# Genetic Diversity in Iranian Fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare* Mill.) Populations Based on Sequence Related Amplified Polymorphism (SRAP) Markers

H. Maghsoudi Kelardashti<sup>1</sup>, M. Rahimmalek<sup>1\*</sup>, and M. Talebi<sup>2</sup>

## ABSTRACT

To evaluate the genetic variations in eleven fennel populations in Iran, 55 accessions were analyzed by SRAP markers. Twelve primer combinations produced 171 polymorphic bands. The cumulative dendrogram delineated fennel accessions into five major groups in accordance to the geographical regions from which the populations were originated. About 43.57% of total genetic variation was detected among the populations, while 56.43% of total variation were observed within the populations. The studied populations showed high genetic differentiation (Gst= 0.52) and low gene flow (Nm= 0.46). Among the studied populations, Yazd and Kerman accounted for the highest values of PPB (%), Shanon index (I), and heterozygosity. The self-pollinated seeds were in the range of 2.01% in Paveh-2 to 9.24% in Isfahan-2 accessions. The essential oil content ranged from 0.62% in Isfahan-3 to 2.21% in Tabriz-3. Generaly, the dwarf populations *viz.*, Tabriz and Paveh, had higher essential oil yield and their pollination was less affected by environmental factors than the average.

Keywords: Apiaceae, Genetic differentiation, Molecular marker, Pollination, Variation.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Fennel is a biennial medicinal and aromatic plant belonging to the family Apiaceae. It is a hardy, perennial umbelliferous herb with yellow flowers and feathery leaves [9]. It is generally considered indigenous to the shores of Mediterranean Sea, but has become widely domesticated in many parts of the world, especially on dry soils near the coastal area and on the river Some researchers banks [9]. have distinguished two sub-species of fennel, piperitum and vulgare: the former has bitter seeds, while the latter is characterized by sweet seeds mainly used as flavoring agents in baked foods, meat and fish dishes, ice creams, and alcoholic beverages due to their characteristic anise odour [9]. Herbal medicine and essential oils extracted from fennel are known for their diuretic, antiinflammatory, analgesic, stomachic and galactogogue properties and antioxidant activities among many others[8, 26].

Plants breeders indebt their success in the past, present, and future to genetic variations in crops and their wild relatives. Landraces widely characterized with unique traits are promising for breeding programs [31]. The main objective to study genetic variation and interrelationships among germplasm collections is to apply such information to develop and release much productive cultivars among cultivated species [2]. Furthermore, genetic variation pattern can

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Department of Agronomy and Plant Breeding, College of Agriculture, Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan 84156 83111, Islamic Republic of Iran.

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author; e-mail: mrahimmalek@cc.iut.ac.ir

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Department of Agricultural Biotechnology, College of Agriculture, Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, 8415683111, Islamic Republic of Iran.



provide new insights for developing genepool collections.

Recent breakthroughs in DNA-based markers technology have led to breeders overcome wide varieties of issues on classification and conservation of plant genetic sources and to screen repetitive specimens in gene banks. SRAP (Sequence Related Amplified Polymorphism) is a Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR)-based marker system which preferentially amplifies Open Reading Frames (ORFs) [18]. It has been employed to detect polymorphism among individuals in various crop species [18], considering advantages such as reasonable throughput rate, disclosing numerous codominant markers such as ISSR and easy isolation of bands for sequencing [19, 34].

It is possible to evaluate genetic relationships of the fennel ecotypes to introduce them for further breeding programs. In spite of its medicinal potential, limited number of molecular and breeding studies on Iranian fennels in literatures is available. Furthermore, there are no reports concerning the genetic diversity among and within Iranian fennel populations. Zahid *et al.* (2009) assessed the genetic diversity of Pakistan fennel germplasm using 16 RAPD

primers [35]. Genetic diversity among Indian varieties of *Foeniculum vulgare* was also evaluated using nuclear ribosomal DNA and RAPD markers [32]. Bahmani *et al.* (2013) evaluated the genetic diversity of 25 Iranian ecotypes based on 72 RAPD polymorphic bands [5]. Torabi *et al.* (2012) dealt with the genetic diversity of 30 fennel accession using AFLP markers [33].

The present research aimed to: (i) determine the level and the patterns of genetic variation and differentiation among and within fennel ecotypes using SRAP markers and (ii) assess variation in some morphological traits, self-pollinated seed production and its relationship with essential oil yield.

### **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

#### **Plant Materials**

Young leaf samples of 55 accessions from 11 populations of Iranian fennels were used as starting material to carry out a SRAP marker analysis (Table 1). Sampling was performed based on different geographical origins of the country (Figure 1).



Figure 1. Origin of the fennel population collected from different geographical regions of Iran.

l accessions.
fennel
Iranian
S
f5
0
eld
yi.
=
<u> </u>
essential
, and
traits
logical
, morpho
location
al
geographic
he
Ε
Ŀ.
Table

		-		Dry weight	No. of lateral	Flower	Day to 100%	Flowering	Essential	Oil Plant	t height	Self-	Seed	vield
	No	Population	Geographical region	per plant (gr)	shoots	diameter	flowering	date	yield (%)	(cm)	)	pollination (%)	(gr)	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1	Shiraz1	Shiraz, Fars	182.33	28	7.32	98	Medium	0.89	182.2	24	4.23	10.26	
3         Shinad         Shinad <thshinad< th=""> <thshinad< th=""></thshinad<></thshinad<>	2	Shiraz2	Shiraz, Fars	180.17	28	7.54	98	Medium	0.91	170.5	56	4.72	12.35	
4         Shinz, Fas.         Tix, I         Tix, Fas.         Tix, I         Tix, Fas.         Tix, I         Tix, Fas.         Tix, I         Tix, Fas.	e	Shiraz3	Shiraz, Fars	192.17	31	7.33	76	Medium	0.88	167.2	25	3.96	13.24	
5         Haredan Hanelan         183.74         20         7.57         9.8         Medium         0.85         172.64         4.86         11.9           7         Haredan Hanelan         131.4         2.0         7.57         9.8         Medium         0.85         172.64         4.86         0.11           7         Haredan Hanelan         137.14         2.0         7.57         100         Medium         0.85         1705         5.56         20.4           10         Hanedan Hanelan         217.1         2.3         8.4         100         Medium         0.85         1705         5.66         25.4         20.4         20.5         25.4         20.4         20.5         25.4         20.5         25.4         20.5         25.4         20.5         25.4         20.5         25.4         20.5         25.4         20.5         25.4         20.5         25.4         20.5         25.4         20.5         25.4         20.5         25.4         20.5         25.4         20.5         25.4         27.5         25.6         25.4         27.5         25.6         25.4         27.5         25.6         25.4         27.5         25.6         25.4         27.5         25.6	4	Shiraz4	Shiraz, Fars	178.14	32	6.98	66	Medium	0.95	180.4	43	4.05	9.84	
	5	Shiraz5	Shiraz, Fars	188.74	30	7.87	98	Medium	0.92	172.0	64	4.86	11.96	
	9	Hamedan1	Hamedan, Hamedan	208.14	22	7.85	101	Medium	0.88	170.8	86	6.56	32.14	
8         Hancdard, Hancdar, Kerma, Ker	7	Hamedan2	Hamedan, Hamedan	217.12	23	8.54	101	Medium	0.86	179		5.68	30.46	
9         Hamedian         Hamedian         207.52         21         7.24         100         Medium         0.92         180.22         4.86         25.4           11         Kermani         Kermani         Kermani         Kermani         Kermani         Kermani         20.32         4.86         23.3         8.55         332         7.85         333         8.57         36.5         332         8.65         333         8.75         34.73         36.5         4.37         30.8         8.23         8.23         8.23         8.23         8.23         8.23         8.23         8.23         8.23         8.23         8.23         8.23         8.23         8.23         100         Medium         0.91         110         8.23         8.23         8.23         103         8.44         103         8.24         23.3         8.23         103         8.44         103         8.24         113         23.4         9.3         23.4 <td>8</td> <td>Hamedan3</td> <td>Hamedan, Hamedan</td> <td>185.14</td> <td>20</td> <td>7.67</td> <td>103</td> <td>Medium</td> <td>0.84</td> <td>169</td> <td></td> <td>5.26</td> <td>26.42</td> <td></td>	8	Hamedan3	Hamedan, Hamedan	185.14	20	7.67	103	Medium	0.84	169		5.26	26.42	
	6	Hamedan4	Hamedan, Hamedan	207.52	21	7.24	100	Medium	0.92	180.3	32	4.86	25.46	
	10	Hamedan5	Hamedan, Hamedan	211.45	23	7.87	102	Medium	0.83	173.2	26	4.67	29.75	
	11	Kerman1	Kerman, Kerman	208.25	18	4.32	131	Very late	0.89	136.2	25	4.32	8.35	
	12	Kerman2	Kerman, Kerman	222.45	19	4.56	132	Very late	0.85	137.0	62	4.47	9.23	
14         Kermath         Carnady         Ca	13	Kerman3	Kerman, Kerman	219.68	17	5.22	130	Very late	0.83	130.	72	3.98	8.23	
	14	Kerman4	Kerman, Kerman	232.75	18	4.46	132	Very late	0.81	140		5.2	7.86	
	15	Kerman5	Kerman, Kerman	215.94	20	3.98	129	Very late	0.91	132		4.62	8.24	
	16	Isfahan1	Isfahan, Isfahan	172.15	14	7.35	102	Medium	0.64	118		9.1	27.56	
	17	Isfahan2	Isfahan, Isfahan	173.85	14	7.59	102	Medium	0.71	124		9.24	23.45	
	18	Isfahan3	Isfahan. Isfahan	182.17	15	7.45	103	Medium	0.62	111.4	56	8.56	24.32	
	19	Isfahan4	Isfahan. Isfahan	180.75	16	8.01	103	Medium	0.67	110.8	85	8.46	30.21	
	20	Isfahan5	Isfahan, Isfahan	175.46	15	6.88	103	Medium	0.69	115		7.98	20.86	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	21	Boushehr1	Boushehr. Boushehr	185.35	16	6.33	110	Late	0.86	132.2	24	3.56	35.12	
23         Boushent, Bust, Kermanshah 346,75 13 6.512 14 5.523 83 Very early 0.95 85.3 3.16 30.5         208           20         Paveh, Rermanshah 345,712 14 5.548 83 Very early 0.958 83.24 2.266 29.8         31.45 7.52 811 140.23 85.12 14         31.45 2.26 29.8         31.6 5.22 811 140.23 85.16         31.6 5.22 811 140.23 85.16         31.6 5.20 88.24 2.26 29.8         31.6 7.2 206 29.8         31.6 7.2 206 29.8         31.6 7.2 206 29.8         31.6 7.2 206 29.8         31.6 7.2 206 29.8         31.6 7.2 206 29.8         31.6 7.2 206 29.8         31.6 7.2 206 29.8         31.6 7.2 206 29.8         31.6 7.2 206 29.8         31.6 7.2 206 29.8         31.4 7.3 2.3 3.1 140.23 3.1 140.23 3.1 140.23 3.1 140.23 3.1 140.23 3.1 140.25 3.1 140.23 3.1 140.25 5.3 3.1 140.23 3.1 140.25 5.3 3.1 140.25 5.3 3.1 140.25 5.3 3.1 140.25 5.3 3.1 140.25 5.3 3.1 140.25 5.2 13.2 11.2 140.23 3.1 140.25 5.3 3.1 140.25 5.2 13.2 11.2 140.23 3.1 140.25 5.2 13.2 11.2 140.23 3.1 140.25 5.2 13.2 11.2 140.23 3.1 140.25 5.2 13.2 11.2 140.23 3.1 140.25 5.2 13.2 140.2 13.1 140.25 5.2 13.2 11.2 140.23 3.1 140.25 5.2 13.	22	Boushehr?	Roushehr Boushehr	182 17	13	6 57	109	Iate	0.83	130 4	28	41	337	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	23	Boushehr3	Boushehr, Boushehr	187.16	13	6.02	108	Late	0.81	140.2	23	3.56	30.56	
25         Boushen's         Baveh         Farenashah         346.75         13         5.45         82         Very early         0.95         82.36         2.32         35.4	24	Boushehr4	Boushehr, Boushehr	193.15	15	6.88	108	Late	0.87	135.9	95	4.2	36.48	
	25	Boushehr5	Boushehr, Boushehr	194.32	14	6.03	107	Late	0.84	129.4	48	3.46	29.86	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	26	Paveh1	Paveh, Kermanshah	345.12	14	5.33	83	Very early	0.95	82.30	6	2.32	35.45	
28         Paveh3         Paveh, Kermanshah         355.12         15         6.11         82         Very early         0.86         87.42         2.26         29.8           29         Paveh4         Paveh, Kermanshah         333.45         15         5.22         81         Very early         1.56         88.24         2.42         28.8           30         Paveh5         Paveh, Kermanshah         333.45         15         5.22         81         Very early         1.56         88.24         2.42         28.8           31         Tabriz1         Tabriz1         Tabriz1         Tabriz1         7.8         83         Very early         1.9         73.4         28.3           32         Tabriz2         Tabriz4         Tabriz4         7.8         8.3         Very early         1.9         72.46         3.15         20.2           33         Tabriz4         Tabriz, Azarbayjan sharghi         127.53         13         7.88         8.4         Very early         2.14         28.3         3.14         28.2         20.1         28.2         20.2         28.3         3.14         28.2         24.1         28.2         24.1         28.2         24.1         28.3         24.1         <	27	Paveh2	Paveh, Kermanshah	346.75	13	5.45	82	Very early	0.93	85		3.16	30.56	
29         Paveht         Paveht         Paveht, Kermanshah         333.45         15         5.22         81         Very early         1.56         88.24         2.42         28.8           30         Paveh5         Paveh, Kermanshah         348.17         14         5.48         83         Very early         1.05         88.24         2.42         28.8           31         Tabriz/1         Tabriz/1         Tabriz/2         Tabriz/2         144         5.48         83         Very early         1.05         84.68         2.01         37.4           32         Tabriz/2         Tabriz/2         Tabriz/2         Tabriz/2         14         8.3         Very early         1.05         84.68         2.01         37.4           33         Tabriz/2         Tabriz/2         Tabriz/2         14         8.3         Very early         1.05         74.6         3.15         20.24           34         Tabriz/6         Tabriz/2         Tabriz/2         Tabriz/2         Tabriz/2         198         78         84         Very early         1.16         74.32         20.1         27.46         3.15         20.1           35         Tabriz/2         Tabriz/2         Tabriz/2         Tabriz/	28	Paveh3	Paveh, Kermanshah	355.12	15	6.11	82	Very early	0.86	87.42	2	2.26	29.86	
30         Paveh, Kermanshah         348.17         14         5.48         83         Very early         1.05         84.68         2.01         37.4           31         Tabriz1         Tabriz1         Tabriz, Azarbayjan sharghi         127.22         14         8.11         83         Very early         2.14         73.23         3.14         28.3           32         Tabriz2         Tabriz         Tabriz, Azarbayjan sharghi         130.85         14         8.35         83         Very early         2.14         73.23         3.14         28.3           33         Tabriz2         Tabriz         Tabriz         Tabriz         Tabriz         7.46         3.15         20.2           34         Tabriz5         Tabriz6         Tabriz         14         8.35         84         Very early         1.76         3.15         20.2           35         Tabriz6         Tabriz6         Tabriz6         Tabriz6         81.23         4.21         26.1           36         Mashhad         Khorasan razavi         196.75         10         8.78         100         Late         0.81         150.23         3.21         20.1           37         Mashhad         Khorasan razavi	29	Paveh4	Paveh, Kermanshah	333.45	15	5.22	81	Very early	1.56	88.24	4	2.42	28.83	
31       Tabriz1       Tabriz1       Tabriz, Azarbayjan sharghi       127.22       14       8.11       83       Very early       2.14       73.23       3.14       28.3         32       Tabriz2       Tabriz2       Tabriz, Azarbayjan sharghi       130.85       14       8.35       83       Very early       1.98       78       3.02       24.2         33       Tabriz3       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       74.32       3.02       3.15       20.2         34       Tabriz5       Tabriz5       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       74.32       3.02       24.1         35       Mashhadi       Khorsan razavi       188.17       14       8.25       98       Very early       2.11       81.23       44.21       26.1         36       Mashhadi       Khorsan razavi       196.75       10       8.78       100       Late       0.81       150.23       3.21       20.2         37       Mashhadi       Khorsan razavi       196.75       10       8.78       100       Late       0.81       150.23       3.21       20.1         38       Mashhadi       Khorsan razavi       290.15       11	30	Paveh5	Paveh, Kermanshah	348.17	14	5.48	83	Very early	1.05	84.68	8	2.01	37.43	
32       Tabriz2       Tabriz2       Tabriz4	31	Tabriz1	Tabriz, Azarbayjan sharghi	127.22	14	8.11	83	Very early	2.14	73.23	3	3.14	28.32	
33       Tabriz3       Tabriz3       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       3.15       20.2         34       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       72.46       3.15       20.2         35       Tabriz5       Tabriz5       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       74.32       3.9       24.1         35       Tabriz5       Tabriz6       Tabriz4       Tabriz4       2arbayjan sharghi       125.63       13       8       24.1       24.1       24.1       24.1       24.1       26.1         36       Mashhad1       Mashhad2       Khorsan razavi       196.75       10       8.75       98       Late       0.81       150.23       3.21       21.2       21.2         37       Mashhad5       Mashhad4       Khorsan razavi       296.15       11       8.9       98       100       Late       0.83       19.26       3.45       20.1         38       Mashhad4       Mashhad4       Khorsan razavi       299.15       11       8.9       98       99       19.3       3.64       19.3         3	32	Tabriz2	Tabriz, Azarbayjan sharghi	130.85	14	8.35	83	Very early	1.98	78		3.02	24.23	
34       Tabriz4       Tabria4       Tabriz4       Tabria4       Tabriz4       Tabria4	33	Tabriz3	Tabriz, Azarbayjan sharghi	122.85	13	7.88	84	Very early	2.21	72.40	9	3.15	20.23	
35       Tabriz       Tabriz       Tabriz, Azarbayjan sharghi       132.87       11       8.22       81       Very early       2.11       81.23       4.21       26.1         36       Mashhad1       Mashhad, Khorasan razavi       188.17       14       8.55       98       Late       0.81       150.23       3.21       21.2       21.2         37       Mashhad       Khorasan razavi       196.75       10       8.78       100       Late       0.83       149.26       3.45       20.1         38       Mashhad5       Mashhad, Khorasan razavi       209.15       11       8.9       98       Late       0.84       158.23       3.64       19.3         39       Mashhad5       Mashhad, Khorasan razavi       209.15       11       8.66       97       Late       0.91       161.56       2.39       16.3         40       Mashhad5       Mashhad, Khorasan razavi       197.94       11       8.66       98       Late       0.82       157.42       2.76       17.2	34	Tabriz4	Tabriz, Azarbayjan sharghi	125.63	13	8	82	Very early	1.76	74.32	2	3.9	24.16	
36         Mashhad1         Mashhad, Khorasan razavi         188.17         14         8.55         98         Late         0.81         150.23         3.21         21.2           37         Mashhad2         Mashhad, Khorasan razavi         196.75         10         8.78         100         Late         0.83         149.26         3.45         20.1           38         Mashhad3         Mashhad, Khorasan razavi         209.15         11         8.9         98         Late         0.84         158.23         3.64         19.3           39         Mashhad4         Mashhad, Khorasan razavi         220.56         13         7.86         97         Late         0.91         161.56         2.89         16.4           40         Mashhad5         Mashhad, Khorasan razavi         197.94         11         8.66         98         Late         0.91         161.56         2.89         16.4	35	Tabriz5	Tabriz, Azarbayjan sharghi	132.87	11	8.22	81	Very early	2.11	81.2	3	4.21	26.12	
37       Mashhad2       Mashhad, Khorasan razavi       196.75       10       8.78       100       Late       0.83       149.26       3.45       20.1         38       Mashhad3       Mashhad, Khorasan razavi       209.15       11       8.9       98       Late       0.84       158.23       3.64       19.3         39       Mashhad4       Mashhad, Khorasan razavi       220.56       13       7.86       97       Late       0.91       161.56       2.89       16.4         40       Mashhad5       Mashhad, Khorasan razavi       197.94       11       8.66       98       Late       0.91       161.56       2.89       16.4	36	Mashhad1	Mashhad, Khorasan razavi	188.17	14	8.55	98	Late	0.81	150.2	23	3.21	21.23	
38       Mashhad3       Mashhad, Khorasan razavi       209.15       11       8.9       98       Late       0.84       158.23       3.64       19.3         39       Mashhad4       Mashhad, Khorasan razavi       220.56       13       7.86       97       Late       0.91       161.56       2.89       16.4         40       Mashhad5       Mashhad, Khorasan razavi       197.94       11       8.66       98       Late       0.82       157.42       2.76       17.2	37	Mashhad2	Mashhad, Khorasan razavi	196.75	10	8.78	100	Late	0.83	149.2	26	3.45	20.18	
39         Mashhad4         Mashhad, Khorasan razavi         220.56         13         7.86         97         Late         0.91         161.56         2.89         16.4           40         Mashhad5         Mashhad, Khorasan razavi         197.94         11         8.66         98         Late         0.82         157.42         2.76         17.2	38	Mashhad3	Mashhad, Khorasan razavi	209.15	11	8.9	98	Late	0.84	158.3	23	3.64	19.32	
40 Mashhad5 Mashhad, Khorasan razavi 197.94 11 8.66 98 Late 0.82 157.42 2.76 17.2	39	Mashhad4	Mashhad, Khorasan razavi	220.56	13	7.86	97	Late	0.91	161.5	56	2.89	16.42	
	40	Mashhad5	Mashhad, Khorasan razavi	197.94	11	8.66	98	Late	0.82	157.4	42	2.76	17.23	





Continued of Table 1.

No	Population	Geographical region	Dry weight per plant (gr)	No. lateral shoots	of Flower diameter	Day to 100% flowering	Flowering date	Essential Oil yield (%)	Plant heig (cm)	ght Self- pollination (	%) (gr)
41	Tehran1	Tehran, Tehran	183.17	12	8.01	117	Late	0.95	130.21	5.26	20.32
42	Tehran2	Tehran, Tehran	175.42	11	8.33	116	Late	0.93	130	5.33	18.16
43	Tehran3	Tehran, Tehran	176.14	11	8.54	116	Late	0.91	128.74	4.98	16.32
44	Tehran4	Tehran, Tehran	179.85	11	7.86	118	Late	0.94	135.42	4.78	18.46
45	Tehran5	Tehran, Tehran	173.15	12	8.12	117	Late	0.96	132.21	5.46	19.64
46	Yazd1	Yazd, Yazd	147.23	13	9.11	110	Late	1.16	126.23	4.75	20.18
47	Yazd2	Yazd, Yazd	150.65	6	9.33	108	Late	1.32	128.24	4.82	21.32
48	Yazd3	Yazd, Yazd	155.45	11	8.54	107	Late	0.98	122.45	4.32	18.56
49	Yazd4	Yazd, Yazd	160.17	10	9.75	105	Late	0.97	120.36	3.98	17.42
50	Yazd5	Yazd, Yazd	148.86	12	9.42	108	Late	1.87	122	4.36	15.46
51	Ardebil1	Ardebil, Ardebil	137.56	7	7.52	76	Very early	1.023	90.23	3.45	33.26
52	Ardebil2	Ardebil, Ardebil	134.16	8	7.56	76	Very early	1.47	95	3.26	32.17
53	Ardebil3	Ardebil, Ardebil	130.56	8	7.33	76	Very early	0.95	91.23	3.75	28.46
54	Ardebil4	Ardebil, Ardebil	144.86	6	7.88	LL	Very early	0.98	94.23	2.98	27.89
55	Ardebil5	Ardebil, Ardebil	140.75	10	7.01	75	Very early	1.42	97.46	2.86	30.24

#### **DNA Extraction**

DNA extraction from young leaves was performed using modified CTAB procedure as described by Murry and Thompson (1980)<sup>13</sup>. The quality and quantity of DNA was estimated spectrophotometrically and electrophoretically.

The ratio of OD260/280 was measured for the quality of DNA and the quantity of DNA was calculated as the following simple formula:

DNA concentration (ng  $\mu L^{-1}$ )= OD260×50×Dilution coefficient

Finally, DNA was diluted to operating concentration of 50 ng mL<sup>-1</sup>.

#### **Protocol for the SRAP Analysis**

SRAP analysis was performed according to the protocol described by Li and Quiros [18] with slight modifications. The primers used in the analysis are reported on Table 2. Initially, all SRAP primer [34] combinations were screened using 20 samples. Based on the screening results, 12 primer combinations, which produced scorable polymorphic bands, were used to amplify all accessions (Table 3). PCR reactions were performed in a total volume of 25.0 µL as follows: 2.5 µL of dNTP mix (2.5 mM), 2.5  $\mu$ L of PCR buffer (10X), 0.4  $\mu$ L of Taq polymerasease (2.5 U  $\mu$ L<sup>-1</sup>), 2.5  $\mu$ L of forward primer and reverse primer (3) Pmol mL<sup>-1</sup>), 3.0  $\mu$ L of DNA template, and 9.8 µL of distilled water. The SRAP markers were amplified on following parameters: 4 minutes at 94°C, 5 cycles of 94°C for 1 minute, 35°C for 1 minute, 72°C for 2 minutes, 35 cycles of 94°C for 1 minute, 50°C for 1 minute, 72°C for 2 minutes, and final extension of 10 minutes at 72°C. The PCR products were run polyacrylamide on 6% denaturing electrophoresis gel. The amplification products were then detected by silver staining followed by allele scoring for more accuracy. The first five cycles are run at 94°C, 1 minute, 35°C, 1 minute, and 72°C, 1 minute, for denaturing, annealing, and extension, respectively. Then, the annealing temperature was raised to 50°C

	Primer	Sequence $(5' \rightarrow 3')$	Annealing temp (°C)
	Me1	5'-TGAGTCCAAACCGGATA-3'	50
	Me2	5'-TGAGTCCAAACCGGAGC-3'	55
urd	Me3	5'-TGAGTCCAAACCGGAAT-3'	50
Š.	Me4	5'-TGAGTCCAAACCGGACC-3'	55
Foi	Me5	5'-TGAGTCCAAACCGGAAG-3'	52
	Em1	5'-GACTGCGTACGAATTAAT-3'	49
	Em2	5'-GACTGCGTACGAATTTGC-3'	54
e	Em3	5'-GACTGCGTACGAATTGAC-3'	54
ers	Em4	5'-GACTGCGTACGAATTTGA-3'	52
kev	Em5	5'-GACTGCGTACGAATTAAC-3'	52
ł	Em6	5'-GACTGCGTACGAATTGCA-3'	54

Table 2. Sequence of forward and reverse SRAP primer combinations for 55 accessions.

**Table 3.** The number of total and polymorphic fragments per SRAP primer combinations and Polymorphic Information Content (PIC) along with Gene diversity.

No.	Primer combinations	No. total bands	No. $PB^a$	$PPB^{b}(\%)$	PIC
1	Me2_Em5	16	12	75	0.27
2	Me5_Em2	20	18	90	0.47
3	Me4_Em3	12	11	92	0.35
4	Me3_Em6	15	13	87	0.34
5	Me1_Em6	12	10	83	0.28
6	Me4_Em1	14	13	93	0.43
7	Me1_Em4	22	21	95	0.31
8	Me2_Em4	16	13	81	0.35
9	Me2_Em2	16	15	94	0.34
10	Me4_Em6	11	9	82	0.28
11	Me3_Em3	18	17	94	0.46
12	Me1_Em1	20	19	95	0.46
Total		192	171	-	-
Averag	ge	-	14.14	88.41	0.36

<sup>a</sup> Number of Polymorphic Band; <sup>b</sup> Percentage of Polymorphic Band. \* Annealing temp 50°C.

for another 35 cycles. The amplicons were separated by denaturing acrylamide gels.

## **Essential Oil Extraction**

Essential oil yield of each population was measured by hydro-distillation of 20 g shade dried leaf samples in three replicates using a clevenger apparatus.

#### **Morphological Analysis**

The fennel populations were collected from different geographical regions of Iran.

The fennel accessions were cultivated in Randomized Block Design (RCBD) with three replicates. Some of morphological traits such as plant height, flowering date, flower diameter, day to 100% flowering, number of lateral shoots, dry weight per plant, and seed yield were measured in three replicates and the average values were used for analysis (Table 1).

## **Determination of Self-pollinated seeds**

The inflorescence of each population was divided in two parts. Half was used for cross pollination and the other umbels were bagged to prevent cross-pollination. The number of self- pollinated seeds was calculated at seeds harvesting time. The percent of self- pollination (%) was measured as the ratio of the number of selfpollinated seeds to cross pollinated ones.

#### **Data Analysis**

Distinct polymorphic SRAP bands in each gel were scored as present (1) or absent (0) and the missing bands was shown with number (9). The number of bands, Percentage of Polymorphic Bands (PPB), and Percentage of Special Bands (PSB) were calculated. PPB was calculated as the products amplified by each individual primer across all accessions, i.e. the number of polymorphic bands produced in all accessions, expressed as a percentage of the total number of products amplified by the given primer. PSB was determined as the percentage of unique bands in each accession's profile over the total number of products yielded by all primers. similarity coefficient  $S_{ij} = 2a/(2a+b+c)$ , after the Nei and Li (1979)<sup>14</sup> was used to calculate genetic distances (GD<sub>ii</sub>= 1-S<sub>ii</sub>) among populations, where,  $S_{ij}$  represents the similarity between two individuals *i* and *j*; *a* is the number of shared bands; b is the number of bands exclusive of i, and c is the number of bands exclusive of *j*. Cluster analysis and PCoA were (Principle Coordinate Analysis) performed by the Numerical Taxonomy and Multivariate Analysis System (NT-SYS-pc) Version 2.02 [30]. The Polymorphic Information Content (PIC) was calculated using simplified formula [3]. Jaccard's similarity index was used to calculate genetic similarity among all accessions [17]. Dendrogram was generated using the Unweighted PairGroup Method with Arithmetic mean (UPGMA) clustering procedure of NTSYS-pc ver. 2.02 software. Mantel test (1967) was used to determine correlation between two matrices [22]. The Cophenetic correlation coefficient was generated by means of COPH algorithm to

check the goodness of fit between the cluster in the dendrogram and the similarity coefficient matrix. Analysis of Molecular Variance (AMOVA) was calculated within each species using Arlequin ver. 3.1 software. POPGENE32 software was used to compute the number of effective loci, the percentage of polymorphic loci, Shannon's information index (I), observed number of alleles (Na), expected heterozygosity (He) and effective number of alleles (Ne).

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

## SRAP Amplification and Levels of Polymorphism

In the present study, 12 primer combinations were selected according to clarity, sharpness, and number of bands produced in a pre-screening assay carried out with 30 primer combinations on 20 accessions. A total number of 192 distinguishable fragments were produced by 12 SRAP primer combinations out of which 171 (88.3%) were polymorphic ranging from 9 to 21 with an average of 14.4 polymorphic bands per combinations (Table 3), in line with previous researchers who 10-20 SRAP reported polymorphic fragments per primer combinations [18, 11, 7]. Polymorphism Information Content (PIC) was calculated with an average of 0.36. The highest (0.47) and the lowest (0.27) PIC belonged to SRAP primer combinations of Me5-Em2 and Me2-Em5, respectively. The pattern of SRAP markers (Me1-Em4 primer) in the studied fennel accessions is illustrated in Figure 2.

#### **Cluster Analysis**

The constructed dendrograms were evaluated by the cophenetic correlation coefficient (0.88) based on the similarity matrix to validate the robustness of the obtained tree topology of cluster analysis. The UPGMA clustering algorithm based on



**Figure 2.** SRAP banding pattern of different fennel accessions using Me1-Em4 primer combination. M is 100 bp ladder and 1-27 includes the half of accessions amplified in one acrylamide gel.

Jaccard's similarity matrix was applied to construct the dendrogram that divided 55 fennel accessions into five groups at the level of similarities of 0.58 (Figure 3). First group involved 25 accessions and this group included populations from Shiraz, Isfahan, Ardabil and Paveh regions. In this group, populations from Shiraz and Isfahan showed more similarity in respect to climate. These populations were located in arid and warm



**Figure 3.** Dendrogram of 55 studied fennel accessions based on SRAP markers according to the Unweighted Pair Group Mean Algorithm (UPGMA) with the Jaccard similarity index.

climates. Also, populations of Ardabil and Paveh showed some degrees of genetic similarity. These populations, characterized by dwarf, early maturity, light green color, and high essential oil yield, are found commonly in cold climates (Table 1). The second group consisted of two populations (10 accessions). In this group, Kerman and Bushehr were located in warm regions. Furthermore, Kerman and Boshehr populations were similar in morphological and essential oil yield (Table1). The third group involved Mashhad population from North-Eastern part of the country and contained five accessions. It was differed from others groups in climate conditions. The main feature attributed to this population was late-flowering (Table 1). Rahimmalek et al. (2009) assessed the essential oil composition of the fennel populations used in this research. In their studies, the lowest Limonene content in essential oil was recorded in Mashhad population compared to other populations [28]. The fourth group included Tabriz and Hamadan populations. Both of them were similar in climate condition. Tabriz and Hamedan populations vary morphologically and phonologically in spite of similar climate conditions. Tabriz is characterized by dwarf plants and light green color leaves, while Hamedan possessed high and late growing plants with dark grey leaves. These accessions revealed high essential oil yield (Table 1). The fifth group included plants from Tehran with moderate ripening and dark green leaves (Figure 3).

## Principle Coordinate Analysis (PCoA) of Molecular Data

The first three eigenvectors explained 66.63 % of the total molecular variations, accounting 57.92, 4.78, and 3.93% of the observed variations, respectively. The results of PCoA analysis corresponded to those obtained through cluster analysis (Figure 4). As it is shown in Figures 4,

accessions were grouped in similar pattern compared to cluster analysis.

## **Population Genetic Structure**

Using Analysis of Molecular Variance (AMOVA), 43.57% of the total genetic variation was detected among the populations, while 56.43% of total variation was observed within the populations (Table 4).

Genetic distances and similarity coefficients of fennel populations are shown according to Ni and Li approaches in Table 5. The highest and the lowest similarity were obtained between Ardabil and Isfahan (0.910) and Shiraz and Hamedan (0.714) populations, respectively. Since Shiraz and Hamadan showed the highest genetic distance, they might be used as good sources for further breeding purposes. Some other populations indices were calculated using Popgene32 (Table 6). Gene variation, Shannon information index, heterozygosity and polymorphism percent for populations of Yazd and Kerman were found to be the highest, while Hamadan and Tabriz populations had the lowest ones. The highest PPB was recorded in Yazd (45.95) followed by Kerman (42.34) populations. Genetic coefficient differentiation (Gst) was calculated at about 0.52. The average of Nm was obtained as 0.46, suggesting relatively low gene flow among populations.

## Morphological and Essential Oil Yield Variation

Morphological traits, essential oil yield and percent of self-pollination were measured among the accessions. Analysis of variance showed significant differences among all evaluated traits. The average of each trait is shown in Table 1. High variation was observed among studied morphological traits. Among accessions, Kerman4 and Paveh5 revealed the lowest



Group 1 (Isfahan, Yazd, Ardebil, Paveh, Shiraz
 Group 2 (Kerman, Boushehr)
 Group 3 (Mashhsd)
 Group 4 (Tabriz, Hamedan)
 Group 5 (Tehran)

**Figure 4.** Principle Coordinate Analysis (PCoA) based on first three eigenvectors of 55 fennel accessions used in this study.

 Table 4. AMOVA analysis among 11 fennel populations.

Source of variation	df <sup>a</sup>	Sum of squares	Mean of squares	Percentage variation	of	P value	Fst
Among groups	10	363.5	5.77	43.57		< 0.001	0.43
Within groups	44 54	329 629 5	7.48	56.43			
Total	34	629.3	15.20				

(8.43 gr) and the highest values (37.43g) for seed yield per accession, respectively. Hamedan, Tabriz, and Paveh populations had very early flowering, while Yazd, Mashahad, Bushehr, Shiraz, and Kerman were late flowering populations. The selfpollinated seeds were in the range from 2.01 to 9.24% in Paveh5 and Isfahan2 accessions, respectively.

[ DOR: 20.1001.1.16807073.2015.17.7.17.0 ]

(SHILD

	lehr Hamedan	0.729	0.714	0.769	0.794	0.771	0.745	0.780	0.793	0.841	0.851	*		g Gst <sup>h</sup>	1	I	I	ı	I	I	ı	I	I		ı	
	Boush	0.798	0.845	0.761	0.816	0.827	0.842	0.767	0.836	0.897	*	0.162		Nm	Ĩ	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	l	I	110
	Kerman	0.791	0.807	0.802	0.842	0.816	0.832	0.776	0.859	*	0.109	0.173		% PPB/	45.95	34.23	38.74	27.03	30.63	29.73	23.83	27.03	34.23	42.34	40.54	07 70
ons.	Tehran	0.780	0.800	0.810	0.820	0.818	0.822	0.868	*	0.152	0.179	0.232		He	0.22	0.18	0.19	0.13	0.15	0.15	0.14	0.13	0.17	0.22	0.19	C 1 7
l populatic	Tabriz	0.785	0.764	0.776	0.800	0.749	0.796	*	0.141	0.254	0.266	0.249	pulations.	$I^{q}$	0.26	0.21	0.23	0.15	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.15	0.20	0.25	0.22	CV (
of 11 fenne	Isfahan	0.874	0.908	0.804	0.874	0.910	*	0.228	0.197	0.184	0.172	0.295	11 fennel po	H <sup>c</sup>	1.17 (	0.14 (	0.15 (	0.10 (	0.12 (	0.12 (	0.11 (	0.10 (	0.13 (	0.17 (	0.15 (	000
ce (below*)	Ardebil	0.849	0.858	0.801	0.882	*	0.094	0.289	0.201	0.204	0.190	0.260	markers in	$Ne^{b}$	1.29	1.26	1.27	1.17	1.20	1.20	1.19	1.17	1.23	1.30	1.25	1 17
netic distan	Paveh	0.828	0.820	0.870	*	0.126	0.135	0.223	0.198	0.172	0.204	0.227	s for SRAP	$Na^{a}$	1.46	1.34	1.39	1.27	1.31	1.30	1.29	1.27	1.34	1.42	1.41	1 96
ve*) and ge	Mashhad	0.785	0.775	*	0.139	0.222	0.218	0.254	0.210	0.221	0.273	0.263	ion statistic	ame				-		L						
ficient (abo	Shiraz	0.886	*	0.198	0.198	0.153	760.0	0.269	0.223	0.214	0.169	0.337	enetic variat	opulation n	Yazd	Esfahan	Mashhad	Hamedan	Paveh	Boushehi	Tehran	Tabriz	Shiraz	Kerman	Ardebil	Total
ilarity coef	Yazd	*	0.144	0.242	0.188	0.164	0.135	0.243	0.249	0.235	0.226	0.317	mary of ge	Vo F												
<b>Table 5</b> . Simi	Populations	Yazd	Shiraz	Mashhad	Paveh	Ardebil	Isfahan	Tabriz	Tehran	Kerman	Boushehr	Hamedan	Table 6. Sum	Population 1	1	2	3	4	5	9	7	8	6	10	11	

<sup>a</sup> Observed number of alleles, <sup>b</sup> Effective number of alleles, <sup>c</sup> Gene diversity, <sup>d</sup> Shannon's information index, <sup>e</sup> Heterozygosity, <sup>f</sup> Percentage of

Polymorphic Bands, 8 Gene flow, h Genetic differentiation coefficient.

#### DISCUSSION

A relationship between genetic variability and geographic distribution has been observed in several species of medicinal plants belonging to different families. For instance, Eryngium alpinum [12], Cuminum cyminum, Foeniculum vulgare and Falcaria vulgaris [21] and Changium smyrnioides [27] were studied in Apiaceae family. The present study revealed high level of polymorphism (88.3 %) for Iranian fennel accessions confirmed by most of the previous reports on Apiaceae family [12, 21, 27]. The level of polymorphism obtained by SRAP primer combinations was higher than those reported by RAPD [5], ISSR [4] and AFLP [33] markers.

The number of polymorphic bands per primer combinations ranged from 9 to 21, on average 14.4, and the average PIC value for the amplification products was estimated to be 0.36 (Table 3), smaller than those obtained by Bahmani et al. (2011) using ISSR markers in Iranian fennels [4]. Results indicated that the majority of genetic diversity of Iranian fennel populations was obtained within populations, although there was high variation between populations. In the cluster analysis, the accessions from the same region were grouped together. The results were not in agreement with Qiu et al. (2004) report in Changium smyrnioides from Apiaceae based on RAPD markers [27]. Torabi et al. (2012) assessed the genetic similarity of 30 fennel accessions from Iran and some other countries. In their study, the highest genetic similarity among Iranian accessions was reported between Karaj and Kashan (89%), while in this research, the highest similarity was obtained between Ardebil and Esfahan populations [33]. Bahmani et al. (2013) studied genetic diversity of 25 Iranian fennel ecotypes using RAPD markers and found the highest and the lowest similarity coefficients between Sari and Kaleibar and between Hamedan and Ardabil populations, respectively [5]. Zahid et al. (2009) evaluated the genetic

relationships of 50 indigenous fennel germplasm accessions in Pakistan using 30 RAPD primers that generated a total number of 145 bands [35]. In their research, 48% of fragments were polymorphic, that was much lower than those obtained in the present research.

*PIC* ranged from 0.27 to 0.47 with an average of 0.36. In the previous reports, the range of *PIC* in *F. vulgare* was 0.08 to 0.28 based on RAPD markers [16]. *PIC* determines the degree of polymorphism of marker, i.e. proportion of individuals heterozygous for a marker. In fact, *PIC* is a realistic measure of the heterozygosity [16].

Among the studied populations, Yazd and Kerman revealed the highest values for PPB%, Shanon index (I), and heterozygosity (Table 6), indicating these populations as good candidates for further breeding programs. In this research, the studied populations showed high Gst (0.52) and low Nm (0.46). Nei and Li (1979) [24] divided gene differentiation coefficient into three classes of low (Gst< 0.05), moderate (Gst= 0.05-0.15), and high (Gst> 0.15). The relatively high differentiation among populations and low gene flow (Nm= 0.46) observed in this study was in line with the results obtained by Qiu et al. [27] in Changium smyrnioides from Apiaceae. Low gene flow among populations may result from several factors, such as low seed dispersal, isolation of populations, selfpollination, and population size [27, 13]. Limited gene flow among populations is a plausible reason for the high genetic differentiation observed for this species [27]. In this study, the pollination system was also studied (Table 1). In fennel, flowering phases of the umbels within the same umbel were not simultaneous. Thus, flowering process of fennel assures fertilization among the flowers of each single umbel [25]. In the present study, the self-pollinated seeds in sweet fennel were in the range of 2.01% in Paveh to 9.24% in Isfahan, in agreement with the range (0-10%) obtained for bitter fennel populations[11]. Gross et al. (2008) also showed a high (0.7-3.7) index of self-



compatibility, indicative of substantial selfpollination in their studied populations. In the present research, a low gene flow was among studied recorded the fennel populations. Although interbreeding among populations was proven using artificial pollination, geographical isolation and the high likelihood for self-pollination probably restricts gene flow and contributes to the phenotypic diversity observed in wild fennel populations [14]. Furthermore, fennel flowers are strongly protandrous and a series of flowers must be produced to ensure pollination [10].

Different plant heights were observed in fennel populations (Table 1). The tall fennel populations, such as Shiraz and Tehran, are characterized by tall inflorescences and, therefore, withstand winds much stronger than dwarf ones such as Tabriz and Paveh. Therefore. the movement of flying pollinators of fennel, mostly diptera, wasps, or beetles are much smaller than the honeybee, and hence more susceptible to winds. For this, a panmictic pollination either is reduced, or totally eliminated [6]. The pollination also affects the essential oil yield in fennel. Fruit set is a key component of essential oil yield for fennel. Fruit set in tall populations is often low, possibly due to incomplete pollination [10]. Moreover, in fennel, fruit set decreases by a lack of synchrony between pollen production and stigma receptivity [10]. The previous reports also confirmed dwarf fennel populations possessed higher essential oil yield in their leaves than tall ones, while tans-anethole content, as the major compound of sweet fennel, was not highly affected by plant Furthermore, a reverse height [28]. correlation between estragole and transanethole content was reported and the action of a biallelic gene with partial dominance for high estragole content was also inferred [15].

Introducing new variation into plant germplasm is very helpful in the development of new cultivars characterized by either the higher content of important metabolites or better agronomic traits [1,

20]. According to the present data, essential highly oil yield was affected bv environmental factors and, in most cases, molecular classification did not confirm the essential oil pattern of the studied accessions (Table 1). High variation was also observed within populations. For example, essential oil yield of Paveh accessions ranged from 0.86 to 1.32%, while Yazd accessions varied from 0.97 to 1.87%. It has been reported that essential oil yield is related to genetic and climatic factors, soil condition, stage of growth flowering), (vegetative or organogenesis, and anatomical part of the plant [29]. Finally, selection of accessions with high essential oil content and high genetic variation can be beneficial for further breeding purposes.

### CONCLUSIONS

For the first time, the genetic diversity of different fennel populations was analyzed using SRAP molecular markers. These results showed high efficiency of SRAP markers (83.4%) in distinguishing various individuals from different fennel populations. In this research, the relatively high differentiation and low gene flow observed among populations might be attributed to fennels pollination. Furthermore, it is worthy to suggest that the dwarf populations like Tabriz and Paveh had higher essential oil yield and their pollination was less affected by environmental factors. Consequently, further selection of populations for evaluation of genetic diversity can lead to more insightful results.

#### REFERENCES

 Ahmadi, H., Rahimmalek, M. and Zeinali, H. 2014. Assessment of the Genetic Variation of Chamomile (*Matricaria chamomilla* L.) Populations Using Phytochemical, Morphological and ISSR Markers. *Biochem. Syst. Ecol.*, 54:190-197.

- Alawala, S., Suman, A., Arro, J. A., Veremis, J. C. and Kimbeng, C. A. 2006. Target Region Amplification Polymorphism (TRAP) for Assessing Genetic Diversity in Sugarcane Germplasm Collections. *Crop. Sci.*, 46: 448-455.
- Anderson, J. A., Churchill, G. A., Autrique, J. E., Sorells, M. E. and Tanksley, S. D. 1993. Optimizing Parental Selection for Genetic-linkage Maps. *Genome*, 36: 181– 186.
- 4. Bahmani, K., Izadi Darbandi, A., Ashraf Jafari, A., Sadat Noori, S. and Farajpour, M. 2012. Assessment of Genetic Diversity in Iranian Fennels Using ISSR Markers. J. Agr. Sci., 4(9): 79-84.
- Bahmani, K., Izadi Darbandi, A., Sadat Noori, S. A. and Jafari, A. 2013. Assessment of the Genetic Diversity in Iranian Fennels by RAPD Markers. J. Herb. Spice. Med. Plant., 19(3): 275-285.
- Barazani, O., Cohen, Y. and Fait, A., Diminshtein, S., Dudai, N., Ravid, U., Putievsky, E. and Friedman, J. 2002. Chemotypic Differentiation in Indigenous Populations of *Foeniculum vulgare* var. *vulgare* in *Israel. Biochem. Syst. Ecol.*, **30**: 721-731.
- Budak, H., Shearman, R. C., Parmaksiz, I., Gaussoin, R. E., Riordan, T. R. and Dewiak, I. 2004. Molecular Characterization of Buffalograss Germplasm Using Sequencerelated Amplified Polymorphism Markers. *Theor. Appl. Genet.*, 108: 328–334.
- Camejo-Rodrigues, J. S., Ascensa o, L., Bone, T. M. A. and Valle', S. J. 2003. An Ethnobotanical Study of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants in the Natural Park of Serra de S. Mamede (Portugal). J. Ethnopharmacol., 89: 199–209.
- Diaaz-Maroto, M. C., Pea Rez-Coello, M. S., Esteban, J. and Sanz, J. 2006. Comparison of the Volatile Composition of Wild Fennel Samples (*Foeniculum vulgare* Mill.) from Central Spain. J. Agric. Food Chem. 54: 6814–6818.
- Falzari, L. M., Menary, R. C. and Dragar, V. A. 2005. Reducing Fennel Stand Density Increases Pollen Production, Improving Potential for Pollination and Subsequent Oil Yield. *Hort. Sci.*, 40(3): 629-634.
- 11. Ferriol, M., Pico, B. and Nuez, F. 2003. Genetic Diversity of a Germplasm Collection of *Cucurbita pepo* Using SRAP

and AFLP Markers. *Theor. Appl. Genet.*, **107**: 271-282

- Gaudeul, M., Till-Bottraud, I., Barjon, F. and Manel, S. 2004. Genetic Diversity and Differentiation in *Eryngium alpinum* L. (Apiaceae): Comparison of AFLP and Microsatellite Markers. *Hered.*, **92(6)**: 508-18.
- Gharibi, S., Rahimmalek, M., Mirlohi, A., Majidi, M. M. and Sayed Tabatabaie, B. E. 2011. Assessment of Genetic Diversity in Achillea millefolium subsp. millefolium and Achillea millefolium subsp. elbursensis using Morphological and ISSR Markers. J. Med. Plant. Res., 5(11): 2413-2423.
- 14. Gross, M., Lewinsohn, E., Dudai, N., Cohen, Y. and Friedman, J. 2008. Flowering Dynamics and Crossability of Different Populations of Bitter Fennel (*Foeniculum* vulgare Mill. var. vulgare, Apiaceae). Israel J. Plant Sci., 58(3): 215-226.
- 15. Gross, M., Lewinsohn, E., Tadmor, Y., Bar, E., Dudai, N., Cohen, Y. and Friedman, J. Inheritance 2009. The of Volatile Phenylpropenes in Bitter Fennel (Foeniculum vulgare Mill. var. vulgare, Apiaceae) Chemotypes and Their Distribution within the Plant. Biochem. Syst. Ecol., 37: 308-316.
- Grover, S., Jakhar, M. L. and Malik, C. P. 2011. Genetic Diversity of Different Varieties of *Foeniculum vulgare* Miller by RAPD Markers. *Arch. Appl. Sci. Res.*, 3(5): 17-25.
- 17. Jaccard, P. 1908. Nouvelles Recherches sur la Distribution Florale. *Bull Soc. Vaud. Sci. Nat.*, **44**: 223–270.
- Li, G. and Quiros C. F. 2003. Sequence-Related Amplified Polymorphism (SRAP), a New Marker System Based on a Simple PCR Reaction: Its Application to Mapping and Gene Tagging in *Brassica. Theor. Appl. Genet.*, 103: 455-461.
- Li, P., Yangdong, W., Chen, Y. and Zhang, S. H. 2009. Genetic Diversity and Association of ISSR Markers with the Eleostearic Content in Tung Tree (*Vernicia fordii*). *Afr. J. Biotechnol.*, 8: 4782–4788.
- Mansour, E., Ben khaled, A., Triki, T., Abid, A., Bachar, K., Ferchichi, A. 2015. Evaluation of Genetic Diversity among South Tunisian Pomegranate (*Punica* granatum L.) Accessions Using Fruit Traits and RAPD Markers. J. Agr. Sci. Tech., 17(1): 109-119.

Downloaded from jast.modares.ac.ir on 2024-11-29



- Masoumi, S. M., Kahrizi, D., Rostami-Ahmadvandi, H., Soorni, J., Kiani, S., Mostafaie, A. and Yari, K. 2012. Genetic Diversity Study of Some Medicinal Plant Accessions Belong to Apiaceae Family Based on Seed Storage Proteins Patterns. *Mol. Biol. Rep.*, **39**(12): 10361-10365.
- Mantel, N. A. 1967. The Detection of Disease Clustering and a Generalized Regression Approach. *Cancer Res.*, 27: 209–220.
- Murray, M. G. and Thompson, W. F. 1980. Rapid isolation of high molecular weight plant DNA. *Nucl. Acid Res.*, 8: 4321–4325.
- Nei, M. and Li, W. H. 1979. Mathematical Model for Studying Genetic Variation in Terms of Restriction Endonucleases. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA*, **76**: 5269-5273.
- 25. Németh, É., Bemáth, J. and Petheô, F. 1999. Study on Flowering Dynamic and Fertilization Properties of Caraway and Fennel. *Acta. Hort.*, **502**: 77-83.
- Novais, H. M., Santos, I., Mendes, S. and Pinto-Gomes, C. 2004.Studies Onpharmaceutical Ethnobotany in Arra bida Natural Park. J. Ethnopharmacol., 93: 183– 195.
- 27. Qiu, Y. X., Hong, D. Y., Fu, C. X. and Cameron, K. M. 2004. Genetic Variation in the Endangered and Endemic Species *Changium smyrnioides* (Apiaceae). *Biochem. Syst. Ecol.*, **329(6)**: 583-596.
- Rahimmalek, M., Maghsoudi, H., Sabzalian, M. R. and Ghasemi Pirbalouti, A. 2014. Variability of Essential Oil Content and Composition of Different Iranian Fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare* Mill.) Accessions in Relation to Some Morphological and Climatic Factors. J. Agr. Sci. Tech., 16(6): 1365-1374.

- Rahimmalek, M., Sayed Tabatabaie,, B. E., Etemadi, N., Goli, S. A. H., Arzani, A. and Zeinali, H. 2009. Essential Oil Variation among and within Six *Achillea* Species Transferred from Different Ecological Regions in Iran to the Field Conditions. *Ind. Crop. Prod.*, 29: 348–355.
- Rohlf, F. J. 1998. NTSYS-PC Numerical Taxonomy and Multivariate Analysis System: Version 2.02. Exter Publications, Setauket, NY, PP. 1-31.
- Sharma, K. K., Crouch, J. H. and Hash, C. T. 2003. Application of Biotechnology for Crop Improvement: Prospects and Constraints. *Plant Sci.*, 163: 381-397.
- 32. Singh, S. K., Kakani, R. K., Meena, R. S., Pancholy, A., Pathak, R. 2012. Genetic Diversity among Indian Varieties of *Foeniculum vulgare* and *Cuminum cyminum* Based on Nuclear Ribosomal DNA and RAPD Analyses. *Int. J. Agric. Stat. Sci.*, 8(2): 493-502.
- Torabi, S., Hasani, M. H., Omidi, M., Etminan, A., Dasmalchi, T. and Gharakhanlou, H. 2012 Evaluation of Genetic Diversity in Fennel Accessions Using AFLP Markers. *Adv. Environ. Biol.*, 6(11): 2821-2828.
- 34. Uzun, A., Yesiloglu, T., Aka-Kacar, Y., Tuzcu, O. and Gulsen, O. 2009. Genetic Diversity and Relationships within Citrus and Related Genera Based on Sequence Related Amplified Polymorphism Markers (SRAPs). *Sci. Hortic.*, **121**: 306–312.
- 35. Zahid, N., Abbasi, Y. I., Hafiz, A. and Ahmad, Z. 2009. Genetic diversity of Indigenose Fennel (*foeniculum vulgare* mill) Germplasm in Pakistan an Assessed by RAPD Markers. *Pak. J. Bot.*, **41**: 1759-1767.

## بررسی تنوع ژنتیکی جمعیت های رازیانه های ایرانی با استفاده از نشانگر مولکولی SRAP

ح. مقصودي كلاردشتي، م. رحيم ملك، و م. طالبي

چکیدہ

به منظور بررسی تنوع ژنتیکی ۵۵ نمونه جمعیتی از ۱۱ جمعیت رازیانه در ایران، نشانگر SRAP مورد استفاده قرار گرفت. ۱۲ ترکیب آغازگری در مجموع ۱۷۱ نوار چند شکل تولید نمود. نوارهای چند شکل با استفاده از ضریب جاکارد و الگوریتم UPGMA آنالیز شدند. دندروگرام حاصل نمونه ها را در پنج گروه بر اساس موقعیت جغرافیایی آن ها تقسیم نمود.بر خلاف نمونه های جنوبی، نمونه های شمال غربی در نواحی خنک تر قرار داشتند و به صورت پاکوتاه، زودرس، رنگ سبز روشن و دارای عملکرد اسانس بالا بودند. در حدود ۴۳/۵۷٪ کل تنوع در بین جمعیت ها آشکار شد در حالی که (AS/۴۳ تنوع در درون جمعیت مشاهده شد. جمعیت های مورد مطالعه تمایز ژنتیکی بالا (۲۵/۰ =Gst) و جریان ژنی کم (۴۶/۰ (=Nmاز خود نشان دادند. در بین جمعیت های مورد مطالعه جمعیت های یزد کرمان بالاترین تعداد نوارچندشکل، شاخص شانون و هتروزیگوسیتی را نشان دادند. میزان بذور حاصل از خودگشنی از ۲/۰۱٪ در پاوه تا ۹۲/۹٪ در اصفهان-۲ متغیر بودند. عملکرد اسانس نیز از ۲۶/۰٪ در اصفهان-۳ تا ۲/۱۱٪ در تاره تا معنی بودند. در مجموع جمعیت های پاکوتاه ماند پاوه و تبریز، عملکرد اسانسی بالاتری داشته و گرده افشانی آن ها کمتر تحت تاثیر عوامل محیطی قرار گرفته است. معملکرد اسانس بالاترین تعداد نوارچند کره شان دادند. در بین جمعیت های مورد مطالعه تمایز ژنتیکی بالا (۲/۰