

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**The evaluation of morphological and molecular
techniques for discrimination among and verification
of lucerne (*Medicago sativa*) cultivars**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Plant Science

(Seed Technology)

at Massey University

New Zealand

Majid Dehghan-Shoar

1996

ABSTRACT

The stability and usefulness of plant morphological characters for discrimination among lucerne (*Medicago sativa* L.) cultivars was investigated under three sets of field and glasshouse conditions, using two New Zealand cultivars and four Iranian ecotypic cultivars representing diverse geographical adaptations. Following the guidelines of the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV) and the requirements of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) seed certification scheme for testing distinctness, homogeneity and stability of lucerne cultivars in field test plots, morphological data were recorded from four replicates of 18 spaced plants per cultivar in the field in the establishment year (1993) and the following year. Flower colour was recorded from a further 150 one- and two-year old plants of each cultivar in the field. In a glasshouse, where the minimum and maximum temperatures were set at 16°C and 22°C respectively, morphological characters were recorded from three replicates of 22 one-year old plants of each cultivar. The majority of the 12 morphological characters recommended by UPOV and OECD for discrimination and verification of lucerne cultivars were not independent of the environment. Only three characters, number of plant stems immediately above the ground, plant recovery height, and leaflet width/length ratio were stable, and thus could be used as reliable morphological descriptors for lucerne cultivars. However, none of the individual characters, or any combination of these characters, were sufficient to differentiate all of the cultivars at $P < 0.01$, the standard required by UPOV to detect differences among lucerne cultivars. Morphologically based methods are therefore not effective for discrimination among lucerne cultivars, and there is a need to find more precise and effective techniques for assessing whether cultivars are actually different (UPOV) or whether individual seed lots of a cultivar do not differ from the cultivar standard (OECD).

A digital image processing algorithm (VIPS) was used for image processing of 150 individual seeds of 17 seed lots of eight lucerne cultivars and also for image analysis of 66 leaflets from individual glasshouse grown plants of six cultivars. Of the 21 morphological characters and derived measurements recorded from individual seeds of

the cultivars, 10 were useful for cultivar verification and discrimination. Among individual characters, red colour/total intensity, and blue/total intensity of seed had the highest, while actual area of seed/convex area had the lowest ability (64 % vs 18%) to discriminate among cultivars. A better cultivar discrimination (86%) was obtained on the basis of a combined value from the 10 selected characters using Canonical Discriminant Analysis. This was further improved (to 94%) using the result from the 10 individual characters plus the combination of the selected seed characters. Using image analysis of leaflets of individual plants, only 67% of the cultivars could be discriminated.

Discontinuous SDS-polyacrylamide electrophoresis was used for protein analysis of both bulked and single seeds of 14 seed lots from six Iranian and two New Zealand cultivars. A series of preliminary experiments was first undertaken to determine the optimal protein loading volume for bulk, and also single seed samples of the cultivars, to enable production of clear, sharp and therefore easily evaluated bands. Of the many protein bands produced as a result of SDS-PAGE analysis of single seeds of the cultivars, the seventeen most distinctive bands were selected for analysis. Their intensities were assessed using a Vision Image Processing System (VIPS), and the data were used for discrimination among the cultivars. Electrophoresis of protein extracted from the bulked seed samples failed to differentiate the majority of the cultivars. However, 82% of the cultivars could be differentiated using the combined results from intensities of the 17 selected protein bands from single seeds of the cultivars. Since all eight cultivars could not be discriminated using SDS-PAGE of individual seeds, two other molecular techniques (Restriction Fragment Length Polymorphism (RFLP) and Random Amplified DNA Polymorphism (RAPD) were employed to determine if better discrimination among lucerne cultivars was possible using DNA techniques.

DNA samples were extracted from 4-5 frozen leaves (at -70° C) from 40 individual 45 day old seedlings of six Iranian, two New Zealand, and two internationally recognised cultivars. Following purification and quantification, bulked DNA samples of the cultivars, plus those from individual seedlings were digested with four common restriction endonucleases to cleave the DNA into smaller fragments. The digested DNA

fragments were separated by agarose gel electrophoresis and were then transferred to a nylon membrane. This membrane was hybridised with nine probes *i.e.* six lucerne cDNA probes (I013, 492, 281, 328, 473, 457), two apple probes (ADH, cDNA and ribosomal DNA (rDNA)) and one clover probe (ADH) to determine the best combination between restriction enzymes and probes to optimize the number of polymorphic bands. A non-radioactive method was used for probe labelling.

Of the six lucerne probes screened with the restriction endonucleases (*EcoR I*, *Bam HI*, *Hind III* and *Xba I*) all except I013 produced extremely faint bands from the bulked DNA samples of the cultivars. Although a combination of I013 and *Hind III* gave the highest number of RFLP fragments in initial experiment, the result was not reproducible.

No distinct RFLPs were detected using the clover ADH probe from the bulked DNA samples of the cultivars, and the apple rDNA probe detected polymorphism between only some of the cultivars. This result suggested that DNA fingerprinting of lucerne cultivars may not be feasible on the basis of the RFLPs from bulk DNA samples of the cultivars. It was therefore hypothesised that better discrimination among the cultivars might be possible on a population basis *i.e.* by examining the percentage of plants within each cultivar containing particular fragments. This hypothesis was tested by analysing scoring data based on the presence (1) and absence (0) of the RFLP fragments from 40 individual seedlings of each cultivar using Canonical Discriminant Analysis. RFLP analysis of individual seedlings of the cultivar using each of the rDNA and the ADH probes produced distinct but highly polymorphic RFLPs among the seedlings which was an indication of great genetic diversity within each of the cultivars. Seventy percent of cultivar pairs could be discriminated using the RFLPs detected by apple rDNA compared with 56% for the clover ADH probe at $P < 0.05$. Some pairs of cultivars which could not be discriminated using the rDNA, were discriminated on the basis of RFLPs detected by the ADH probe. When the results from these two probes were combined, 91% of the cultivars could be discriminated.

Using the PCR based RAPD technique, bulk DNA extracts from 10 lucerne cultivars plus DNA from 40 individual 45 day old seedlings of each cultivar were analyzed.

Twenty-six 10-base arbitrary primers were screened using bulk DNA samples of the cultivars to select those which were able to generate clear RAPD bands. Of these, four (*i.e.* OPA08, OPB13 OPO19 and OPC10) produced sharp and distinctive RAPD bands. OPB19 produced the highest number of distinct RAPD fragments and all of the cultivars, even those which were closely related, could be discriminated. Although all of the cultivars could not be discriminated using the RAPD profiles generated by OPA08, OPB13 and OPC10 individually, a combination of the results from these primers provided sufficient information for discrimination among all of the 10 cultivars. The number of distinct RAPD fragments generated by a combination of the primers OPB19 and OPC10 was less than those produced by individual primers alone. To check the reproducibility of the RAPD results, replicated reactions were carried out using two primers (OPB19 and OPC10) alone and in combination with the standard reaction mixture using different batches of enzyme from the same manufacturer. This demonstrated that a high degree of reproducibility of results obtained by the RAPD technique is possible.

To assess genetic variation within and among the cultivars, nine distinct RAPD bands generated by primer OPO8 were scored. The RAPD products from 40 individual seedlings of the each cultivars produced distinct but very diverse profiles, indicating genetic diversity within each individual population. Pairwise comparison of the LSMEANS of the RAPD profiles illustrated that 86% of the cultivars were significantly different.

These molecular techniques and seed image analysis were also assessed for their ability to test uniformity, and detect genetic relationships among the cultivars. For seed protein and DNA analysis, uniformity was assessed using similarity of protein and DNA banding profiles from individual seeds and seedlings from each of the seed lots of the lucerne cultivars. For seed image analysis, uniformity of the cultivars was assessed on the basis of the proportion of uniform seeds in each of the seed lots. Genetic relatedness among the cultivars was detected using the squared Mahalanobis distances (D^2) of the cultivars.

The genetic relatedness established among the cultivars was almost the same irrespective of whether the three molecular or the seed image analysis techniques were used, despite the different nature of each analysis. The results were consistent with the genetic background, autumn-dormancy and geographical adaptation of the cultivars examined. However, these techniques did not produced the same results for testing of uniformity. Analysis of a larger sample size from a number of cultivars with known genetic background would be needed before drawing any final conclusion as to the relative merits of these techniques for estimation of relatedness and uniformity of lucerne cultivars.

Comparisons between protein banding profiles and also seed morphological characters of seed lots from the same cultivar illustrated significant differences between the seed lots of some of the cultivars. This suggested that genetic shift had occurred during seed multiplication. As all of the seed lots studied had been certified under the OECD scheme, the scheme is apparently not capable of detecting this degree of genetic shift.

Of all the techniques investigated, image analysis is regarded as the most suitable alternative to plot testing for discrimination among, and verification of lucerne cultivars, and for detection of genetic shift. The reasons for this are the speed of analysis, lower running costs, lack of need for chemicals and ease of operation of the equipment. However, this will be dependent on access to image analysis facilities. For genetic analysis of lucerne cultivars the RAPD technique was considered the best among the molecular techniques used.

In the name of God the most compassionate the most merciful

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is a pleasure to thank the many people who have each contributed in their own way to the completion of this thesis.

Firstly, I would like to thank God for his love, blessing and his guidance enabling me to complete my study.

My sincerest thanks to my chief supervisor, Professor John G. Hampton of the Seed Technology Centre, Massey University, for his guidance and wise supervision through the conducting of experiments and writing of the manuscript. Appreciation and thanks are extended to my co-supervisor, Dr. Sue E. Gardiner of the Molecular Genetic Group, HortResearch, CRI, Palmerston North for her direct supervision and extremely valuable guidance and encouragement for genetic analysis of lucerne cultivars.

My sincere thanks also extended to my other co-supervisors *i.e.*

Prof. M. J. Hill, Director of the Seed Technology Centre Massey University for his support, and valuable guidance and parental care during this study.

Assoc. Prof. S. J. Haslett, Director of the Applied Statistics Consulting Centre, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand, for his advice on the statistical analysis.

Prof. R.G. Thomas of Plant Biology and Biotechnology, Massey University, New Zealand for his guidance in the plant physiological study.

Dr. D. Woodfield of Agricultural research, CRI, Palmerston North, New Zealand, for his advise and guidance

I would like to express my gratitude to my wife, Tahereh, for her support, patience, encouragement and help in many ways for running the experiments, and also to my son,

Mahdi, and my daughter, Zeinab, for their valuable assistance for data collection and analysis and my youngest son, Mohammad-Hossian whose smile and sweetness was great encouragement for continuation of this study.

I would like to thank Dr. D.G. Bailey of the Image Analysis Unit, Massey University for his guidance and writing the required image analysis programs in this study and also Dr. M.A. Naderi-Shahab; Dr. Bob Skip; Mr. B. Show; Dr. M.R. Ghannaha; Dr. S.R. Mirhosseini; Dr. H. Mirzaie and Dr. M. Askarian for their help and guidance.

I would like express my sincere thanks to Mr. Ray Johnston; Mr. Robert Southward; Mr Hugh Neilson; Mr. Charlie H. Forbes; Mr Criag McGill; Mr. Naba R. Devkota; Ms. Colette Gwynne; Ms Kathy Hamilton; Ms Karen Hill; Ms Ruth G. Morrison of the Plant Science Department, Massey University for providing technical assistance during this study.

Ms Heather Bassett and Ms Charolotte Madie of the Molecular Genetic Group, Horticultural Research, CRI, Palmerston North for their technical assistance.

I am grateful for the grant awarded to me by the Ministry of Agriculture through the Sugar Beet Research Institute and the Agricultural Research Organization, and by the Ministry of Culture and Higher Education of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

I thank the Seed and Plant Improvement Institute, Ministry of Agriculture, Karadj, Islamic Republic of Iran for the supply of seed of the Iranian cultivars, and the Margot Forde Germplasm Centre, New Zealand Pastoral Agriculture Research Institute Ltd., Palmerston North, New Zealand for supply of seed of other cultivars.

To all these people, Thank you.

Majid Dehghan-Shoar

March 1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	i
Table of Content	v
List of Tables	xviii
List of Plates and Figures	xxii
Chapter 1 General Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Verification of stability, and usefulness of plant morphological characters for discrimination among lucerne (<i>Medicago sativa</i> L.) cultivars	7
2.1 Literature Review	7
2.1.1 Introduction	7
2.1.2 Cultivar registration and the requirement for plot testing	7
2.1.3 Seed certification and the requirement for plot testing	9
2.1.4 Leaf morphology	13
2.1.5 Plant growth and development	17
2.1.6 Time of flowering	19
2.1.7 Number of vegetative nodes to the first flower	19
2.1.8 Seed yield	20
2.1.9 Seed morphology	21
2.2 Materials and Methods	23
2.2.1 Experimental field	23
2.2.2 Cultivars used in this study	23
2.2.3 Land preparation	23
2.2.4 Experimental design	24
2.2.4.1 Spaced plants trial	24
2.2.4.2 Flowering trial	24
2.2.5 Transplanting of seedlings into the field	24
2.2.6 Morphological and physiological characters recorded from first and second year plants	26
2.2.7 Weed control	28
2.2.8 Pest and disease control	29
2.2.9 Application of fertiliser	29
2.2.10 Statistical analysis	29
2.2.11 Examination of plant morphological characteristics in controlled glasshouse conditions	33
2.2.11.1 Growth environment	33

2.2.11.2	Growing media	34
2.2.11.3	Experimental design	34
2.2.11.4	Watering system	34
2.2.11.5	Morphological characteristics recorded from the plants grown in the glasshouse	35
2.2.11.6	Experimental management	35
2.2.12	Definitions	36
2.3	Results	38
2.3.1	Stem number	38
2.3.2	Thickness of the main stem	38
2.3.3	Plant height at flowering	39
2.3.4	Leaflet size	39
2.3.5	Number of nodes on the main stem	40
2.3.6	Foliage dry weight	40
2.3.7	Time of flowering	41
2.3.8	Flower colour	42
2.3.9	Plant recovery height	48
2.3.10	Discrimination among cultivars using plant morphological characters which could only be recorded from the field trials	51
2.3.10.1	Angle of plants at flowering and after cutting	51
2.3.10.2	Disease observation	52
2.3.10.3	Plant growth habit	52
2.4	Discussion	55
2.4.1	Stem number	55
2.4.2	Thickness of the main stem	56
2.4.3	Plant height at flowering	56
2.4.4	Time of flowering, and the number of nodes on the stem to the first flower buds	57
2.4.5	Flower colour	57
2.4.6	Leaflet size	58
2.4.7	Plant recovery height	59
2.4.8	Foliage dry weight	60
2.4.9	Discrimination among cultivars using plant morphological characters which could only be recorded from the field trials	60
2.4.9.1	Plant angle	60
2.4.9.2	Disease resistance	61
2.4.10	Problems associated with the conventional test plot method for registration of lucerne cultivars	61
2.4.11	Problems associated with the conventional plot testing method for lucerne seed certification	62
Chapter 3 Image analysis of plant leaflets and individual seeds for identification of, and discrimination among, lucerne cultivars		65

Contents

3.1	Literature Review	65
3.1.1	Introduction	65
3.1.2	Principle of image analysis	66
3.1.3	Application of the image analysis technique for determination of leaf size and shape properties	67
3.1.4	Application of image analysis techniques for determination of seed size and shape properties	68
3.2	Materials and Methods	75
3.2.1	Descriptive summary of the process	75
3.2.2	The configuration of the VIPS	75
3.2.3	Computer commands used for image analysis of seeds and leaflets	77
3.2.4	Image processing of individual seeds and plant leaflets of the cultivars	77
3.2.5	Morphological characters of terminal leaflets	78
3.2.6	Seed Properties measured	79
3.2.7	Statistical analysis	85
3.2.7.1	Comparison between cultivars using each morphological characters recorded from individual seeds and leaflets of the seed lots of the cultivars	85
3.2.7.2	Comparison between cultivars on the basis of a combination value from morphological characters recorded from individual seeds and leaflets of the seed lots of the cultivars	85
3.3	Results	88
3.3.1	Discrimination among lucerne cultivars on the basis of seed morphological characters recorded using image analysis	88
3.3.1.1	Assessment of the most useful seed morphological characters for identification of, and discrimination among, lucerne cultivars	88
3.3.1.2	Discrimination among eight lucerne cultivars using ten individual morphological characters of single seeds of the standard seed lots of the cultivars	90
3.3.2	Identification of, and discrimination among the cultivars using a combination of ten useful morphological characters of individual seeds	96
3.3.2.1	Pairwise comparison between squared Mahalanobis distances between the standard seed lots of the cultivars using ten morphological characters of individual seeds that best discriminate among seed lots of the cultivars	96
3.3.2.2	Assessment of cultivar uniformity using cross validation data for each of the seed lots of the cultivars	99

Contents

3.3.2.3	Pairwise comparisons of least squared means (LSMEANS) of six Iranian and two New Zealand cultivars on the basis of the CDF1, the combination value of ten morphological characters of individual seeds	99
3.3.2.4	General linear models (GLM) procedure for dependent variable CDF1	101
3.3.2.5	Duncan's Multiple range test for discrimination between seed lots of the cultivars	101
3.3.3	Discrimination among four Iranian and two New Zealand lucerne cultivars on the basis of twelve morphological characters of plant leaflets recorded using image analysis	105
3.3.3.1	Cultivar discrimination on the basis of the individual characters	105
3.3.3.2	Cultivar discrimination using a combination value from 12 morphological characters of leaflets of individual plants of the cultivars (CDF1, see section 3.2.7).	106
3.3.3.2.1	Pairwise comparison between squared distances (Mahalanobis distances) of the cultivars on the basis of CDF1, a combination value from the 12 morphological characters of leaflets of individual plants of the cultivars grown under glasshouse conditions	106
3.3.3.2.2	Pairwise comparison of least squared means (LSMEANS) of four Iranian and two New Zealand cultivars on the basis of CDF1, a combination value from the twelve morphological characters of leaflets of the individual plants grown under glasshouse conditions	109
3.3.3.2.3	General linear models (GLM) procedure, and Duncan's Multiple range test for variable CDF1	110
3.4	Discussion	112
3.4.1	Assessment of the most useful seed morphological characters for identification of lucerne cultivars	112
3.4.2	Assessment of the most useful seed morphological characters for discrimination among lucerne cultivars	113
3.4.3	Discrimination among eight lucerne cultivars using each of the ten seed morphological characters	114
3.4.4	Discrimination among lucerne cultivars on the basis of a combination value of ten morphological characters of individual seeds defined using image analysis	116

Contents

3.4.5	Test of uniformity of cultivars using a combination value from the 10 selected morphological characters of individual seeds	117
3.4.6	Pairwise comparison between squared Mahalanobis distances of seed lots of the cultivars	118
3.4.7	Test of relatedness among eight Iranian and New Zealand lucerne cultivars on the basis of a combination value from the 10 selected morphological characters of individual seeds of the cultivars	119
3.4.8	Test of relatedness of seed lots from the same cultivar to the standard seed lots of the cultivar using a combination value from the 10 selected morphological characters of individual seeds of the seed lots	120
3.4.9	Assessment of genetic shift in seed lots of lucerne cultivars using a combination value from the 10 selected morphological characters of individual seeds	121
3.4.10	Discrimination among four Iranian and two New Zealand lucerne cultivars on the basis of 12 recorded characters from leaflets of individual plants grown under glasshouse conditions	122
Chapter 4 SDS-PAGE of seed storage proteins		125
4.1	Literature Review	125
4.1.1	Introduction	125
4.1.2	Advantages of protein electrophoresis cultivar identification and discrimination	126
4.1.3	Methods for protein electrophoresis	126
4.1.4	SDS-PAGE analysis of seed storage proteins for identification and discrimination among cultivars of plant species	128
4.1.4.1	SDS-PAGE analysis of seed storage proteins for discrimination and identification of autogamous (inbreeding) species	129
4.1.4.2	SDS-PAGE analysis of seed storage proteins for discrimination and identification of allogamous (outbreeding) species	129
4.1.5	Practical application of protein electrophoresis techniques in discrimination and identification of lucerne cultivars	131
4.2	Materials and Methods	133

Contents

4.2.1	Chemicals	133
4.2.2	Seed samples	133
4.2.3	Grinding of the seed samples	134
4.2.4	Protein extraction procedure	135
4.2.5	Optimising loading volume for sharpest resolution of protein bands	135
4.2.6	Electrophoresis	136
4.2.7	Protein fixing procedure	138
4.2.8	Staining	138
4.2.8.1	First staining	138
4.2.8.2	Second staining	138
4.2.9	Photography and evaluation of the results	139
4.2.10	Statistical analysis	140
4.3	Results	144
4.3.1	Optimising loading volume of extract for the best resolution of protein bands	144
4.3.2	Discrimination among lucerne cultivars using the protein extracted from bulk seed samples of the cultivars	144
4.3.3	Discrimination among seed lots of six Iranian and two New Zealand lucerne cultivars by electrophoresis of proteins from a number of single seeds from each cultivar	150
4.3.3.1	Cross validation for each of the seed lots of the cultivars	150
4.3.3.2	Pairwise comparison between squared distances (Mahalanobis distances) of protein banding profiles of seed lots from the cultivars	151
4.3.3.3	Pairwise comparisons of least squared means (LSMEANS) of protein banding patterns of the seed lots	152
4.3.4.4	General linear models (GLM) procedure for dependent variable: CDF1	158
4.3.4.5	Duncan's Multiple range test for discrimination between seed lots of the cultivars	158
4.4	Discussion	160
4.4.1	Optimising loading volume of protein extracts from single and bulk seed samples	160
4.4.2	Discrimination among lucerne cultivars on the basis of protein profiles resulting from SDS-PAGE of bulk seed of the cultivars	161
4.4.3	Discrimination among lucerne cultivars on the basis of protein profiles resulting from SDS-PAGE of a number of single seeds	

Contents

	within each seed lot	161
4.4.4	Assessment of the genetic uniformity of the cultivars based on the similarity of the protein banding profile from individual seeds within each seed lot	163
4.4.5	Comparisons among protein banding profiles of different seed lots from the same cultivar	163
4.4.6	Genetic shift in cultivars as a result of removal of a proportion of a seed lot due to shedding and shattering of seed, and also exclusion of immature seeds from the seed lot	165
4.4.7	Preference of pollinators for visiting flowers of a particular colour	165
4.4.8	Other plant genotype effects on attraction of the pollinator	166
4.4.9	Relationship between protein electrophoresis pattern and morphological characteristics of lucerne cultivars	167
4.4.10	Usefulness of the SDS-PAGE technique for discrimination and identification of lucerne cultivars	167
4.4.11	Practical advantages of the Canonical Discriminant Analysis (CDA)	168
Chapter 5	Restriction fragment length polymorphisms (RFLP)	170
5.1	Literature Review	170
5.1.1	Principle of the restriction fragment length polymorphism (RFLP) technique	170
5.1.2	Applications of the RFLP technique for genetic analysis of plant species	172
5.1.3	Applications of the RFLP technique in cultivar identification	173
5.1.4	Importance of probe selection in revealing polymorphisms among populations and cultivars	175
5.1.5	Advantages and disadvantages of the RFLP technique	176
5.2	Materials and Methods	177
5.2.1	Plant Material	177
5.2.2	DNA extraction	177
5.2.3	DNA quantification	179
5.2.4	Optimising loading concentration of the digested DNA into the gel for production of sharp, easily evaluated RFLPs	180
5.2.5	General procedure for DNA digestion, preparation of the Southern blots, probe hybridisation and signal detection, plus determination of best probe/enzyme combinations	180

Contents

5.2.5.1	DNA Digestion	181
5.2.5.2	Processing of the gel	182
5.2.5.3	Capillary blotting	185
5.2.5.4	Probing	186
5.2.5.4.1	Prehybridisation	186
5.2.5.4.2	Probe preparation and hybridisation	186
5.2.5.4.3	Washing the membrane	187
5.2.5.4.4	Signal detection (modified from the Amersham technique)	187
5.2.5.4.5	Probe stripping	188
5.2.6	Evaluation of the results and statistical analysis	189
5.3	Results	192
5.3.1	Optimising the loading of the digested DNA onto the gel to produce clear, easily evaluated restriction fragment length polymorphism (RFLP) banding profiles	192
5.3.2	Screening of endonuclease restriction enzymes and DNA probes for determining the best combinations for production of clear and easily evaluated RFLP bands	192
5.3.2.1	Lucerne probes	192
5.3.2.2	Clover probe	193
5.3.2.3	Apple probes	193
5.3.3	Use of apple rDNA probe for discrimination among lucerne cultivars based on the restriction fragments from probing of Southern blot of BamH I-digested bulked DNA samples from the cultivars.	201
5.3.4	Use of apple rDNA probe for discrimination among lucerne cultivars on the basis of the frequencies of RFLP bands detected by the apple rDNA probe on Southern blots of the Bam HI-digested DNA from 40 single seedlings of each of the cultivars	202
5.3.4.1	Cross validation for each of the seed lots of the cultivars	202
5.3.4.2	Pairwise comparison between Mahalanobis squared distances of RFLP profiles of the cultivars resulting from probing Southern blots with the BamH I-digested DNA extracted from 40 single seedlings of each of the cultivars with apple rDNA	203
5.3.4.3	Pairwise comparisons of least squared means (LSMEANS) of RFLPs of the cultivar, resulting from hybridisation of Southern blots of Bam HI-digested DNA from 40 single seedlings of each of the cultivars with an apple rDNA probe	209
5.3.4.4	General linear models (GLM) procedure for dependent variable: CDF1	209
5.3.4.5	Duncan's Multiple range test for discrimination among	

Contents

	seed lots of the cultivars based on the frequencies of the restriction fragments resulting from hybridisation of Southern blots of Bam <i>HI</i> -digested DNA extracted from 40 single seedlings of each of the cultivars with apple rDNA	210
5.3.5	Use of clover ADH probe for discrimination of lucerne cultivars based on the RFLP fragments resulting from hybridisation of Southern blot of <i>XbaI</i> -digested bulked DNA samples of the cultivars	213
5.3.6	Use of clover ADH probe for discrimination among the cultivars based on frequencies of the restriction fragments produced by hybridisation of Southern blots of <i>Xba I</i> -digested DNA samples from 40 single seedlings from each of the cultivars	213
5.3.6.1	Cross validation for each of the seed lots of the cultivars	213
5.3.6.2	Pairwise comparison between squared distances (Mahalanobis distances) of restriction fragment profiles of the cultivars resulting from probing the Southern blot with the <i>Xba I</i> -digested DNA extracted from 40 single seedlings of each of the cultivars with the ADH probe	214
5.3.6.3	Pairwise comparisons of least squared means (LSMEANS) of the RFLP profiles of the cultivars based on the frequencies of the restriction fragments resulting from hybridisation of Southern blot with <i>Xba I</i> - digested DNA extracted from 40 single seedlings of each of the cultivars with the ADH probe	215
5.3.6.4	General linear models (GLM) procedure for dependent variable: CDF1	220
5.3.6.5	Duncan's Multiple range test for discrimination among seed lots of the cultivars based on the frequencies of the restriction fragments resulting from probing Southern blot with <i>Xba I</i> -digested DNA extracted from 40 single seedlings of each of the cultivars with the ADH probe . . .	220
5.4	Discussion	222
5.4.1	Importance of probe selection in revealing polymorphisms among lucerne cultivars	222
5.4.1.1	Lucerne probes	222
5.4.1.2	Clover probe	222
5.4.1.3	Apple probes	223
5.4.2	Discrimination among lucerne cultivars on the basis of RFLPs from bulked DNA samples of the cultivars using clover ADH	

Contents

and apple rDNA probes	224
5.4.3 Discrimination among lucerne cultivars on the basis of frequencies of RFLPs from single seedlings of the cultivars detected by the apple rDNA and the clover ADH probes	224
5.4.4 Assessment of genetic uniformity of lucerne cultivars on the basis of similarity of the RFLP profiles from the individual seedlings ..	226
5.4.4.1 Genetic uniformity of the cultivars on the basis of frequencies of the RFLPs detected by the apple rDNA probe	227
5.4.4.2 Genetic uniformity of the cultivars on the basis of frequencies of the RFLPs detected by the clover ADH probe	227
5.4.5 Estimation of genetic relatedness among lucerne cultivars on the basis of RFLP profiles from individual seedlings detected by rDNA and the ADH probe	228
Chapter 6 Random amplified polymorphic DNA (RAPD)	230
6.1 Literature Review	230
6.1.1 Polymerase chain reaction (PCR)	230
6.1.2 Random amplified polymorphic DNA (RAPD)	231
6.1.3 Application of RAPD markers for genetic research and cultivar identification	232
6.1.4 Advantages of RAPD analysis	235
6.1.5 Problems associated with the RAPD technique	236
6.1.5.1 Assessment of reproducibility of results	236
6.1.5.2 Presence of a low incidence of non-inherited bands in RAPD products	238
6.2 Materials and Methods	238
6.2.1 DNA samples and optimisation of target DNA concentration	238
6.2.2 Reaction mixture and amplification conditions	239
6.2.3 Oligonucleotide Primers	240
6.2.4 Evaluation of the results and statistical analysis	240
6.3 Results	243
6.3.1 Results from combination of two oligonucleotides in a single PCR reaction	243
6.3.2 Assessment of reproducibility of the results of the RAPD	

Contents

technique	243
6.3.3 Screening of twenty-six 10-base arbitrary primers for their power of discrimination	246
6.3.4 Discrimination among the cultivars based on the frequencies of the amplified polymorphic DNA fragments from 40 single seedlings of the cultivars generated using the primer OPA08	256
6.3.4.1 Cross validation for each of the seed lots of the cultivars ..	256
6.3.4.2 Pairwise comparison between the squared Mahalanobis distances of the RAPD profiles from the cultivars amplified by primer OPA08	261
6.3.4.3 Pairwise comparisons of least squared means (LSMEANS) of RAPD profiles from the cultivars amplified using the primer OPA08	261
6.3.4.4 General linear models (GLM) procedure for dependent variable CDF1	266
6.3.4.5 Duncan's Multiple range test for discrimination among seed lots of the cultivar based on the frequencies of RAPDs amplified using the primer OPA08	266
6.4 Discussion	268
6.4.1 Genomic fingerprinting of lucerne cultivars using a combination of oligonucleotide primers	268
6.4.2 Reproducibility of RAPD results	269
6.4.3 Application of the RAPD technique for genetic Analysis	270
6.4.3.1 Discrimination among 10 lucerne cultivars on the basis of frequencies of the RAPD fragments from single seedlings generated using a single primer (OPA08)	271
6.4.3.2 Assessment of the genetic uniformity of lucerne cultivars on the basis of similarity of the RAPD profiles from individual seedlings generated using primer OPA08	272
6.4.3.3 Estimation of genetic similarity among lucerne cultivars on the basis of RAPD profiles of individual seedlings generated using primer OPA08	274
6.4.4 Genomic fingerprinting of lucerne cultivars on the basis of the RAPD profiles from bulk DNA samples of the cultivars generated by an individual primer (OPA08)	275
6.4.5 Summary	277
Chapter 7 General Discussion	278
7.1 Introduction	278

Contents

7.2	Evaluation of the plot testing, molecular and image analysis techniques for registration of lucerne cultivars	279
7.2.1	Test of distinctness	279
7.2.1.1	Use of plot testing for cultivar discrimination among lucerne cultivars	279
7.2.1.2	Use of electrophoresis of seed storage protein for discrimination among lucerne cultivars	281
7.2.1.3	Use of the RFLP technique for discrimination among lucerne cultivars	282
7.2.1.4	Use of the RAPD technique for discrimination among lucerne cultivars	284
7.2.1.5	Use of image analysis for discrimination among lucerne cultivars	286
7.2.2	Application of molecular techniques and image analysis for testing the uniformity or homogeneity of lucerne cultivars	287
7.3	Application of molecular and image analysis techniques for verification and certification of lucerne cultivars	288
7.4	Genetic analysis among and within cultivars of lucerne using three molecular methods and seed image analysis	292
	Bibliography	298

List of Tables

Table 2.1.1	Leaf area of three lucerne cultivars grown under four temperature regimes, 22 and 47 days after seed was sown (adapted from Bula, 1972)	14
Table 2.1.2	Size (width multiplied by length) of fully developed centre leaflets, sampled from 22 and 47 day old plants grown under four temperature regimes as presented by Bula, 1972)	15
Table 2.1.3	Percentage of five week old lucerne plants with blooms as affected by temperature and spacing (data from Nittler and Kenny ,1964) . .	21
Table 2.2.1	Pesticides used during the establishment and following year of the field experiment	33
Table 2.3.1	Characters recorded from individual plants grown under both glasshouse and field conditions. Character means for cultivars with the same letter are not significantly different at $P<0.05$	43
Table 2.3.2	Length, width, and width/length ratio of the terminal leaflet of individual plants of the cultivars grown under field and glasshouse conditions. Character means for cultivars with the same letter are not significantly different at $P<0.05$	44
Table 2.3.3	Dry weight and number of nodes recorded from individual plants grown under both glasshouse and field conditions. Character means for cultivars with the same letter are not significantly different at $P<0.05$	45
Table 2.3.4	Days required for flowering of 10% (DRFFT.10%), 25% (DRFFT.25%), 50 % (DRFFT.50%), 75% (DRFFT.75%), and 100 % (DRFFT.100%) of the individual plants in each of the cultivars. The means for cultivars with the same letter are not significantly different at $P<0.05$	46
Table 2.3.5	Comparison between percentages of plants of cultivars with identical flower colour in two field and one glasshouse experiments. Flowers were classified into light purple (LP), purple (P), dark purple (DP) and variegated (VAR) colours	47
Table 2.3.6	Weekly recovery height in the field and glasshouse up to 6 weeks after the first cut (CUT1.W2-CUT1.W6), and three weeks after the second cut (CUT2.W3). Character means for cultivars with the same letter are not significantly different at $P<0.05$	50
Table 2.3.7	Pairwise comparisons between mean values of recovery height of cultivars two (CUT1.W2), three (CUT1.W3), four (CUT1.W4), five (CUT1.W5), and six (CUT1.W6) weeks after the first cut, and also three weeks (CUT2.W3) after the second cut in the field and glasshouse	51
Table 2.3.8	Morphological data and disease resistance of individual plants of four Iranian and two New Zealand cultivars grown in the field. Character means for cultivars with the same letter are not significantly different	

Tables

	at $P < 0.05$	54
Table 3.2.1	Seed lots of the cultivars used in the seed image analysis study	81
Table 3.3.1	Duncan's Multiple range test for discrimination among six Iranian and two New Zealand lucerne cultivars on the basis of selected individual morphological characters of single seeds of the cultivars recorded using image analysis.	91
Table 3.3.2	Probabilities that pairs of LSMEANS of 21 morphological characters of individual seeds from a given cultivar are equal	93
Table 3.3.3	Probabilities that pairs of LSMEANS of 10 morphological characters of individual seeds from seed lots of the same cultivar are equal	94
Table 3.3.4	Probabilities that pairs of LSMEANS of 11 morphological characters of individual seeds from a given cultivar are equal	95
Table 3.3.5	Pairwise comparison between squared Mahalanobis distances between cultivars using the ten selected morphological characters defined using image analysis	97
Table 3.3.6	Pairwise comparison between squared distances of certified seed lots from two Iranian and two New Zealand cultivars	98
Table 3.3.7	Cross validation of seeds by cultivar	100
Table 3.3.8	Probabilities that pairs of LSMEANS of the morphological characters of individual seeds from a given cultivar are equal	100
Table 3.3.9	Duncan's Multiple range test for discrimination among the six Iranian and two New Zealand cultivars on the basis of the ten selected morphological characters of individual seeds of the cultivars	103
Table 3.3.10	Duncan's Multiple range test of data from morphological characters of individual seeds of the seed lots recorded by image analysis	104
Table 3.3.11	Duncan's Multiple range test of data from five morphological characters of leaflets of individual plants of the cultivars	107
Table 3.3.12	Pairwise comparisons between squared distances of the cultivars using CDF1, a combination value of the twelve morphological characters of the leaflets of the individual plants of the cultivars grown under glasshouse conditions	109
Table 3.3.13	Probabilities that pairs of LSMEANS of the morphological characters of the leaflets of the given cultivars are equal	110
Table 3.3.14	Duncan's Multiple range test of data from leaflet characters of the cultivars recorded using image analysis	111
Table 4.2.1	Cultivar name, seed lot number and origin of the seed lots used for protein electrophoresis	134
Table 4.2.2	Volume of the components used for making the running gel (12.5 % w/v) polyacrylamide, sufficient for making two protein electrophoresis gels	137
Table 4.2.3	Volume of the components used for making the stacking gel (20 % polyacrylamide, % w/v) sufficient for making two protein electrophoresis gels	137

Tables

Table 4.3.1	Cross validation of seeds by cultivar	153
Table 4.3.2	Cross validation of seeds from different seed lots of the same cultivar	154
Table 4.3.3	Pairwise comparison between squared distances between certified seed lots from six Iranian and two New Zealand cultivars	155
Table 4.3.4	Pairwise comparison between squared distances between certified seed lots from two Iranian and two New Zealand cultivars	156
Table 4.3.5	Probabilities that pairs of LSMEANS are equal	157
Table 4.3.6	Duncan's Multiple range test for discrimination of seed lots . . .	159
Table 5.2.1	Volume of components used for making 50 ml of DNA extraction buffer	178
Table 5.3.1	Pairwise comparison between DNA fragments hybridising to the apple rDNA probe (bands No. 1-7 shown in Plate 5.3.8) using bulked samples of DNA from 40 seedlings of each of the cultivars . . .	204
Table 5.3.2	Cross validation of seedlings by cultivar based on frequencies of the RFLP bands resulting from probing Southern blots of the Bam <i>HI</i> -digested DNA extracted from 40 single seedlings of each of the cultivars with apple rDNA	206
Table 5.3.3	Tests of significance between the proportions of the seedlings from different cultivars which were correctly classified by the discriminant analysis as belonging to each of the cultivars	207
Table 5.3.4	Pairwise comparison between squared distances of the RFLP profiles of the cultivars based on frequencies of the restriction fragments resulting from probing the Bam <i>HI</i> -digested DNA extracted from 40 single seedlings of each of the cultivars with apple rDNA	208
Table 5.3.5	Probabilities that pairs of LSMEANS are equal. The significance probability for LSMEANS was set at 0.05 for this test	211
Table 5.3.6	Duncan's Multiple range test for discrimination among the cultivars for the rDNA probe	212
Table 5.3.7	Cross validation of seedlings by cultivar based on frequencies of the restriction fragments resulting from hybridisation of Southern blots, with <i>Xba I</i> -digested DNA extracted from 40 single seedlings of each of the cultivars with the clover ADH probe	216
Table 5.3.8	Tests of significance between the proportions of the seedlings from different cultivars which were correctly classified by the discriminant analysis as belonging to each of the cultivars	217
Table 5.3.9	Pairwise comparison between squared distances of RFLP profiles of the cultivars based on frequencies of the restriction fragments resulting from hybridisation of Southern blot with <i>Xba I</i> -digested DNA from 40 single seedlings of each of the cultivars with the ADH probe . .	218
Table 5.3.10	Probabilities that pairs of LSMEANS are equal. The significance probability for LSMEANS was set at 0.05 for this test	219
Table 5.3.11	Duncan's Multiple range test for discrimination among the seed lots of	

Tables

	the cultivars for the ADH probe	221
Table 6.2.1	Sequence of the 26 oligonucleotide primers screened	241
Table 6.3.1	Pairwise comparison between the polymorphic fragments from bulked DNA samples (40 single seedlings) from the cultivars generated using the 10-base oligonucleotide OPB19	248
Table 6.3.2	Pairwise comparison between amplified polymorphic bands from bulked DNA samples (40 single seedlings) from the cultivars, amplified using the 10-base oligonucleotide OPB13. The figures in this table indicate the RAPD fragments (Plate 6.3.4) by which a pair of cultivars can be distinguished	250
Table 6.3.3	Pairwise comparison between polymorphic bands from bulked DNA samples (40 single seedlings) of the cultivars, amplified using the 10-base oligonucleotide OPA08. The figures in this table indicate the RAPD fragments (Plate 6.3.5) by which a pair of cultivars can be distinguished	252
Table 6.3.4	Pairwise comparison between the RAPD fragments from bulked DNA samples (40 single seedlings) from the cultivars amplified using the 10-base oligonucleotide OPC10	254
Table 6.3.5	Uniformity of cultivars: Cross validation of seedlings by cultivar based of the frequencies of the RAPDs amplified using the primer OPOA8	262
Table 6.3.6	Tests of significance between the proportions of the seedlings from different cultivars which were correctly classified by the discriminant analysis of the RAPD results as belonging to each of the cultivars	263
Table 6.3.7	Pairwise comparisons between squared distances for the RAPD profiles from the cultivars amplified using the primer OPA08	264
Table 6.3.8	Probabilities that pairs of LSMEANS of the RAPD profiles (directed by primer OPA08) of the given cultivars are equal	265
Table 6.3.9	Duncan's Multiple range test for discrimination among the seed lots based on the frequencies of the RAPDs amplified using the primer OPA08	267
Table 7.1	Uniformity (percentage of individuals within a cultivar with similar characters) within lucerne cultivars using three molecular methods plus seed image analysis	296
Table 7.2	Comparisons between genetic relatedness (D^2) of pairs of cultivars detected using three molecular methods and seed image analysis	297

List of plates

Plate 2.1	Field spaced plant trial	25
Plate 2.2	Field flowering trial	26
Plate 2.3	Classification of growing plants in the field according to the angle of their outer stems in relation to the ground, ranging from prostrate (Pr.) to very erect plants (5)	30
Plate 2.4	■llustration of a wide range of purple flower colour in lucerne	31
Plate 2.5	Different type of variegated flower colour in lucerne	31
Plate 2.6	Cream and the three purple flower colours used in this study as the standard pattern for classification of flower colour in the field and in the glasshouse	32
Plate 2.7	Three replicates of 22 plants of each cultivar grown on different benches which were arranged in three rows in the glasshouse	37
Plate 2.8	Comparison between plant recovery height of cvs. Azari (4) and Bami (2) at three weeks after the first cut	49
Plate 2.9	Illustration of the difference in tolerance to leaf spot (<i>Pseudopeziza medicaginis</i>) between cv. Bami (2) and G.Oranga (5), grown in the flowering trial	53
Plate 4.2.1	Protein bands of single seeds of cv. Azari for which intensity values were used as variables in the statistical analysis of this study	141
Plate 4.2.2	A sample of protein profiles demonstrating the slight bowing in the band profile across the width of the gel	142
Plate 4.2.3	Protein profiles of individual seeds from a Breeders seed lot of cv. G.Oranga before and after elimination of the bowing or "smiling" across the width of the gel	143
Plate 4.3.1	Protein banding profile resulting from SDS-PAGE of 6 µl of the extracted protein from bulk seed samples of the cultivars	145
Plate 4.3.2	Protein banding profile resulting from SDS-PAGE of 8 µl and 10 µl of the extracted protein from bulk seed samples of six cultivars	146
Plate 4.3.3	Protein banding profile resulting from SDS-PAGE of 16 µl of the extracted protein of single seeds of cultivar Azari	147
Plate 4.3.4	Protein banding profile resulting from SDS-PAGE of 16 µl of the extracted protein of single seeds of cultivar Wairau	148
Plate 4.3.5	Protein banding profile resulting from SDS-PAGE of the extracted protein from bulk seed samples of the cultivars	149
Plate 5.2.1	A sample photograph of a DNA quantification gel in this study	183
Plate 5.2.2	A colour photograph of Xba I-digested DNA samples of cultivar Moapa run in a 0.9 % agarose gel in TAE buffer and stained with ethidium bromide	184
Plate 5.2.3	Illustration of RFLP bands resulting from signal detection of membranes probed with the clover ADH probe (exposure time 4 h)	190
Plate 5.2.4	Illustration of RFLP fragments resulting from signal detection of membranes probed with the apple ribosomal DNA probe (exposure time 30 mins.)	191

Plates

	G.Oranga with I013 lucerne probe (exposure time was 4 h)	194
Plate 5.3.2	Lumigram derived from hybridisation of a Southern blot with <i>Xba I</i> -digested DNA samples from 40 single seedlings of cv Wairau with the I013 lucerne probe (exposure time was 4 h)	195
Plate 5.3.3	Lumigram derived from probing a Southern blot of <i>Eco RI</i> , <i>Hind III</i> and <i>Xba I</i> digested DNA samples of single seedlings of cv. G.Oranga with I013, a lucerne DNA probe (exposure time was 4 h)	196
Plate 5.3.4	Lumigram derived from hybridisation of a Southern blot of 5µg digested DNA samples of six single seedlings of cv. G.Oranga, restricted with the clover ADH probe	197
Plate 5.3.5	Lumigram derived from hybridisation of a Southern blot of <i>Xba I</i> -digested DNA samples of 40 single seedlings of cv. Nikshahri with the clover ADH probe (exposure time was 4 h)	198
Plate 5.3.6	Lumigram derived from hybridisation of a Southern blot of <i>Hind III</i> , <i>Bam HI</i> , <i>Eco RI</i> and <i>Xba I</i> -digested DNA samples of the cv. G.Oranga with the apple ribosomal DNA (rDNA) probe (exposure time was 1 h)	199
Plate 5.3.7	Lumigram derived from hybridisation of a Southern blot with <i>BamH I</i> -digested DNA samples from 40 single seedlings from cv. Moapa with the apple ribosomal DNA probe (exposure time was 1 h)	200
Plate 5.3.8	DNA fragments hybridising to the apple rDNA probe (exposure of Lumigram time was 1 h). <i>Bam HI</i> was used to digest bulked DNA from the 10 cultivars	205
Plate 6.2.1	RAPD bands which were scored for individual seedlings. These fragments were generated using primer OA08 from genomic DNA extracted from 40 individual seedlings of each of the 10 cultivars (result for cv. Bami)	242
Plate 6.3.1	Amplified DNA fragments from bulked DNA samples from the cultivars generated using the 10-base oligonucleotides OPC10 and OPB19 alone, and in combination.	244
Plate 6.3.2	The RAPD profiles from bulked DNA samples from the cultivars using 10-base oligonucleotides OPC10 and OPB19 alone, and in combination.	245
Plate 6.3.3	The RAPD profiles generated by 10-base oligonucleotide OPB19 from bulked DNA samples from the cultivars.	247
Plate 6.3.4	The RAPD profiles from bulked DNA samples from the cultivars generated using 10-base oligonucleotide OPB13.	249
Plate 6.3.5	The RAPD profiles from the bulked DNA samples from the cultivars generated using 10-base oligonucleotide OPA08	251
Plate 6.3.6	The RAPD profiles from the bulked DNA samples from the cultivars amplified using the 10-base oligonucleotide OPC10	253
Plate 6.3.7	The RAPD profiles from the bulked DNA samples from the cultivars amplified using the 10-base oligonucleotide OPB18.	255
Plate 6.3.8	RAPD profiles from 40 single seedlings of cv. Hamedani generated using the 10-base oligonucleotide OPA08.	258

Plate 6.3.9 Amplified polymorphic DNA profiles from 40 single seedlings of cv. Azari generated using the 10-base oligonucleotide OPA08 259

Plate 6.3.10 RAPD profiles from 40 single seedlings of cv. Bami generated using the 10-base oligonucleotide OPA08 260

List of Figures

Figure 3.2.1 The components of the Vision Image Processing System (VIPS) 76

Figure 3.2.2 Illustration of plant leaflet morphological characters recorded using the Vision Image Processing System (VIPS) 82

Figure 3.2.3 Illustration of seed morphological characters recorded using the Vision Image Processing System (VIPS) 83