## Genetic Diversity of *Macrophomina phaseolina* Populations, the Causal Agent of Sesame Charcoal Rot Using Inter-Simple Sequence Repeat Markers

R. Salahlou<sup>1</sup>, N. Safaie<sup>2\*</sup>, and M. Shams-Bakhsh<sup>2</sup>

### **ABSTRACT**

Macrophomina phaseolina is an important soil-borne pathogen causing charcoal rot in many important crop plants including sesame, in Iran. A total of 60 isolates of M. phaseolina were collected from the main sesame producing regions in ten provinces of Iran. The genetic diversity among M. phaseolina populations was estimated using Inter-Simple Sequence Repeat (ISSR), focusing particularly on geographic differentiation. Five ISSR primers generated 105 discernible DNA bands, of which 85 (77.11%) were polymorphic. The greatest value of variability (PPB: 60.00%; H: 0.185; I: 0.284) was estimated for Fars population, whereas the least variability (PPB: 9.52%; H: 0.042; I: 0.060) was estimated for Kerman population. Total gene diversity exhibited high levels of variability ( $H_T = 0.186$ ). Analysis of molecular variance indicated a large proportion of genetic variability within populations.

Keywords: Sesamum indicum L, ISSR, Geographic populations, Genetic differentiation.

#### INTRODUCTION

Charcoal rot caused by Macrophomina phaseolina (Tassi) Goid, is one of the factors limiting the cultivation of Sesame (Sesamum indicum L.), an oilseed crop widely grown in different parts of the world. The fungus can infect the root and lower stem parts of more than 500 plant families and has a wide geographic distribution (Dhingra and Sinclair, 1978). Charcoal rot is an important soil-borne disease favored by hot and dry weather or when unfavorable environmental conditions impose stress on plant.

In order to design optimal breeding methods to produce sesame cultivars that can resist charcoal rot, knowledge of fungus population biology and its interaction with sesame cultivars would be quite useful. The existence of high level variations in a fungal populations increases its capability to adapt to various conditions and overcome host resistance (Trigiano et al., 2008). To determine the level of variability in all organisms basic morphological traits and pathogenesis are usually used as the first character, but often these methods are timeconsuming and their quantification difficult. Molecular methods appropriate analysis approach for the rapid evaluation of the variability within and species (Chakravarthi among and Naravaneni, 2006).

In recent years, different DNA markers have been employed to study genetic diversity within populations of *M. phaseolina* such as Restriction Fragment

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Department of Biotechnology, Faculty of Agriculture, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Islamic Republic of Iran.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Department of Plant Pathology, Faculty of Agriculture, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Islamic Republic of Iran.

Corresponding author, e-mail: nsafaie@modares.ac.ir



Length Polymorphism (RFLP) of rDNA-ITS regions (Aghakhani and Dubey, 2009; Almeida et al., 2003), Random Amplified Polymorphic DNA (RAPD) (Aboshosha et al., 2007; Aghakhani and Dubey, 2009; Almeida et al., 2003), Amplified Fragment Length Polymorphism (AFLP) (Linhai et al., 2011; Reyes-Franco et al., 2006), Universal Rice Primer PCR (URP-PCR) (Jana et al., 2005b), Inter Simple Sequence Repeats (ISSR) (Jana et al., 2005a), Repetitive Sequence-Based Polymerase Chain Reaction (Rep-PCR) (Purkayastha et al., 2008) and Simple Sequence Repeats (SSR) (Baird et al., 2010). For example, analysis of the entire fingerprint profiles indicated no clear association between DNA genotypes and geographical locations (Reyes-Franco et al., 2006). Cluster analysis indicated that M. phaseolina isolates obtained from soybean, chickpea clearly cotton. and hosts differentiated into specific groups (Jana et al., 2005b).

The advantages of ISSR over other markers are: (1) low development costs; (2) no prior information or lengthy mapping required, and (3) laboratory procedures can be easily applied to any plant species and fungi (Cao et al., 2006). ISSR markers have been used to access taxonomic and phylogenetic comparisons and as a mapping tool in a wide range of organisms (Zietkiewicz et al., 1994). In Iran, dry root occurs primarily in many economically important crops, including common bean, sesame, soybean, chickpea, sunflower and beta, among others, and leads to yield reduction. Seed infection by this pathogen is responsible for its spread in the main agricultural regions of the country. Although *M. phaseolina* has been present for decades in Iran, still information about the population biology of this pathogen in the region is not fully understood. This study was performed in order to reveal the genetic polymorphism and differentiation of *M. phaseolina* populations collected from different sesame growing regions and ten geographical locations of Iran using ISSR markers.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

### **Fungal Isolates**


M. phaseolina isolates were collected from sesame fields showing typical symptoms and signs of charcoal rot in ten Iranian provinces, as presented in Table 1. Species-specific primer pairs (MpKFI/MpKRI) was used for identification of M. phaseolina isolates at the molecular level previously described by Babu et al. (2007). The DNA from Sclerotinia sclerotiorum, Fusarium graminearum, Alternaria alternata, Trichoderma viride and Cytospora Ehrenb were used as negative controls (Figure 1).

### **Genomic DNA Extraction**

Fungal mycelia were grown on potato

**Table 1.** Source and number of isolates of each *M. phaseolina* population in this study.

Population	Source	Number of isolates
В	Bushehr	8
E	Esfahan	2
F	Fars	12
G	Golestan	4
Н	Hormozgan	7
K	Kerman	3
KH	Khozestan	10
KJ	Khorasan- jonoobi	4
M	Mazandaran	7
Y	Yazd	3



**Figure 1.** Template DNA was amplified using species-specific primer pair (MpKFI/MpKRI), M: 1 kb molecular ladder; B7, F45, G4, KH38 and M9: *M. phaseolina* isolates from Iran; R1: *Sclerotinia sclerotiorum*, R2: *Fusarium graminearum*, R3: *Alternaria alternata*, R4: *Trichoderma viride* and R5: *Cytospora* Ehrenb are negative controls; NC: negative control.

dextrose broth (PDB) for 5 days at 25 °C in darkness. Mycelium biomass was harvested by filtering through Whatman No. 1 paper, washed with sterile water and lyophilized. Samples were ground to fine powder in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80 °C. Genomic DNA was extracted from fresh mycelia according to the procedure of Safaie et al. (2005). The quantity and quality of by DNA samples were determined spectrophotometer (Eppendorf Biophotometer, and Germany) electrophoresis, and were stored at -20 °C until used.

# Primers and Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR)

The sequences of five ISSR primers used in

this study were synthesized by CinnaGen, Tehran, and are shown in Table 2. The PCR reaction was performed in a 20-µL reaction volume containing 20-30 ng of DNA template, 1 mM primer, 200 mM each of four deoxyribonucleotide triphosphate (dNTPs), 1.5 units of Taq polymerase (CinnaGen, Tehran), 2 mM MgCl<sub>2</sub> and 2.5 mL PCR buffer (50 mM KCl, 10 mM Tris-HCl, pH 9.0). PCR amplification was carried out with the thermocycler (Eppendorf, Mastercycler, gradient) system. The PCR conditions included initial denaturation at 95 °C for 4 min followed by 35 cycles of denaturation at 94 °C for 1 min, primer annealing according to Table 2 for 1 min, primer extension at 72 °C for 2 min, and a final primer extension at 72 °C for 7 min. The amplification product was analyzed on a 1.4% agarose gels containing 0.50 µg/mL ethidium bromide and then photographed.

**Table 2.** Primer names and sequences, annealing temperature, marker index (MI), effective multiplex ratio (EMR) and degree of polymorphism of amplified DNA using each of the 5 primers of ISSR.

Primer	Sequence	Annealing temperature	% polymorphism	EMR	MI
ISSR10	5'-CACCACCACCACCAC-3'	59 °C	82.2	22.92	4.56
ISSR02	5'-ACTG ACTGACTGACTG -3'	48 °C	82.2	14.45	4.24
ISSR09	5'-CCACCACCACCACA -3'	55 °C	83.3	14.22	2.16
PcMs	5'-GTCGTCGTCGTCGTCGTC-3'	55 °C	55.5	4.27	1.28
P4	5'-ATGATGATGATGATGATG -3'	51 °C	88.23	13.86	4.16



### **Data Analysis**

Amplified fragments were scored for the presence (1) and absence (0) of bands. Nei's (1973) genetic diversity (h), Shannon index (Lewontin, 1972) the observed number of alleles per locus (Na), the effective number of alleles per locus (Kimura and Crow, 1964) and percentage of polymorphic bands (PPB) were calculated to estimate genetic diversity within each population.

The total genetic diversity (H<sub>T</sub>), genetic diversity within each population (H<sub>s</sub>), and coefficient of gene differentiation (G<sub>st</sub>) were also determined according to Nei (1986). Nei's unbiased genetic distance and genetic identity were calculated for each population pair using the program POPGENE version 1.31 Software (Nei, 1972). Dendrogram based on unbiased genetic distance (Nei, 1972) was generated using UPGMA of NTSYS-pc version 2.02c (Rohlf, 2000) to examine the genetic relationship among populations. The gene flow estimates (Nm) among these populations were computed as Nm \( \frac{1}{\text{Gst}} \) 1)/4 (Nei, 1973; Slatkin and Barton, 1989). An analysis of molecular variance (AMOVA) was preformed to calculate the hierarchical apportionment of variation using GenAlEx 6.41 (Peakall and Smouse, 2006).

### RESULTS

# Identification of *M. phaseolina* Isolates by Species Specific Primers

The isolates were identified at the molecular level using species specific primers (MpFI/MoKRI) as designed by Babu et al. (2007). A fragment of 350-bp was amplified by the primer pair in tested isolates (Figure 1). The result showed that the isolates collected belonged to the species M. phaseolina. No fragment was detected in other fungi used as negative control.

# Genetic Diversity among and within Populations

The percentage of polymorphism for each population varied from 60% (Fars) to 9.52% (Kerman), with an average of 35.90% at the population level. The observed number of alleles (Na) per locus ranged from 1.114 (Esfahan) to 1.600 (Fars) with an average of 1.350, while the effective number of alleles (Ne) ranged from 1.312 (Golestan) to 1.076 (Kerman) with an alleles average of 1.210 (Table 3).

The values of Nei's genetic distance

**Table 3.** Genetic diversity of ten populations of *M. phaseolina*.

Population	Na <sup>a</sup>	Ne <sup>b</sup>	$\mathrm{H}^{c}$	$I^d$	Polymorphic loci	PPB% <sup>e</sup>
В	1.504(0.502)	1.298(0.364)	0.176(0.195)	0.265(0.281)	53	50.48
E	1.114(0.319)	1.114(0.319)	0.057(0.159)	0.079(0.221)	12	11.43
F	1.600(0.492)	1.307(0.357)	0.185(0.188)	0.284(0.268)	63	60.00
G	1.419(0.495)	1.312(0.390)	0.176(0.212)	0.255(0.305)	44	41.90
Н	1.428(0.497)	1.266(0.354)	0.157(0.194)	0.234(0.282)	45	42.86
K	1.095(0.295)	1.076(0.236)	0.042(0.131)	0.060(0.187)	10	9.52
KH	1.542(0.500)	1.273(0.326)	0.169(0.180)	0.261(0.263)	57	54.29
KJ	1.219(0.415)	1.146(0.287)	0.086(0.166)	0.128(0.244)	23	21.90
M	1.457(0.500)	1.255(0.325)	0.157(0.184)	0.238(0.272)	48	45.71
Y	1.209(0.408)	1.167(0.327)	0.093(0.181)	0.133(0.260)	22	20.95

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Observed number of alleles per locus; <sup>b</sup> effective number of alleles per locus; <sup>c</sup> Nei's (1973) gene diversity: <sup>d</sup> Shannon's information index; <sup>e</sup> percentage of polymorphic bands. Values of standard deviation in are given parentheses.

ranged from 0.0281 to 0.1721 in 10 populations. The lowest value for genetic obtained between distance was populations of Fars and Bushehr and showed that the populations from these two provinces were most similar. The highest value based on Nei's gene diversity (0.185) was obtained for Fars and the lowest for Kerman (0.042) with an average of 0.130. The Shannons index (0.284 and 0.060) was obtained for the same populations as in the Nei's gene diversity case. This result indicates that population of Fars had the highest level of variability, while the Kerman population exhibited the lowest diversity (Table 5).

### **Genetic Differentiation**

The total gene diversity  $(H_t)$  and mean diversity within each population  $(H_s)$  were 0.186 and 0.13, respectively, for these ten populations. The mean coefficient of gene differentiation  $(G_{st})$  among populations was 0.303, indicating 30% of differentiation between populations.

The amount of gene flow  $(N_m)$  between populations was 1.14, where  $N_m$  is the average number of migrants among the population. According to Wright (1951), the  $N_m > 1$  shows the existence of little differentiation among populations (Table 6).

Significant correlation was found between Shannon index and the percentage of polymorphism for all populations (R=0.87, P=0.001) suggesting that ISSR markers were unevenly distributed in the populations. This result shows that ISSR divergence among populations was mainly attributed to difference of the DNA-bands frequency instead of allele fixation.

### **ISSR Polymorphism**

The five ISSR primers produced 105 scorable bands, of which 85 (77.11%) were polymorphic (Figure 2). In terms of investigating the discriminatory feature of ISSR primers, effective multiplex ratio and marker index

were calculated for all the primers. The EMR of the five primers ranged from 22.92 (ISSR10) to 4.27 (PcMs) with an average of 13.94 and marker index values were between 1.28 (PcMs) and 4.56 (ISSR10) (Table 2).

### **Genetic Relationship**


Genetic identities among populations ranged from 0.9722 to 0.8419 with an average of 0.9292. The greatest genetic identity was obtained among Hormozgan, Fars, and Bushehr populations and indicated that the populations from these three regions were most similar.

In this study, the relationship among populations was examined based on Nei's genetic distance. Cluster analysis demonstrated that clusters were not related to the geographic distance between populations. The UPGMA analysis showed that the populations could be separated into four clusters. Cluster I consisted of seven populations Hormozgan, Bushehr, Fars, Khozestan, Mazandaran, Khorasan-jonoobi and Yazd, while clusters II, III, and IV was comprised of Esfahan, Golestan, and Kerman provinces, respectively (Figure 3). In cluster I, populations of Bushehr and Fars showed 100% similarity coefficient. Both Fars and Bushehr are located in south and share similar climates. The co-phenetic correlation was r = 0.76.

### **Analysis of Molecular Variance**

AMOVA analysis showed that, from the total genetic variability, 9% (p<0.01) could be attributed by the differences among populations while 91% (p<0.01) could be





**Figure 2.** DNA fingerprint profiles of 60 isolates of *M. phaseolina* obtained with PcMs: NC Negative control; B: Bushehr; E: Esfahan; F: Fars; G Golestan; H: Hormozgan; K: Kerman; KH: Khozestan; KJ: Khorasan-jonobi; M: Mazandaran; Y: Yazd; M: molecular marker GeneRuler<sup>TM</sup> 1 kb DNA Ladder.

Table 4. Nested AMOVA for M. phaseolina populations.

Source	Df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	Est. Var.	%
Among Pops	9	133.655	14.851	0.912	9%
Within Pops	50	477.495	9.550	9.550	91%
Total	59	611.150		10.461	100%

Table 5. Nei's unbiased measures of genetic identity (above diagonal) and genetic distance (below diagonal) between populations of M. phaseolina.

Population         B <sup>a</sup> E <sup>b</sup> F <sup>c</sup> G <sup>d</sup> H <sup>e</sup> K <sup>f</sup> KH <sup>g</sup> KJ <sup>h</sup> M <sup>i</sup> Y <sup>j</sup> B         0         0.928         0.9722         0.9263         0.934         0.9519         0.9694         0.9393           E         0.0747         0         0.9425         0.8834         0.937         0.8419         0.9629         0.9341         0.9126         0.9394           F         0.0747         0         0.9425         0.8834         0.9149         0.9524         0.9341         0.9129         0.9349         0.9341         0.9539         0.9341         0.9539         0.9341         0.9539         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184         0.9184		1 1											
tion         B $^a$ E $^b$ F $^c$ G $^d$ H $^e$ K $^f$ KH $^g$ KJ $^h$ 0.0747         0.928         0.9722         0.9263         0.971         0.9239         0.9582         0.9519           0.0747         0         0.9425         0.8834         0.937         0.8419         0.9029         0.9341           0.0281         0.0592         0         0.9207         0.9412         0.8882         0.9594         0.9435           0.0294         0.065         0.0282         0.0606         0         0.9318         0.9598         0.9487           0.0294         0.065         0.0282         0.0606         0         0.9318         0.9598         0.9487           0.0791         0.1721         0.0883         0.1186         0.0707         0         0.9308         0.8988           0.0447         0.0682         0.0414         0.0705         0.1067         0.0458         0.0458         0.0568         0.0568         0.0568         0.0568         0.0568         0.0568         0.0568         0.0568         0.0568         0.0568         0.0458         0.0568         0.0568         0.0568         0.0568         0.0468 <td< td=""><th></th><td><math>\mathbf{Y}^{j}</math></td><td>0.9393</td><td>0.8995</td><td>0.918</td><td>0.8613</td><td>0.928</td><td>0.888</td><td>0.9184</td><td>0.9463</td><td>0.9254</td><td>0</td><td></td></td<>		$\mathbf{Y}^{j}$	0.9393	0.8995	0.918	0.8613	0.928	0.888	0.9184	0.9463	0.9254	0	
tion         B $^a$ E $^b$ F $^c$ G $^d$ H $^e$ K $^f$ KH $^g$ 0.0747         0.928         0.9722         0.9263         0.971         0.9239         0.9582           0.0747         0         0.9425         0.8834         0.937         0.8419         0.9029           0.0281         0.0592         0         0.9207         0.9722         0.9154         0.9594           0.0766         0.124         0.0827         0         0.9412         0.8882         0.932           0.0294         0.065         0.0282         0.0606         0         0.9318         0.9598           0.0791         0.1721         0.0883         0.1186         0.0707         0         0.9308           0.0427         0.1022         0.0414         0.0705         0.0411         0.0718         0           0.0493         0.0682         0.0582         0.1141         0.0527         0.1067         0.0458           0.0626         0.1059         0.0856         0.1493         0.0748         0.0188         0.0851		$\mathbf{M}^{i}$	0.9694	0.9126	0.9539	0.9184	0.9504	0.9252	0.9552	0.9464	0	0.0776	
tion         B $^a$ E $^b$ F $^c$ G $^d$ H $^e$ K $^f$ 0.0747         0.928         0.9722         0.9263         0.971         0.9239           0.0747         0         0.9425         0.8834         0.937         0.8419           0.0281         0.0592         0         0.9207         0.9154         0.8882           0.0766         0.124         0.0827         0         0.9412         0.8882           0.0294         0.065         0.0282         0.0606         0         0.9318           0.0791         0.1721         0.0883         0.1186         0.0707         0           0.0427         0.1022         0.0414         0.0705         0.0411         0.0718           0.0493         0.0682         0.0582         0.1141         0.0527         0.1067           0.0311         0.0914         0.0472         0.0852         0.0568         0.0148         0.1188           0.0626         0.1059         0.0856         0.1493         0.0748         0.1188		$\mathrm{KJ}^h$	0.9519	0.9341	0.9435	0.8922	0.9487	0.8988	0.9465	0	0.0551	0.0552	
tion         B $^a$ E $^b$ F $^c$ G $^d$ H $^e$ 0         0.928         0.9722         0.9263         0.971           0.0747         0         0.9425         0.8834         0.937           0.0281         0.0592         0         0.9207         0.9722           0.0766         0.124         0.0827         0         0.9412           0.0294         0.065         0.0282         0.0606         0           0.0791         0.1721         0.0883         0.1186         0.0707           0.0427         0.1022         0.0414         0.0705         0.0411           0.0493         0.0682         0.0582         0.1141         0.0527           0.0311         0.0914         0.0472         0.0852         0.0508           0.0626         0.1059         0.0856         0.1493         0.0748		$\mathrm{KH}^{g}$	0.9582	0.9029	0.9594	0.932	0.9598	0.9308	0	0.055	0.0458	0.0851	
tion         B $^a$ E $^b$ F $^c$ G $^d$ 0         0.928         0.9722         0.9263           0.0747         0         0.9425         0.8834           0.0281         0.0592         0         0.9207           0.0766         0.124         0.0827         0           0.0294         0.065         0.0282         0.0606           0.0791         0.1721         0.0883         0.1186           0.0427         0.1022         0.0414         0.0705           0.0493         0.0682         0.0582         0.1141           0.0311         0.0914         0.0472         0.0852           0.0626         0.1059         0.0856         0.1493		$\mathbf{K}^f$	0.9239	0.8419	0.9154	0.8882	0.9318	0	0.0718	0.1067	0.0777	0.1188	i
tion         B $^a$ E $^b$ F $^c$ 0         0.928         0.9722           0.0747         0         0.9425           0.0281         0.0592         0           0.0766         0.124         0.0827           0.0294         0.065         0.0282           0.0791         0.1721         0.0883           0.0427         0.1022         0.0414           0.0493         0.0682         0.0582           0.0311         0.0914         0.0472           0.0626         0.1059         0.0856		$_{ m H}^{e}$	0.971	0.937	0.9722	0.9412	0	0.0707	0.0411	0.0527	0.0508	0.0748	
tion         B $^a$ E $^b$ 0         0.928         0           0.0747         0         0           0.0281         0.0592         0.0744         0           0.0766         0.124         0         0           0.0294         0.065         0         0           0.0791         0.1721         0         0           0.0427         0.1022         0         0           0.0493         0.0682         0         0           0.0626         0.1059         0         0		$^{q}$	0.9263	0.8834	0.9207	0	0.0606	0.1186	0.0705	0.1141	0.0852	0.1493	
tion B a  0  0.0747  0.0281  0.0766  0.0294  0.0791  0.0427  0.0493  0.0431		$\mathbf{F}^c$	0.9722	0.9425	0	0.0827	0.0282	0.0883	0.0414	0.0582	0.0472	0.0856	
tion B a  0  0.0747  0.0281  0.0766  0.0294  0.0791  0.0427  0.0493  0.0431		$\mathbf{E}^{b}$	0.928	0	0.0592	0.124	0.065	0.1721	0.1022	0.0682	0.0914	0.1059	100
Population B E E G G K K K K K K K K K K K K K K K K		$\mathbf{B}^{\;a}$	0										
	ľ	Population	В	田	ц	G	Н	K	KH	K	M	Y	


<sup>a</sup> Bushehr, <sup>b</sup> Esfahan, <sup>c</sup> Fars, <sup>d</sup> Golestan, <sup>e</sup> Hormozgan, <sup>f</sup> Kerman, <sup>g</sup> Khozestan, <sup>h</sup> Khorasan- jonoobi, <sup>i</sup> Mazandaran, <sup>j</sup> Yazd.

Table 6. Genetic structure estimated by Nei's genetic parameters for ten populations of M. phaseolina from ten Iranian provinces

${ m N_m}^d$	1.146	
${f G_{ m ST}}^c$	0.303	
${ m H_S}^{b}$	0.13	0.015
${\rm H_T}^a$	0.186	0.328
Eatimative	Mean	St. Dev

<sup>a</sup> Total genetic diversity in the pooled populations, <sup>b</sup> Mean diversity within each population, <sup>c</sup> The mean coefficient of gene differentiation (Gst), <sup>d</sup> Estimate of gene flow from Gst, Nm = 0.5(1 - Gst)/Gst. JAST





**Figure3.** UPGMA dendrogram for populations of *M. phaseolina* based on Nei's genetic distance.

attributed by the differences within populations (Table 4).

### DISCUSSION

ISSR genomic fingerprinting revealed a high level of heterogeneity among M. *phaseoina* populations. The low level of observed genetic differentiation could be related to level of gene flow among populations. In addition, the observation of low levels of differentiation in populations could be explained by asexuall propagules and polyphagous nature of this fungus.

In populations of M. phaseolina diversity be attributed to parasexual recombination between nuclear genes or of vegetative cells favoring heterokaryons (Carlile, 1986). Factors such immigration, climatic conditions, different patterns of culture, use of various genotypes of different hosts, high selection pressure, and breeding system have been used to explain high levels of genetic diversity fungus (Aghakhani and Dubey, 2009; Almeida et al., 2008; Purkayastha et al., 2008).

AFLP assessment of the polymorphism of *M. phaseolina* isolates from sesame in China has shown high level of variations (73.9%) among the isolates (Linhai *et al.*, 2011). ISSR evaluation of *M. phaseolina* populations originated from soybean and

cotton grown in India and the USA has shown highly significant genetic heterogeneity among within populations, and isolates could be grouped into three major clusters according to their hosts and geographical region (Jana et al., 2005a). Genetic variation of M. phaseolina isolates in India using RAPD marker has grouped the isolated into six categories with 40% genetic similarity (Aghakhani and Dubey, 2009). The results of the present study are in corroboration with the above findings that there are a high genotypic diversity levels among M. phaseolina isolates. The results showed that populations from and originating Fars Golestan provinces have the highest heterozygosity (18.5%) among the ten tested populations. This might be caused by diversity of sesame varieties in these two regions.

The high similarity observed among populations from Fars, Bushehr, and Hormozgan provinces is a powerful finding, suggesting that the isolates used in this study did not evolve independently from each other and that these populations might originate from the same ancestor (Almeida *et al.*, 2003). Also, the observed similarity among isolates from different geographic areas confirmed genetic exchange and free genetic information flux in the genus, reducing the probability of formation of delimited groups (Mihail and Taylor, 1995).

In this study, both genetic differentiation and AMOVA indicated that most of the genetic diversity existed within populations. The existence of high levels of variations within populations, the expression of disease resistance to M. phaseolina might be due to genetic diversity of the pathogen. One reason for high genetic diversity within might populations be parasexual recombination among isolates (Carlile, 1986).

The level of gene flow (N<sub>m</sub>) was measured at 1.14, demonstrating a very high migration rate between populations. This gene flow might be due to movement of M. phaseolina through infected seeds and soil with planting materials by the means of vegetative stage and sclerotia or may occur through natural dispersal mechanisms involving ascospores (Kohn, 1995). Gene flow induces replacement of new alleles or genotypes in new areas via introduction, reproduction, and survival of the introduced organism.

These results confirmed 9% and 19.42% of the genetic variation existing between populations, as measured by AMOVA analysis and Shannon's diversity index, respectively. In conclusion, because of high levels of variations among the isolates of *M. phaseolina* in Iran, to control charcoal rot, different disease management systems should be integrated by combining chemical, cultural, and biological methods.

Our study provided preliminary information about the population genetics of *M. phaseolina* from different geographical regions in Iran. The results of the present research indicated that ISSR are appropriate markers to determine genetic diversity among populations of *M. phaseolina*.

### **REFERENCES**

 Aboshosha, S. S., Attaalla, S. I., El-Korany, A. E. and El-argawy, E. 2007. Characterization of *Macrophomina* phaseolina Isolates Affecting Sunflower Growth in El-Behera Governorate Egypt. Int. J. Agric. Biol., 9: 807–815.

- Aghakhani, M. and Dubey, S.C. 2009. Determination of Genetic Diversity among Indian Isolates of *Rhizoctonia bataticola* Causing Dry Root Rot of Chickpea. *Anton Leeuw Int. J. G.*, 96: 607–619.
- 3. Almeida, A. M. R., Abdelnoor, R.V., Arias, C. A. A., Carvalho, V. P., Martin, S. R. R., Benato, L. C., Pinto, M. C. and Carvalho, C. G. P. 2003. Genotypic Diversity among Brazilian Isolates of *Macrophomina phaseolina* Revealed by RAPD. *Fitopatol. Bra.s*, **28**: 279–285.
- Almeida, M. R., Sosa-Gomez, D. R., Binneck, E., Marin, S. R. R., Zucchi, M. I., Abdelnoor, R. V. and Souto, E. R. 2008. Effect of Crop Rotation on Specialization and Genetic Diversity of *Macrophomina* phaseolina. Trop. Plant. Pathol., 33: 257–264.
- 5. Babu, B. K., Saxena, A. K., Srivastava, A. K. and Arora, D. K. 2007. Identification and Detection of *Macrophomina phaseolina* by Using Species-Specific Oligonucleotide Primers and Probe. *Mycologia.*, **99**: 797–803.
- Baird, R. E., Wadl, P. A., Allen, T., McNeill, D., Wang, X. W., Moulton, J. K., Rinehart, T. A., Abbas, H. K., Shier, T. and Trigiano, R. N. 2010. Variability of United States Isolates of *Macrophomina phaseolina* Based on Simple Sequence Repeats and Cross Genus Transferability to Related Genera within Botryosphaeriaceae. *Mycopathologia.*, 170: 169–180.
- Carlile, M. J. 1986. Genetic Exchange and Gene Flow: Their Promotion and Prevention. In: "Evolutionary Biological of the Fungi." (Eds.): Rayner A. D. M., Moore D. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press. pp. 203-214.
- 8. Chakravarthi, B. K. and Naravaneni, R. 2006. SSR Marker Based DNA Fingerprinting and Diversity Study in Rice (*Oryza sativa*. L.). *Afr. J. Biotechnol.*, **5**: 684–688.
- 9. Dhingra, O. D. and Sinclair, J. B. 1978. Biology and Pathology of *Macrophomina phaseolina*. Vic<sub>s</sub>osa(Brasil): Imprensa Universita´ ria, Universidade Federal de Vic<sub>s</sub>osa. Pp. 166
- Jana, T., Sharma, T. R. and Singh, N. K. 2005a. SSR-Based Detection of Genetic Variability in the Charcoal Root Rot Pathogen *Macrophomina phaseolina*. *Mycol. Res.*, 109: 81–86.



- Jana, T., Singh, N., Koundal, K. and Sharma, T. 2005b. Genetic Differentiation of Charcoal Rot Pathogen, *Macrophomina* phaseolina, Into Specific Groups Using URP-PCR. Can. J. Microbiol., 51: 159–164.
- Cao, P., Yao, Q., Ding, B., Zeng, H., Zhong, Y. and Fu, C. 2006. Genetic Diversity of Sinojackia dolichocarpa (Styracaceae), A Species Endangered and Endemic to China, Detected by Inter-simple Sequence Repeat (ISSR). Biochem. Syst. Ecol., 34, 231-239.
- 13. Kimura, M. and Crow, J. F. 1964. The Number of Alleles That Can Be Maintained in a Finite Population. *Gent.*, **49**: 725-38.
- 14. Kohn, L. M. 1995. The Clonal Dynamic in Wild and Agricultural Plant Pathogen Populations. *Can. J. Bot.*, **73**: S1231-S140.
- 15. Lewontin, R. C. 1972. The Apportionment of Human Diversity. *Evol. Biol.*, **6**: 381–398.
- Linhai, W., Yanxin, Z., Donghua, L., Junbin, H., Wenliang, W., Haixia, L. and Xiurong, Z., 2011. Variations in the Isolates of *Macrophomina phaseolina* from Sesame in China Based on Amplified Fragment Length Polymorphism (AFLP) and Pathogenicity. *Afr. J. Microbiol. Res.*, 5: 5584-5590.
- Mihail, J. D. and Taylor, S. J. 1995. Interpreting Variability among Isolates of Macrophomina phaseolina in Pathogenicity, Picnidium Production and Chlorate Utilization. Can. J. Microbiol., 73: 1596– 1603.
- 18. Nei, M. 1986. Definition and Estimation of Fixation Indices. *Evolution.*, **40**: 643-645.
- 19. Nei, M., 1972. Genetic Distance between Populations. *Nat.*, **106**: 283–292.
- 20. Nei, M. 1973. Analysis of Gene Diversity in Subdivided Populations. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA.*, **70**: 3321–3323.
- Peakall, R., Smouse, P. E., 2006. GENALEX 6: Genetic Analysis in Excel. Population Genetic Software for Teaching

- and Research. *Mol. Ecol. Notes.*, **6**: 288–295.
- 22. Purkayastha, S., Kaur, B., Arora, P., Bisyer, I., Dilbaghi, N. and Chaudhury, A. 2008. Molecular Genotyping of *Macrophomina phaseolina* Isolates: Comparison of Microsatellite Primed PCR and Repetitive Element Sequence-based PCR. *J. Phytopathol.*, **156**: 372–381.
- Reyes-Franco, M. C., Hernandez-Delgado, S., Beas-Fernandez, R., Medina-Fernandez, M., Simpson, J. and Mayek-Perez, N. 2006. Pathogenic and Genetic Variability Within *Macrophomina phaseolina* from Mexico and other countries. *J. Phytopathol.*, 154:447–453.
- 24. Rohlf, F. J. 2000. NTSYS-pc: Numerical Taxonomy and Multivariate Analysis System. Version 2.1. Setauket, Exeter Biological Software, New York, USA,.
- 25. Safaie, N., Alizadeh, A., Saidi, A., Rahimian, H. and Adam G. 2005. Molecular Characterization and Genetic Diversity among Iranian Populations of *Fusarium* graminearum, the Causal Agent of Wheat Head Blight. Iran. J. Plant Pathol., 41: 171-189.
- 26. Slatkin, M. and Barton N. H. 1989. A Comparison of Three Indirect Methods for Estimating Average Levels of Gene Flow. *Evolution.*, **43**: 1349-1368.
- Trigiano, R. N., Windham, M. T. and Windham, A. S. 2008. Plant Pathology: Concepts and Laboratory Exercises. Boca Raton (FL): CRC Press, 462p.
- 28. Wright, S. 1951. The Genetics Structure of Populations. *Ann. Hum. Genet.*, **15**: 323-782
- 29. Zietkiewicz, E., Rafalski, A. and Labuda, D. 1994. Genome Fingerprinting by Simple Sequence Repeat (SSR)-anchored Polymerase Chain Reaction Amplification. *Genom. Genet. Wkly.*, **20**: 176–183.

### بررسی ساختار ژنتیکی جمعیت های Macrophomina phaseolina عامل ایجاد کننده پوسیدگی ذغالی کنجد با استفاده از نشانگر ISSR

### ر. صلاحلو، ن. صفایی، و م. شمس بخش

### چکیده

قارچ M. phaseolina یکی از مهمترین بیمارگرهای خاکبرد است که باعث بیماری پوسیدگی فی الله بیماری از گیاهان زراعی مهم، از جمله کنجد، در ایران می شود. تعداد ۶۰ جدایه M. فی خالی در بسیاری از گیاهان زراعی مهم، از جمله کنجد کشور شامل ۱۰ استان جمع آوری گردید. تنوع phaseolina از مناطق اصلی تولید کننده کنجد کشور شامل ۱۰ استان جمع آوری گردید. تنوع ژنتیکی میان جمعیتهای ISSR با استفاده از نشانگر ISSR با تاکید بر تمایز جغرافیایی بررسی گردید. پنج آغاز گر ISSR در مجموع ۱۰۵ نوار قابل امتیاز دهی ایجاد شد که در این بین بررسی گردید. پنج آغاز گر ISSR در مجموع ۱۰۵ نوار قابل امتیاز دهی ایجاد شد که در این بین جمعیت فارس محاسبه شد. در حالی که کمترین مقدار تنوع (۲۸۲٬۱۸۵ PPB=۹/۵۲٪) برای جمعیت کرمان دیده شد. شاخص تنوع ژنی کل میزان بالایی از تنوع را نشان داد (۲۸۸۰ ۱۸۳ با که سهم بالایی از تنوع ژنتیکی مربوط به تنوع درون جمعیت ها می باشد.