR) 82.8%, Toro (TR) 93.7%, Weymouth (WT) 87.5%, Climax (CX) V. ashei, Tifblue (TB) V. ashei, Fla4B (FL) V. darrowi, and W85-20 (W2) V. corymbosum sequencing were compared to each other manually and by use of BLAST algorithms. Pairwise BLAST and BLASTX or BLASTN to search GenBank.

Marker Data Analysis. The Numerical Taxonomy and Multivariate Analysis System program package for PC (NTSYS-pc, version 2.1, Exeter Software, Setauket, N.Y.) was used to construct a similarity matrix from the EST-PCR and CAPS marker data and to perform a cluster analysis of the resulting similarity matrix. Similarity matrices were generated using the Jaccard (1908) and simple matching coefficient functions of the NTSYS-pc program. Dendrograms of the genotypes were constructed by applying the unweighted pair-group clustering method (UPGMA) to the genetic similarity matrices. Cophenetic value matrices were produced from the tree matrices to measure the goodness of fit to the similarity matrix on which each tree was based.

Results and Discussion

cDNA Sequencing and Gene Identification. Attempts were made to sequence from the 5’ and 3’ ends of 30 cDNA clones that were picked at random from an unamplified cDNA library prepared from RNA from floral buds of cold acclimated ‘Bluecrop’ plants. A dendrogram was constructed by applying UPGMA to the coefficients of coancestry matrix. To determine the level of correlation between the genetic similarity values derived from the molecular marker data and the pairwise coefficients of coancestry, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated using SAS Procedure CORR.

Table 1. The genotypes (and their abbreviations) used in this study, along with their species, ploidy level, and immediate parents.

| Genotype  | Species      | Ploidy | Immediate parents                   |
|-----------|--------------|--------|------------------------------------|
| Berkeley  | V. corymbosum| 4x     | Stanley x GS-149 (Jersey x Pioneer)|
| Bluecrop  | V. corymbosum, 6.3% V. angustifolium | 4x | GM-37 (Jersey x Pioneer) x CU-5 (Stanley x June)           |
| Bluegold  | V. corymbosum, 14.1% V. angustifolium | 4x | Bluehaven x ME-US-5 (Ashworth x Bluecrop) |
| Bluejay   | V. corymbosum | 4x | Berkeley x Michigan 241 (Pioneer x Taylor) |
| Blueray   | V. corymbosum, 6.3% V. angustifolium | 4x | GM-37 (Jersey x Pioneer) x CU-5 (Stanley x June) |
| Cooper    | V. corymbosum, 25% V. darrowi, 4.7% V. angustifolium | 4x | G-180 [G-100 (Ivanhoe x Earliblue) x Collins] x US-75 (V. darrowi Fla4B x Bluecrop) |
| Duke      | V. corymbosum, 3.9% V. angustifolium | 4x | G-100 (Ivanhoe x Earliblue) x 192-8 [(Berkeley x Earliblue) x (Coville x Atlantic)] |
| Georgiagem| V. corymbosum, 25% V. darrowi, 3.9% V. angustifolium | 4x | G-132 (E-118 x Bluecrop) x US-75 (V. darrowi Fla4B x Bluecrop) |
| Gulfcoast | V. corymbosum, 25% V. darrowi, 4.7% V. angustifolium | 4x | G-180 [G-100 (Ivanhoe x Earliblue) x Collins] x US-75 (V. darrowi Fla4B x Bluecrop) |
| Nelson    | V. corymbosum, 3.1% V. angustifolium | 4x | Bluecrop x G-107 (F-72 x Ivanhoe x Earliblue) |
| Patriot   | V. corymbosum, 28.1% V. angustifolium | 4x | US 3 (Dixi x V. angustifolium Michigan Lowbush 1) x Earliblue |
| Sierra    | V. corymbosum, 20% V. darrowi, 15% V. ashei, 15% V. constablaei, 2.4% V. angustifolium | 4x | US 169 (self-pollination of pentaploid hybrid of V. darrowi Fla4B and hexaploid V. constablaei-V. ashei hybrid US 56) x G-156 (V. corymbosum) |
| Sunrise   | V. corymbosum, 17.2% V. angustifolium | 4x | G-180 [G-100 (Ivanhoe x Earliblue) x Collins] x ME-US-6620 (E-22 x ME-US-24) |
| Toro      | V. corymbosum, 6.3% V. angustifolium | 4x | Earliblue x Ivanhoe |
| Weymouth  | V. corymbosum, 12.5% V. angustifolium | 4x | June x Cabot |
| Climax    | V. ashei | 6x | Callaway x Ethel |
| Tifblue   | V. ashei | 6x | Ethel x Clara |
| Fla4B     | V. darrowi | 2x | Wild selection |
| W85-20    | V. corymbosum | 2x | Wild selection |
Table 2. Summary of blueberry cDNA clones including their names, sizes of cDNA inserts, length of nucleotide sequences, putative identification from BLASTX searches, and BLASTX E-values.

| Clone name | Size of cDNA insert (base pairs) | Length of nucleotide sequence (bases) | Putative identification | E value$^a$ |
|------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| 3          | 1700                            | 5’-676                               | DNAJ protein            | 1 x 10$^{-10}$ |
| 4          | 1400                            | 5’-611, 3’-600                       | Nonidentified           | ns$^b$       |
| 9          | 900                             | 5’-669, 3’-549                       | Nonidentified           | ns           |
| 10         | 1250                            | 3’-728                               | Phospholipid-hydroperoxide glutathione peroxidase | 3 x 10$^{-9}$ |
| 13         | 1500                            | 5’-607                               | Nonidentified           | ns           |
| 14         | 850                             | 3’-692                               | Nonidentified           | ns           |
| 15         | 1600                            | 5’-647, 3’-740                       | Pyruvate decarboxylase isozyme 1 | 1 x 10$^{-10}$ |
| 20         | 850                             | 5’-656, 3’-688                       | Nonidentified           | ns           |
| 21         | 1600                            | 5’-350, 3’-399                       | Nonidentified           | ns           |
| 22         | 1500                            | 5’-348                               | Dessication-responsive protein 29B | 2 x 10$^{-1}$ |
| 23         | 2000                            | 5’-576, 3’-622                       | Putative protein *Arabidopsis thaliana* | 2 x 10$^{-17}$ |
| 25         | 600                             | 5’-602                               | Ub snRNA-associated Sm-like protein | 2 x 10$^{-6}$ |
| 28         | 1200                            | 5’-660                               | Auxin-responsive protein IAA8 | 6 x 10$^{-15}$ |
| 30         | 750                             | 5’-601                               | Putative protein *Arabidopsis thaliana* | 1 x 10$^{-8}$ |
| 31         | 1200                            | 5’-632, 3’-584                       | Aldehyde dehydrogenase | 2 x 10$^{-3}$ |
| 32         | 1400                            | 5’-660, 3’-667                       | Putative protein *Arabidopsis thaliana* | 6 x 10$^{-9}$ |
| 33         | 800                             | 5’-345, 3’-428                       | MAP kinase kinase       | 6 x 10$^{-4}$ |
| 34         | 1500                            | 5’-666                               | Low-temperature-induced 65 kDa protein | 2 x 10$^{-15}$ |
| 36         | 600                             | 5’-344                               | Dehydrin                | 5 x 10$^{-31}$ |
| 39         | 1650                            | 5’-330, 3’-438                       | Putative protein *Arabidopsis thaliana* | 9 x 10$^{-27}$ |
| 42         | 850                             | 5’-675, 3’-715                       | Putative pollen allergen, beta expansin | 1 x 10$^{-27}$ |
| 43         | 1400                            | 5’-667, 3’-721                       | Calmodulin-binding protein | 6 x 10$^{-8}$ |
| 44         | 1400                            | 5’-606, 3’-655                       | ATP synthase alpha chain | 2 x 10$^{-47}$ |
| 45         | 1200                            | 5’-669, 3’-659                       | Putative RNA helicase    | 7 x 10$^{-31}$ |
| 47         | 1500                            | 5’-627, 3’-730                       | Ubiquitin activating enzyme E1 | 1 x 10$^{-39}$ |
| 49         | 2500                            | 5’-571, 3’-557                       | Nonidentified           | ns           |
| 51         | 650                             | Complete                             | Dicyanin, blue copper protein | 8 x 10$^{-27}$ |
| 52         | 1868                            | Complete                             | ABI3-interacting protein | 6 x 10$^{-10}$ |
| 53         | 1044                            | Complete                             | Lysophosphatidic acid acyltransferase | 1 x 10$^{-53}$ |
| 148        | 1600                            | 5’-611, 3’-744                       | Phosphatidylinositol transfer-like protein | 2 x 10$^{-38}$ |

$^a$Probability of a random association with a sequence in GenBank.

$^b$No significant ($p \geq 10^{-3}$) association with a sequence in GenBank.

The cDNA library represents genes that are expressed mid-winter, when plants have reached their maximum level of cold hardiness. Table 2 summarizes characteristics of these clones. Good quality single-pass sequences were obtained from both the 5’ and 3’ ends of 17 clones, from the 5’ ends of eight clones, and from the 3’ ends of two clones. Complete sequences from both the 5’ and 3’ directions were obtained for three clones. Eight clones did not yield good 3’end sequences apparently because of difficulty sequencing through their long poly (A) tails. The ESTs produced from the single-pass sequences were 598 bases long on average, after trimming vector sequences. To characterize the cDNAs, nucleotide sequences were compared against known nucleotide and amino acid sequences in Genbank using the network BLASTN and BLASTX algorithms. ESTs with BLASTX scores $>50$ and/or E values $\leq 10^{-3}$ ($p \leq 0.001$) were considered to have significant similarity to known sequences and putative biochemical functions of the cDNAs were assigned. The identified cDNAs encode a wide range of proteins including temperature stress-related proteins (DNA J, low temperature-induced 65 kDa protein, dehydrin, dessication-induced protein, glutathione peroxidase, ubiquitin activating enzyme E1), proteins involved in signal transduction (MAP kinase kinase, calmodulin-binding protein), hormone-associated proteins (auxin-responsive protein IAA8, ABI3-interacting protein), cell wall proteins (beta expansin), and basic metabolic proteins (pyruvate decarboxylase, ATP synthase alpha chain), among others.

**Development of EST-PCR and CAPS markers and DNA fingerprinting.** Thirty PCR primer pairs were designed from the ends of the available nucleotide sequence data. The primer pairs were tested in amplification reactions with DNA from the 19 blueberry genotypes. Fifteen primer pairs resulted in amplification of polymorphic fragments that were detectable directly after ethidium bromide staining of 1.4% agarose gels (Table 3). An example is shown in Fig. 1A. Eleven primer pairs resulted in amplification of monomorphic fragments (derived from ESTs 10, 14, 20, 25, 30, 32, 33, 42, 44, 52, and 53). An example is shown in Fig. 1B. The remaining five primer pairs did not work well (3, 9, 13, 36, and 41), yielding faint bands that would have been difficult to score. For those primer pairs that worked well and yielded either a single fragment or a major fragment plus some secondary fragments, the single or major amplification product was, in all cases, of the expected size (calculated from the sequence data and size of the cDNA inserts) or larger than expected, indicating the presence of introns. None of the major products were smaller than expected. For those primer pairs that worked well and yielded either a single fragment or a major fragment plus some secondary fragments, the single or major amplification product was, in all cases, of the expected size (calculated from the sequence data and size of the cDNA inserts) or larger than expected, indicating the presence of introns. None of the major products were smaller than expected. Of the eleven monomorphic amplification products, four (derived from primer pairs 20, 33, 44, and 52) were digested with the restriction enzyme Alul and the digestion products were analyzed on 1.4% agarose gels. Amplification products from one other primer pair (45), that originally yielded only one polymorphic fragment present in one genotype along with a monomorphic fragment present in all genotypes, were also digested with Alul. Alul was chosen because...
it is a four-base cutter, it cuts DNA at 37 °C, and it is inexpensive. Of these five digestions, three (from primer pairs 44, 45, and 52) resulted in polymorphisms (Table 3).

The type of inheritance, predicted or observed, of the polymorphic EST-PCR and CAPs markers is summarized in Table 3, along with the primer sequences and annealing temperatures. All the annealing temperatures were in the range of 52 to 60 °C. About half of the primer pairs yielded multiple fragments (more than two fragments even in the diploid genotypes). Because this study did not enable us to determine which fragments were derived from different alleles and which were derived from different genes, these markers were simply classified as being derived from a multigene family. A few primer pairs (21, 43, and 45) yielded one polymorphic-sized fragment (present in one parent and absent in the other) and one monomorphic fragment (present in both parent plants of the mapping population). Segregation patterns of these fragments in the mapping population could be explained by both a dominant and codominant model of inheritance; thus, they were classified as not verifiable (see footnote to Table 3). Polymorphic markers resulting from restriction enzyme digestion were classified as codominant because that is the predicted mode of inheritance for CAPS markers if a product is amplified in both parental genotypes (44/Alu, 45/Alu, and 52/Alu). Four primer pairs (44, 45, 49, and 51) yielded one fragment in one of the parents of the mapping population and no fragments in the other parent. Segregation of these markers in the mapping population was consistent with a dominant mode of inheritance (present or absent). One primer pair (47) yielded one fragment that was polymorphic among some of the genotypes but not between the parent plants of the mapping population; thus, the mode of inheritance for this fragment was also classified as not verifiable.

Amplification using the 17 primer pairs listed in Table 3, followed by digestion with AluI for primer pairs 44, 45, and 52, resulted in a total of 37 polymorphic fragments (without digestion) and seven different digestion profiles. With these markers, all genotypes were distinguishable from each other. Of these fragments and digestion profiles, a subset of the most easily scored markers that were sufficient for all the possible distinctions was identified. This subset

Table 3. Summary of EST primers that yielded scorable polymorphic fragments among the genotypes tested.

| Clone name | Forward and reverse primer sequences | Annealing temp (°C) | Genetic variation among genotypes | Type of inheritance |
|------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| 4          | GCC CGT CTC TCC TTC TCA GC          | 58                  | Polymorphic                      | Dominant           |
|            | CCA TCA AAG ACC ACC TAT GC         |                     |                                  |                    |
| 15         | CTA GAG GCT GCA GTG GAA GC         | 58                  | Polymorphic                      | Multigene family   |
|            | TTG CTC GTG TCG TCC TTA TG         |                     |                                  |                    |
| 21         | TCC GAT AAC GTG TAC CAA GC         | 56                  | Polymorphic                      | nV                 |
|            | TAT ACA GCG ACA CGC CAA GA         |                     |                                  |                    |
| 22         | CTG GTC ATA CCG GGC AAC            | 58                  | Polymorphic                      | Multigene family   |
|            | GAT CAA CCG GGT TCA TGG T           |                     |                                  |                    |
| 23         | GTT AGA GAG GGT TCC TTC GAG GA     | 54                  | Polymorphic                      | Multigene family   |
|            | AGC AAA AAC TTC AGC CCA AT          |                     |                                  |                    |
| 28         | AAT GGA AAG AAG CTC TGA CA         | 54                  | Polymorphic                      | Multigene family   |
|            | AAT GGA AAG AAG CTC TGA CA         |                     |                                  |                    |
| 31         | AGC ATT TGA CAC CAG TCA CG         | 52                  | Polymorphic                      | Multigene family   |
|            | TTG CAG GAG GGG GAT TTT             |                     |                                  |                    |
| 34         | CTA AAG AGC GGC CTG AAG TG         | 60                  | Polymorphic                      | Dominant           |
|            | TCT GGT GAG AAC TGG TCG TG          |                     |                                  |                    |
| 39         | TAA TGA GTG TGT GGC GAA CG         | 56                  | Polymorphic                      | Multigene family   |
|            | AAC AAG ACC AAA CCC CAC AT          |                     |                                  |                    |
| 43         | GGC AGC AGG TCA CAG AAT GT         | 54                  | Polymorphic                      | nV                 |
|            | ACA ATC CCA CCC AAA AAC AA          |                     |                                  |                    |
| 44         | AGC AGC GGT ATT CTC CTC AA          | 58                  | Polymorphic after digestion with AluI | Codominant         |
|            | CAC AGA ATC CAT TGA CAG CG          |                     |                                  |                    |
| 45         | CAA TGT TGG GGA GAA TGC TT         | 56                  | Polymorphic before and after digestion with AluI | nV before digestion | codominant after digestion |
|            | AAC AGC AAA ATA CAG CCA CG          |                     |                                  | nV                 |
| 47         | CTG CTG ATC CTA GCC ACC TC         | 56                  | Polymorphic                      | nV                 |
|            | AAA GGT TGC CCA AAA GGT CC          |                     |                                  |                    |
| 49         | GGC CAA AAC ATT TGA TGG GT          | 54                  | Polymorphic                      | Dominant           |
|            | CTT TCC GCC TTC TCA CAA AA          |                     |                                  |                    |
| 51         | GCT CTT CTT GTA CAG GGC TC          | 55                  | Polymorphic                      | Dominant           |
|            | TTG CCG ACA CAT AAA CCT AA          |                     |                                  |                    |
| 52         | GCC AGG TGG GCA ATG ATA GT          | 58                  | Polymorphic after digestion with AluI | Codominant         |
|            | TCA CAA ACT GAC CCC GTA CA          |                     |                                  |                    |
| 148        | CAA GGG TGC AGC TGA ACT TA          | 56                  | Polymorphic                      | Multigene family   |
|            | AAA AGC ATT GCA GTG ACA CG          |                     |                                  |                    |

*nV = not verifiable. The type of inheritance was not verifiable in the mapping population either because the amplified fragments were not polymorphic between the parent plants of the population or because the segregation pattern could fit either a dominant or a codominant model of inheritance. In this case, there were generally two fragments present in the parent plants, one that was present in both parents and one that was present in only one parent. This second fragment could have been an allele of the first fragment segregating in a codominant fashion or a separate gene from the first, segregating in a dominant fashion.
of EST-PCR markers included amplification products from four primer pairs, 21, 22, 34, and 49.

CLONING AND SEQUENCE ANALYSIS OF EST-PCR PRODUCTS. The homology of 20 EST-PCR markers was investigated by DNA sequencing. In making our selection of PCR products to sequence, we chose a sufficient number to give a good indication of whether the fragments were generally homologous to the cDNAs from which the primer sequences were derived. We sequenced approximately equal numbers of monomorphic and polymorphic fragments, including several fragments that would be useful for mapping in our populations (polymorphic between the original parent plants of the mapping populations). Specifically, eight monomorphic and 12 polymorphic fragments were cloned and sequenced and the sequences were analyzed (Table 4). Of the 20 EST-PCR products examined, all but three were homologous to the cDNAs from which the primer sequences were designed. The three that were not homologous were generated from primers that amplified some of the highest numbers of fragments (>5) per genotype of all the primers. On the other hand, three different cloned fragments amplified using primer pair 28, which yielded numerous PCR fragments, all showed homology to the original cDNA clone 28. These results show that, if an EST-PCR or CAPS marker has been mapped, one should not assume that the particular gene from which the PCR primer sequences were derived has been mapped until the EST-PCR product has been cloned and sequenced and its homology has been established. However, even the EST-PCR markers that lack homology to the original cDNA clones may still be used for DNA fingerprinting and genetic studies if they are reproducible, as are all the markers described in this study.

GENETIC SIMILARITY COEFFICIENTS AND COEFFICIENTS OF COANCESTRY. Similarity coefficients based on the molecular marker data were calculated for each pair of genotypes using the simple matching (symmetrical, including double-zeros) and Jaccard (asymmetrical, excluding double-zeroes) coefficient functions of the NTSYS-pc program. The dendrograms derived from the two matrices were nearly identical; therefore, only the similarity matrix based on the simple matching coefficient function (data not shown) is discussed. The simple matching similarity values ranged from 0.432 to 0.932, and the average similarity value was 0.740. The average similarity value among just the V. corymbosum cultivars was 0.789. The most divergent V. corymbosum cultivar was ‘Sierra’, with an average pairwise similarity value of 0.728 (based on just the V. corymbosum cultivar V. corymbosum cultivar pairwise comparisons). ‘Sierra’ is a hybrid of four different species (V. corymbosum, V. darrowi, V. constablaei Gray, and V. ashei); thus, this divergence is consistent with its pedigree (Table 1). The most divergent genotypes overall were the V. ashei cultivar Tifblue (average similarity value of 0.605), followed by the V. darrowi selection Fla4B (average similarity value of 0.645), the diploid V. corymbosum selection W85-20 (average similarity value of 0.683), and the V. corymbosum cultivar Sierra (average similarity value of 0.685). The genotypes ‘Bluecrop’ and ‘Nelson’ had the highest similarity value (0.932) of all the pairwise comparisons. This also is in agreement with their pedigrees, since ‘Bluecrop’ is a parent of ‘Nelson’.

Coefficients of coancestry were calculated for all possible pairs of the 19 genotypes based on complete pedigree information (data not shown). Polysomic inheritance was assumed for the tetraploids based on the findings of Krebs and Hancock (1989) and Qu and Hancock (1995), as was done by Ehlenfeldt (1994), for calculations of inbreeding coefficients. Coefficients of coancestry ranged from 0, for those genotypes that shared no parents in common, to 0.044, for the two pairs of genotypes that are parent and offspring (‘Bluecrop’/’Nelson’ and ‘Berkeley’/’Bluejay’), to even 0.45 for ‘Weymouth’ and ‘Toro’, which shared several ancestors in common. The average coefficient of coancestry value was 0.006. The average coefficient of coancestry value among the V. corymbosum cultivars was 0.008.

GENETIC RELATEDNESS TREES. The dendrogram based on a cluster analysis of the simple matching similarity matrix is shown in Fig. 2A. A cophenetic value matrix was produced from the tree matrix to measure the goodness of fit to the similarity matrix. An r value of 0.775 indicated a very good fit (data not shown).

A dendrogram based on cluster analysis of the coefficients of coancestry matrix is shown in Fig. 2B. This tree is similar to the tree based on similarity coefficients in some general ways but differs...
in much of the detail. In the tree based on similarity coefficients, the first division, at 65% similarity, separated the V. ashei cultivars, Tifblue and Climax, from the remaining genotypes. Next, at about 66% similarity, Fla4B and W85-20, the only diploid V. darrowi genotype and the only diploid V. corymbosum genotype, respectively, were separated from the remaining genotypes. The next division, at about 73% similarity, separated ‘Sierra’, the cultivar with multiple species in its background from the other V. corymbosum cultivars. In the tree based on coefficients of coancestry, the V. ashei cultivars, Tifblue and Climax, grouped separately from the V. corymbosum cultivars, as did the only diploid V. corymbosum genotype, W85-20. In the coefficients of coancestry tree, however, the diploid V. darrowi genotype, Fla4B, clustered together with the southern V. corymbosum × V. darrowi hybrid cultivars, Cooper, Georgiagem, and Gulfcoast, for which it is a parent, rather than remaining separate. In the similarity coefficient tree, ‘Cooper’ and ‘Gulfcoast’, full sibs, clustered together with ‘Sunrise’, their half sib, rather than with ‘Georgiagem’ and Fla4B. In the tree based on similarity coefficients, ‘Bluecrop’, ‘Nelson’, ‘Blueray’, and ‘Georgiagem’ clustered together. ‘Bluecrop’ is a parent of ‘Nelson’, a full sib of ‘Blueray’, and a grandparent of ‘Georgiagem’ on both sides. Likewise, in the coefficients of coancestry tree, ‘Bluecrop’, ‘Nelson’, and ‘Blueray’ grouped together, but this cluster included ‘Bluegold’ rather than ‘Georgiagem’. Clustering of most of the other V. corymbosum cultivars was quite different between the two trees.

Comparison of relationship measures. A correlation test was performed on the genetic similarity matrix based on the molecular marker data and the coefficient of coancestry matrix based on pedigree information. A fair positive correlation (r = 0.317) was found, which was highly significant (p < 0.0001). This was not surprising since an empirical examination of the two dendrograms suggested that they agreed in some ways but differed in others. The similarity matrix and resulting dendrogram is based on only 37 EST-PCR markers and seven digestion profiles; thus, a better correlation with the coefficients of coancestry matrix might be found with the development and analysis of additional markers. However, in our previous studies in blueberry using hundreds of RAPD markers (Levi and Rowland, 1997) and in strawberry using hundreds of AFLP markers (Degani et al., 2001), we still found only weak to moderate correlations between genetic similarity values based on molecular marker data and coefficients of coancestry. A cause for these fair, at best, correlations may be inaccuracies in both estimates. Coefficients of coancestry are based on probabilities of inheriting the same genes; therefore, they are indirect estimates of similarity and may not always reflect the true relationships between accessions (Graner et al., 1994; Russell et al., 1997). The assumptions underlying the coefficients of coancestry calculations also may not be completely fulfilled. Coefficients of coancestry assume a natural or breeder’s selection and assume that all original ancestors are equally unrelated, which is probably not true (Schut et al., 1997). The accuracy of genetic similarity estimates based on molecular markers depends on several variables as well, such as the number of markers analyzed, their distribution over the genome if linkage disequilibrium is involved, and correct scoring of the markers (Schut et al., 1997).

In conclusion, the EST-PCR and CAPS markers proved very effective at distinguishing the cultivars in this study and many were polymorphic between the parent plants of the mapping population. A selection of 20 EST-PCR products were cloned and sequenced and homology to the original cDNA clones confirmed for all but three. A dendrogram constructed from genetic similarity values, based on molecular marker data, agreed fairly well with pedigree information. Thus, these markers should have general utility for DNA fingerprinting and for estimates of genetic relatedness in blueberry. In addition, these markers are being added to our current genetic linkage maps (data not shown). Because the markers are derived from ESTs produced from a cDNA library made from RNA from cold-acclimated plants, they should be particularly useful for mapping QTLs controlling cold hardiness.

In studies with other plants, amplification using EST-PCR primers generally had to be followed by either digestion with restriction enzymes to generate CAPS markers, heteroduplex analysis,
or SSCP analysis to detect polymorphisms (Cato et al., 2001). In the case of blueberry, 15 out of the 30 tested EST-PCR primer pairs resulted in amplification of polymorphic fragments that were detectable directly after ethidium bromide staining of agarose gels, and amplification reactions with as few as four of the primer pairs could distinguish all the genotypes in this study. Blueberry species are primarily outcrossing and exhibit low to moderate levels of self-fertility. Self-pollinations are not often used in blueberry cultivar development due to inbreeding depression as evidenced by reduced seed set and poor germination (Galletta and Ballington, 1996). The inherent breeding behavior of blueberry together with past breeding techniques used for cultivar development may explain the high level of polymorphic EST-PCR markers observed without the need for additional modifications or analyses.
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