Genetic Diversity Analysis of Greater Yam (*Dioscorea alata* L.) Collections Using Tuber Morphology and Simple Sequence Repeats (SSR) Markers

Junelyn B. Ravelo*, Lara Jaaziel Batalon, and Antonio G. Lalusin

Institute of Crop Science, College of Agriculture and Food Science, University of the Philippines Los Baños, College, Laguna 4031 Philippines

*Author for correspondence; Email: jbravelo@up.edu.ph

Received: March 27, 2023/ Revised: April 8, 2024/ Accepted: April 12, 2024

The diversity of 148 greater yam (*Dioscorea alata* L.) accessions from the collections of the National Plant Genetics Resources Laboratory (NPGRL), Visayas State University (VSU), and the Institute of Crop Science - University of the Philippines Los Baños (ICROPS-UPLB) was evaluated using 54 *Dioscorea*-based SSR markers. Out of 54 SSR markers, polymorphic bands were amplified in 50 SSR markers with Polymorphic Information Content (PIC) values ranging from 0.65 to 0.89. Subsequent cluster analysis generated nine distinct clusters with a Jaccard's distance index of 0.85, implying 85% dissimilarity among the greater yam accessions. Each formed cluster from the analysis comprised a varying number of accessions: Cluster I with three, Cluster II with 24, Cluster III with 15, Cluster IV with 31, Cluster V with two, Cluster VI with four, Cluster VII with 11, Cluster VIII with 27, and Cluster IX with 31 accessions. Based on the multiscale bootstrap with 5000 times resampling, the approximately unbiased (AU) *p*-value > 0.95 was generated at Clusters II, IV, VIII, and IX with a 0.05 level of confidence. Consequently, high dissimilarity rates obtained from the molecular analysis of 148 greater yam accessions revealed high genetic diversity. Thus, eight greater yam accessions comprising PHL 33537, LA 068B, PHL 33550, PHL 31889, LA 110, LA147, TABACO, and LA 597 were potential parents for future breeding programs. Moreover, the information obtained could be essential in various greater yam improvement programs and genetic resource conservation measures.

Keywords: Dioscorea alata L., greater yam, genetic diversity, SSR, PIC

INTRODUCTION

Dioscorea alata L., commonly referred to as greater yam, is among the species belonging to the section Enantiophyllum of the genus Dioscorea L. (Dioscoreaceae) and is widely disseminated in the humid and semi-humid tropics (Obidiegwu et al. 2009). Greater yam originated from Southeast Asia; however, the exact origin is still debatable (Obidiegwu et al. 2009). In early times, the distribution of this species was evident in Southeast Asia, Indonesia, and the Pacific and Indian Oceans; then, during the 16th century, Portuguese and Spanish traders disseminated this species to Africa and tropical Africa (Coursey 1967). According to Egesi et al. (2002), it has a basic chromosome number of x = 10, while various polyploidy clones with 2n = 4x, 6x, and 8x were reported. Various disadvantages in the vegetatively propagated clones of *D. alata* L. were reported to lessen the capacity of various genotypes to be economically important crops. An example is the inability of the species to become sterile due to infrequent seed setting. Thus, the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA, Nigeria) and the Central Tuber Crop Research Institute (CTCRI, India)

revealed that natural and artificial pollination and fertile seed production can be attained through optimized culture and management practices (Egesi et al. 2001). Nevertheless, the greater yam (*Dioscorea alata* L.) is still the oldest cultivated yam species having the largest distribution around the world. It is an essential staple food crop for millions of individuals, specifically in humid and sub-humid areas (Jyothy et al. 2017). In the Philippines, greater yam, commonly known as *ube* or *ubi*, is often used in preparing sweetened food delicacies due to its appealing purple color and distinct flavor (Lubag et al. 2008).

The production rates of greater yams continue to decline in various small-scale holders as pests and diseases are manifested during and after cultivation. This includes yam anthracnose, yam mosaic virus disease, weeds, and infestations brought by insects such as beetles and root-knot nematodes (Baquiran 2012). However, some greater yam varieties exhibit natural resistance to certain diseases that provide promising opportunities for disease management and sustainable cultivation practices. In the Philippines, two prominent native varieties of greater yams-kinampay and kabusah-possess natural resistance to diseases like leaf spot (Martin and Delpin 1978). However, the production of greater yams in the Philippines is extremely constrained due to improper seed systems, production methods, and postproduction procedures (Salda et al. 2005). Thus, proper pest and cultural management practices should be implemented to provide optimum yield. Continuous improvement of greater yam varieties is essential to enhance their resistance to pest and diseases and increase their productivity. By employing advanced breeding technologies and techniques, the genetic traits of the greater yams are improved to withstand various diseases more effectively. It ensures that cultivation of greater yam remains resilient and sustainable.

Crop improvement provides desirable characteristics that are usually based on the preference of the farmers, consumers, and breeders. This requires studies that provide information concerning the genetic relationship and genetic diversity of crops to continue the manipulation of the existing germplasm. However, just like any other crop, the genetic diversity of greater yam continues to decline; thus, the occurrence of genetic erosion in greater yam implies that there is a need to conserve and preserve the available germplasm.

The assessment of genetic relationships and genetic diversity is essential to further analyze the variations among the existing germplasms. For instance, genetic diversity studies assess the differences among individuals, groups of individuals, or populations through specific or combined methods of analysis (Mohammadi and Prasanna 2003). It can be evaluated within and between plants, and populations using morphological characterization, biochemical characterization, and molecular marker analysis (Govindaraj et al. 2015).

The advances in analyzing the genetic diversity among and within the plant population pave the way for the development of marker systems that can detect the diversity on the DNA level. Among various plant populations, molecular markers or nucleotide sequences can be studied in the presence of polymorphism between the sequences (Nadeem et al. 2018). Also, changes due to deletion, duplication inversion, and/or insertion in the chromosomes can be determined using molecular markers (Govindaraj et al. 2015). According to Nadeem et al. (2018), ideal DNA markers should possess characteristics such as co-dominance, even distribution throughout the genome, high reproducibility, and detection of a higher level of polymorphism. They are categorized based on the mode of gene action that can either be co-dominant or dominant, the method of detection that includes hybridization-based molecular markers and polymerase chain reaction (PCR)- based markers, and modes of transmission such as paternal organelle inheritance, maternal organelle inheritance, bi-parental nuclear inheritance, and maternal nuclear inheritance (Nadeem et al. 2018).

The improvement of the molecular marker system leads to a more efficient and effective tool for determining genetic relatedness and variations among individuals. Simple sequence repeats (SSRs), also referred to as microsatellites, are tandem repeats ranging from 2 - 8 nucleotide units of DNA entirely present in the previously investigated genomes (Singh et al. 2016). The association of SSR markers with non-repetitive DNA is advantageous as its derived SSR markers from genomic libraries can contain either transcribed region (genic SSRs) or a non-transcribed region (genomic SSRs) (Park et al. 2009). However, SSR-based methods require a relatively high cost to develop, and technical expertise is needed especially in the production of species-specific primers and enriched libraries (Miah et al. 2013). Nevertheless, SSR markers are still widely used in various genetic diversity studies including soybean (Wang et al. 2006), maize (Pandit et al. 2016), rice (Cao et al. 2006), sweet potato (Yang et al. 2015), abaca (Boguero et al. 2016), yam (Arnau et al. 2017), and other plant species. Thus, the incorporation of SSR markers in plant breeding continues to materialize along with the improvement of various techniques. Successful genetic diversity analyses in greater yam using SSR markers have been reported including studies by Otoo et al. (2015), Arnau et al. (2017), and Olu-Olusegun et al. (2018). Aside from this, the application of species-based SSR markers extends to diverse yam species, achieving crossamplification.

Thus, this study's objectives were to assess the genetic diversity of the existing greater yam collections available at the University of the Philippines Los Baños (UPLB) using molecular marker analysis. This particularly aimed to: 1) determine the genetic diversity and relatedness of all greater yam collections using simple sequence repeats (SSR) markers and tuber morphology, and 2) identify promising accessions of greater yam that can be used as parents for breeding or commercial production.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Plant Materials

The 148 greater yam (*D. alata* L.) accessions were screened to analyze their molecular diversity. These included 16 greater yam accessions from ICROPS-UPLB, 71 greater yam accessions from NPGRL, and 61 greater yam accessions from VSU. Currently, these greater yam accessions are planted and maintained at the greater yam plantation and tissue culture laboratory of the National Plant Genetic Resources Laboratory (NPGRL), Institute of Plant Breeding (IPB), University of the Philippines Los Baños.

The tuber morphological characterization was based on the available yam descriptor list formulated by the International Plant Genetic Resources (IPGRI/IITA 1997), with modifications. Based on the modified descriptor list, 22 tuber morphological characters were selected, with 21 qualitative traits and one quantitative trait. The quantitative descriptor was based on the phenotypic average of three measurements for each accession. These selected variables were used in characterizing the available greater yam tubers.

The qualitative traits included the number of tubers per hill (TPH), the relationship of tubers (RT), the presence and absence of corms (PAC), corm size (CS), tuber shape (TS), the tendency of the tuber to branch (TTB), places where the tuber branches (PTB), tuber length (TL), roots on the tuber surface (RTS), place of the roots on the tuber (PRT), cracks on tuber surface (CTS), tuber skin thickness (TST), tuber skin color (TSC), hardness of tuber (HT), skin color at the head of the tuber (SCH), fresh color at the central transverse cross-section (FCC), flesh color at the lower part of the tuber (FCL), uniformity of flesh color in cross-section (UFC), the texture of flesh (TF), flesh oxidation color (FOC), and time for flesh oxidation after cutting (TFO). On the other hand, the quantitative trait was the tuber width (TW). Each trait was characterized after harvesting the available tubers of the greater yam collections.

DNA Extraction

Leaf samples of 148 greater yam accessions maintained in the field were used in this study. The second youngest leaves in the vegetative stage or at least 20 - 30 d after emergence were collected and used as plant material. Genomic DNA was isolated using a modified Doyle and Doyle (1990) CTAB/NaCl protocol. One gram of leaf sample was frozen and pulverized using liquid nitrogen, followed by homogenization using CTAB extraction buffer, and purification of the DNA using chloroform:isoamyl alcohol. The DNA was then precipitated using isopropanol and resuspended. The obtained genomic DNA was further purified using TE buffer and RNase A. The genomic DNA extraction procedure was conducted at the Molecular Plant Breeding Laboratory, Institute of Crop Science, College of Agriculture and Food Sciences, University of the Philippines Los Baños. The concentration (ng/µL) of 2 µL isolated DNA was measured using a microplate spectrophotometer (BioTek Instruments, U.S.A). DNA samples with absorbance values (260/280) ranging from 1.8 to 2.0 were considered high-quality DNA while those with absorbance values less than 1.8 and greater than 2.0 contained impurities. Two μ L of the isolated DNA was subjected to 1% agarose gel electrophoresis to assess the quality. Lastly, the DNA bands were visualized using a gel photo-documentation system from Clinx Science Instruments Co., Ltd, China, under UV light.

Fifty-four *Dioscorea*-based SSR primer pairs that are widely distributed throughout the yam genome were used to analyze the greater yam accessions. The information and profile of the SSR primer pairs were presented in various diversity analysis studies. The final volume of the PCR mixture used for amplification was 10 μ L containing 100ng/ μ L DNA, 1X PCR buffer, 2.5 mM MgCl2, 0.30 mM dNTPs, 0.30 μ M each of forward and reverse markers, and 0.5 U/ μ L Taq DNA polymerase.

The PCR profile of the Dioscorea-based primers contained initial denaturation of 94°C for 4 min, followed by 35 cycles of denaturation at 94°C for 30 s, defined annealing temperature for each primer pair for 1 min, extension at 72°C for 1 min, and a final extension at 72°C for 8 min. The optimization of PCR protocol was done using thermal cycler (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Inc., Singapore) to ensure that the SSR markers would provide consistent results.

Genotyping

The products from the polymerase chain reaction were electrophoresed using 2.0% agarose gel at 100 V for 35 – 45 min. The gel was stained with GelRed[™] Staining Dye and visualized under UV light using a gel photo-documentation system (Clinx Science Instruments Co., Ltd, China). Further analysis was done using the PCR products that displayed polymorphism. Polymorphic PCR products were subjected to Polyacrylamide Gel Electrophoresis (PAGE) using the ClearPAGE [™] (C.B.S. Scientific Co., Del Mar, CA) system. The PCR products were placed in the 6% polyacrylamide gel soaked in 1x TBE buffer and electrophoresed for 2.5 h at 100 V. The gels were stained with GelRed [™] Staining Dye; then, viewed under UV light with the aid of the gel photo-documentation system (Clinx Science Instruments Co., Ltd, China).

Data Analysis

The scoring of the genotypic data was based on the binary matrix where the presence (1) or absence (0) of alleles was determined after several PCR amplification procedures. Amplified bands of varying sizes were considered in each microsatellite marker using the binary matrix. The best runs that generated verified results were subjected to molecular marker scoring.

The discriminative power of SSR markers was analyzed through the values obtained in calculating the polymorphic information content (PIC). According to Ni et al. (2002), PIC is one of the key characteristics of molecular markers in assessing the capacity of the markers to differentiate within a population. Moreover, it measures the informativeness of the molecular markers based on the amplified alleles and their frequency. The calculation of the PIC value followed the formula:

$$PIC=1-\sum_{i=1}^{n} Pi^2$$

where *Pi* is the frequency of the ith allele over the total allele at an SSR locus; and n is the total number of alleles in that locus.

Based on the study by Botstein et al. (1980), the formulation of the PIC shows four different levels. Loci that obtained PIC >

Table 1. Total number of alleles amplified in 148 greater yam (*Dioscorea alata* L.) accessions using 50 polymorphic SSR markers.

0.50 are considered highly informative. PIC between 0.5 to 0.25 are reasonably informative, PIC < 0.25 are slightly informative, while loci with PIC near 1 are most desirable. Thus, based on their PIC value, the molecular markers' usefulness can be evaluated.

To compare the accessions and their genetic relationship, cluster analysis was done. The dissimilarity index matrix was estimated using Jaccard's distance and then clustered through the Unweighted Pair Group Method with Arithmetic Mean (UPGMA) of R statistical analysis PC version R.4.2.2 software (R Core Team 2023).

Cont...Table 1. Total number of alleles amplified in 148 greater yam (*Dioscorea alata* L.) accessions using 50 polymorphic SSR markers.

SSR Markers	Rare Alleles	Common Alleles	Most Frequent Alleles	Number of	SSR Markers	Rare Alleles	Common Alleles	Most Frequent Alleles	Number of	
	(0.01 - 0.05) (0.05 - 0.10)		(> 0.10)	Alleles		(0.01 – 0.05)	(0.05 – 0.10)	(> 0.10)	Alleles	
YM88	2	4	4	10	Da3G04	1	5	4	10	
YM23	5	1	3	9	D12	3	3	4	10	
YM90	4	2	4	10	D7	1	5	4	10	
CIR60	4	1	5	10	D9	1	3	4	8	
CIP61	1	5	1	10	C5	4	1	3	8	
CIROI	1	5	4	10	D3	0	7	3	10	
YM86	1	1	3	5	D11	2	2	5	9	
YM83	6	1	3	10	D4	3	1	4	8	
YM75	3	3	3	9	YM33	0	6	4	10	
YM66	2	3	4	9	YM52	2	5	3	10	
YM58	3	1	4	8	YM09	2	1	6	9	
YM46	4	2	4	10	D5	3	4	3	10	
YM45	3	3	4	10	D1	3	2	4	9	
YM37	1	5	3	9	D2	1	4	5	10	
VM20A	י ס	0	5	10	D6	3	5	2	10	
TIVISUA	3	2	5	10	A7	2	4	3	9	
YM27	2	1	3	6	CIR17	3	2	5	10	
YM21	1	3	6	10	CIR20	0	6	4	10	
YM18	3	4	3	10	F1	3	4	3	10	
YM19	3	3	4	10	YM13A	3	3	4	10	
V/M07	0	0	<u>,</u>	10	YM17	3	2	5	10	
Y IVIU7	Z	Z	0	10	YM65	2	1	3	6	
YM02	6	0	4	10	E11	5	1	4	10	
YM62	3	0	4	7	YM10	0	5	5	10	
YM55	2	3	5	10	YM12	1	5	4	10	
YM15	1	2	5	8	CIR8	2	4	4	10	
		2	-	0	Total	119	147	200	466	
H2	1	4	5	10	Percentage	25.54	31.54	42.92	100%	

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

PCR Amplification

Fifty-four SSR markers were used to screen the diversity of 148 D. alata L. collections. The SSR markers used were all Dioscoreabased markers obtained from various publications. Of the screened SSR markers, 19 were from D. alata L., 2 were from *D. abyssinica*, 2 were from *D. praehensilis*, and 31 were from *D.* cayenensis (Table 2). All SSR markers amplified bands on the screened greater yam collections with annealing temperatures ranging from 50°C to 62°C. However, among the screened SSR markers, only 50 SSR markers exhibited polymorphism, while the remaining four SSR markers produced monomorphic bands. Despite the absence of polymorphism in the four SSR markers, the number of polymorphic SSR markers is relatively high compared to the study of Arnau et al. (2017) where 24 microsatellite markers determined the genetic diversity of 384 accessions of *D. alata* from different geographical regions including South Pacific, Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean. Also, considering the capacity of the selected SSR markers, the observed amplification proved that the screened SSR markers from the Dioscorea species exhibited transferability among the 148 D. alata L. accessions. This was supported by the study of Tostain et al. (2006) which concludes that there is consistent transferability among the SSR markers from various Dioscorea species in agreement with their botanical classification. Thus, the rate of cross-species amplification increases for species that are found in the same botanical family of the developed SSR markers.

Allelic Frequency

The 50 polymorphic markers amplified reproducible fragments with a total of 466 alleles and an average of 9.32 alleles per locus (Table 1). Among the analyzed markers, YM86 detected the lowest number of alleles observed with five alleles in total, followed by YM65 (6 alleles), YM27 (6 alleles), YM62 (7 alleles), C5 (8 alleles), YM58 (8 alleles), Da1F08 (8 alleles), YM15 (8 alleles), and D9 (8 alleles). The size of amplified alleles of the analyzed markers ranged from 100 to 470 bp. The lowest amplified allele size was observed in locus Dpr3F12, while the highest amplified size was observed in the alleles of YM15. Based on the classification of allele frequency adapted by Korsa et al. (2022), 25.54% of the detected alleles exhibited rare alleles with frequencies between 0.01 and 0.05, common alleles with frequencies ranging from 0.05 to 0.1 accounted for 31.54% of the detected alleles (147 alleles), while the remaining percentage (42.92%) was observed to have the most frequent alleles with frequencies ranging from 0.11 to 0.50.

Polymorphic Information Content

The calculated PIC values of the SSR markers obtained in this study ranged from 0.65 to 0.89 with an average PIC value of

0.83 (Table 2). Loci YM86 obtained the lowest PIC value while YM10 and YM21 recorded the highest PIC values with 0.8944 and 0.8940, respectively. On average, the obtained PIC values of the SSR markers used in this study indicate a high level of information. The result corroborates with the PIC values reported by Korsa et al. (2022) and Otoo et al. (2015). However, the observed PIC values in the study are higher than the result of Girma et al. (2015). Different results were also observed in the D. alata L. reported by Siqueira et al. (2011) with an average PIC value of 0.65, Olu-Olusegun et al. (2018) with a mean PIC value of 0.63, and an average PIC value of 0.66 from the study of Siqueira et al. (2012). In comparison, the mean PIC value observed in this study is relatively higher than in the previous studies. The findings thus demonstrate that the SSR markers used in this study were highly informative and had discriminatory power to identify genetic variation among the examined greater yam accessions. Also, the observed information reveals that the markers were useful in the phylogenetic relationship and genetic diversity studies.

Cluster Analysis

The clustering analysis formed nine distinct clusters (Cluster I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VII, IX) at a Jaccard's distance of 0.85 indicating that 85% of the generated clusters were observed to exhibit dissimilarities (Fig. 1). This observation signifies a notable dissimilarity between the accessions within 1 cluster and those belonging to the other cluster. Consequently, members within the same cluster exhibited a higher degree of relatedness compared to those from different clusters, emphasizing the distinct genetic relationships present among the various accession groups.

Cluster I grouped 3 greater yam accessions-1 from the VSU (LA 075) and 2 from the NPGRL collections (PHL 31887 and PHL 33537). It was observed that Cluster I was divided into two sub-clusters at a 0.82 dissimilarity index. The accessions PHL 31887 and PHL 33537 were grouped together due to the similarities they exhibited in some important tuber morphological characteristics such as irregular tuber shape, unbranched tuber, and < 1-mm tuber skin thickness. Cluster II grouped 24 greater yam accessions (15 from VSU and 9 from NPGRL collections). It was observed that five greater yam accessions (PHL 9599, PHL 5012, LA 108B, PHL 33488, and PHL 4640) formed distinct clusters and were considered dissimilar to the other remaining 14 greater yam accessions. These accessions exhibited unbranched tuber, absence of corm and tuber cracks, < 1-mm tuber skin thickness, completely separate and distant tubers, hard tuber, uniform flesh color, and yellow flesh oxidation color. On the contrary, the lowest rate of dissimilarity was observed in two VSU yam collections-LA 068B and LA 067. Among the 15 greater yam accessions in Cluster III, 12 accessions were from the NPGRL,

Annealing

Nemorin 0.880 et al. 2013

Refer-

ences

Table 2. The description of 50 polymorphic Dioscorea-based SSR markers and their polymorphic information content (PIC) amplified across the 148 greater yam (Dioscorea alata L.) accessions.

Cont...Table 2. The description of 50 polymorphic Dioscorea-based SSR markers and their polymorphic information content (PIC) amplified across the 148 greater yam (Dioscorea alata L.) accessions.

$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	SSR primer	Origin	Expected Size (BP)	Primer sequences (5' - 3')	Annealing Temperature (°C)	PIC	Refer- ences	SSR primer	Origin	Expected size (BP)	Primer sequences (5' - 3')	Annealing temperature (°C)	PIC	Refer ences
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Dpr3F04 (D11)	Dpr	115–127	F: AGACTCTTGCTCATGT	51	0.855	Tostain et al.	YM37	Dca	216	F: CCTTACCACCGGACTCCTC	59/60	0.786	
Display [1] [1] Image: state s	Dpr3F12 (D12)	Dor		F: TCCCCATAGAAACAAAGT		0.860	2006		Dca				0.863	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		op.	162–171		51			YM45		235		57		
BALECOS (PS) *** <	Dab2C05 (D5) Da Dab2C12 (D6) Da	Dab		F: CCCATGCTTGTAGTTGT		0.872 0.819							0.850	
Back Display Des TP PACCONCRUSTIONAL RECOMMEDIATIONAL STATUS RECOMMEDIATIONAL STATUS RECOMMEDIATIONA		545	168–198	R: TGCTCACCTCTTTACTTG	51			YM46	Dca	250	F: ACTIGACATCCAGAAGGTGC	57/59		
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Dab		F: AGGCATCTTGGGAAA							R: GCTGTAACTTATCAAGGGTAGC			
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			179	R: CGAACGATCCAATAAAA	51			YM52	Dca	384	F: TGCATAGAGTGAGAGCTTAAGAG	56/57		
Baddel (D) 33 R. GATTICOTTIGATION Stand R. Construction Tutto R. Construction F. TUTCOGRAMMEDCATTICA R. Construction Stand R. Construction Data R. Construction F. TUTCOGRAMMEDCATTICA R. Construction Stand R. Construction F. TUTCOGRAMMEDCATTICA R. Construction Stand R. Construction F. Construction Stand R. Construction<		Dab		F: ACAAGAGAACCGACATAGT		0.007		TWOZ		004	R: ATGGGTAGTTGAGCAAGAGAAT	50/57	0.074	
A7 Ds SF F COCCACCITATION SI Out State SI SI CALCITECACTORACIDATION SI Out State SI CALCITECACTORACIDATION SI CALCITECACTORACIDINACIDE SI <td>Dab2D08 (D7)</td> <td></td> <td>335</td> <td>R: GATTTGCTTTGAGTCCTT</td> <td>51</td> <td>0.867</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Dca</td> <td>290</td> <td>F: TCTTCCGAGATATACACATCCA</td> <td>F7</td> <td>0.077</td> <td></td>	Dab2D08 (D7)		335	R: GATTTGCTTTGAGTCCTT	51	0.867			Dca	290	F: TCTTCCGAGATATACACATCCA	F7	0.077	
AV AS R COLATIONATIONATION FOR RECONTRACTORNEG Solution Recontractornet Recontractor	A7	Da	267	F: GCCCCACCTTAATTTCAT	53		Siqueira	YMSS	Dca	300	R: ACAGTGACAATGAGAAGGAACA	57	0.877	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				R: GGAATGAGATGGGACGAGAA		0.844	et al. 2012				F: TCTGGGGCACTGTCCTTTC			
GS Index R. BCCTTRCAMPCANTTERA GS CAS YME2 Dra 155 F. GASCITCCCTURADACTICAC Separation Data 163 F. CASCITCCACCTURADACTICAC Separation Data 173 F. GASCITCCCTURADACTICAC Separation	C5	Da	145–180	F: AACCAATTACCCTTTGTCATGG	58	0.752	Siqueira et al. 2011	YM58	Dee	199	R: CCACATGGACTGGAATAGCTC	59/60	0.780	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				R: GCCTTGCAAGCAATTTTGA										Tamiru
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	E11	Da	040.000	F: ATGGTGTTCTCCCATGCTTC	55 0.	0 020		YM62	DCa	195		59/60	0.737	et al.
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	EII		240-200	R: ACCAAAAATCAGGCTTGTGC		0.039								2015
P1 133-B0 R GGOCCITATINACTIGAT 58 0.822 THE DE R CONCIDENTIFICACION DE DE DE DE PARACCAMACAGOAMACAT DE DE PARACCAMACAGOAMACAT S0 0.822 PARACCAMACATCACACACACATA S0 DE PARACCAMACATCACACACACATA S0 DE PARACCAMACATCACACACACATA S0 DE PARACCAMACATCACACACACATA S0 DE PARACCACACACATA S0 DE PARACCACACACATA S0 DE PARACCACACACATA S0 DE PARACCACACATA S0 DE PARACCACACATA S0 DE PARACCACACATA S0 DE PARACCACACATA S0 DE PARACCACATA S0 DE PARACCACATA S0 DE PARACCACATA PARACCACACATA S0 DE PARACCACATA S0 DE PARACCACATA S0 DE PARACCACATA PARACCACATA S0 DE PARACCACATA PARACCACATA PARACCACATA PARACCACATA PARACCACATA PARACCACATA PARACCACATA PARACCATA PARACATA PARACATA	-	Da		F: ATGGCTCAAGAGCACACG	50	0.822 0.883		YM65	Dca	183	F: ACAAAIGCACGCICIGAAGG	60	0.672	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	F1		130–180	R: GGGCCTCATAAACATGCAAT	58						R: GGGCAGTAGAATTTGGTGCG			
H2 IND-260 R: EACAGETETEXAGETTEXAGETERA 58 DBS F: CERCENTICICACITATION CONTINUED AND ACCOUNT ACCOU		Da		F: AAACCAAACAGGCAAAGCAT				YM66	Dca	246	F: ATATTGACTGACCACCAGATCA	55/57	0.842	
D9 De He-320 F: CCACTAGCGEGGGAGAGC R: TOAAGAAGAGCGCAAGG R: TOAAGAAGAGCGCAAGG R: TOAAGAAGAGCGCAAGG R: TOAAGAAGAGCGCAAGGC R: TOAAGAAGAGCGCAAGGC R: TOCGAATTCCCCATT R: CCCACTCCCTTTTTC R: GCCCTATTCCCCCATTTTCCCAA S: 0.853 Dea 2015 Dea 2015 Dea 2015 S: 0.816 R: TCGCTAACCCCCATCCCATTCC R: CCCCCACCAAGCGCCAAGCC R: AGCACCCCTCCACCAACAC R: CCCCACCACCTTGCCCAACGC R: AGCACCCCTCCACCAACGC R: CCCCTGCCTTTGCCCACCA R: CCCTATCCCCCACCACCAC R: CCCTGCCCTTGGGTCC R: CCCTATCCCCCCTCCCCTGGC R: CCCTGCCCTTGGGTCC R: CCCTATCCCCCCCCCCCCTGGC R: CCCTGCCCCTCCCCCTGGC R: CCCTGCCCCTCCCCCTGGC R: CCCTGCCCCCCCCCCCCCTGCGC R: CCCTGCCCCCCCCCCCCTGCGC R: CCCTGCCCCCCCCCCCCTGCCTG R: CCCTGCCCCCCCCCCCCCTGCC R: CCCTGCCCCCCCCCCCCCTGCC R: CCCTGCCCCCCCCCCCCTGCCTG R: CCCTGCCCCCCCCCCCCCTGCCTG R: CCCTGCCCCCCCCCCCCCTGCCTG R: CCCTGCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCTGCC R: CCCTGCCCCCCCCCCCCCTGCC R: CCCTGCCCCCCCCCCCCCCTGCC R: CCCTGCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCTGCCTGC R: CCCTGCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCTGCC R: CCCCGCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCTGCC R: CCCCGCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC	H2		160–250	R: TGCCCTGCTTGTAAGATTGA	58						R: GAAGAGTCTTGGATTTCTACCA			
UB Indu-320 R: TGAMAGAMAGAGGCAMAGG 55 UBB and	D9 Da YM13 A	Da	400.000	F: CTCACTAGCGTGGGGAAGAC			Otoo et al., 2015	YM75	Dca Dca	350 239	F: TCGCTCAACCTAATCCTCTATT	57	0.816	
μ_{H3A} μ_{Ba} $220-275$ $reccontraction control (recontrol (recontrol (recontrol (recont))) reccontrol (recont)) reccont) reccontrol (recont)) reccont) reccontrol (recont)) reccont) recccont) reccont) reccont)$			160-320	R: TGAAAGAAAGAAGCGCAAGG	55	0.809					R: TCAAACCAGCCAAAACATC			
Initian Zool-2/3 R. ETCECTCENTTUCCUCTORITIC Sol (SAT) R. AGEACACCATCAACAAAGG YM30 A Da 200-39 R. GOEGATTLACCCARAAA 55 0.853 YM86 Dra 176 F. GOEGAACCTATAGEGCACTG 5961 0.652 YM02 Dra 283 F. IAGATTTCGCTCATCC 58.57 0.749 at at. YM88 Dra 275 F. CITATACCCATAGACGATTCGGC 59.877 0.749 at at. YM88 Dra 275 F. CITATACCATAGACGATTCGGC 59.877 0.873 YM07 Dra 293 F. AGAATTCACCAAAAGCATCCCC 59 0.887 YM88 Dra 176 F. GOEGAAGCATCCACAACAGGAGATTAGEG 0.859 4.81 YM89 Dra 176 F. GOEGAAGCATCACACACACGACGAGGAGAGAGAGAGAGAGAGA		Da	000 075	F: TTCCCTAATTGTTCCTCTTGTTG	55	0.047		YM83			F: TCGGAATTCAACTGTGATGGC	59/60	0.773	
VM30 A Da 200-390 R F: GGTCCTTCTATCCAACAA R 55 0.853 VM86 Da 176 R F: GGCCAACCTATCCATCGCC R 596 ID 0.662 VM02 Dea 233 R F: AGCATTGCATCATCGTCGTCATC R 5867 0.749 et al. 2015 2015 Dea 276 R F: GGTCATTGCATCACCATAGGGCACTTG R 57 0.873 VM07 Dea 233 R F: AGCATTGCATCATCGTCGTCATC R 59 0.882 YM88 Dea 228-38 R F: GGTGTGCTTGCAT R SAATAGCCAGAGGTGAATT 57 0.873 VM09 Dea 193 R R: AGCATTGCACCACAGCAGTGGTAT 59 0.867 MDaCIR17 Da 228-38 R F: GGTCGTCATTGCAT 0.899 et al. R AGCACTGCACCAGAGGTGAAT 77 0.894 YM10 Dea 18 F: TGACATTGCGCATGGTGGTGG R 5960 0.881 MDaCIR60 Da F: GGTCGTCATTGCAT 0.889 et al. R 2013 YM17 Dea 215 F: TGACGATTGAGGTCTGTGGG 5960 0.856 MDaCIR60 R: GGGATGCAGGAGCAGGGGGGGGGG 0.814 2013 YM17			200-275	R: GTCCTCGTTTTCCCTCTGTGT	55	0.047					R: AGCACACCATTCACACATAGG			
INDUX LODES R. CACGTATTAGCTCATCTACCA 33 Cass FR CTOTACCATTAGGCACTTG YM02 Dea 283 F. TAANTTCCCCATCAC 5857 0.749 et al. 2015 YM88 Dea 257 F. CITAICCATTAGAGCATTGGC 57 0.873 YM07 Dea 203 F. ACGAACTCCCACTCACTATACC 5857 0.749 et al. 2015 YM88 Dea 257 F. CITAICCATTAGAGCATTGGC 57 0.873 YM09 Dea F. ACGAACTCCCCACTCATTATG 59 0.882 YM89 Dea F. CATTAGGTCACTCACATTATAT 57 0.838 YM09 Dea F. ACGAACTCCCCCATTATATG 59 0.867 MDacIRT Da Z28-268 F. CATAGGTGGACTTCCATTA 57 0.838 MDacIRR Da F. CATAGGTGGACACTC 0.889 2017 YM10 Dea 215 F. TAGCATTCTTATATGC 57 0.830 MDacIRR Da F. CAGGAGCAACATC 0.889 YM17 Dea 215 F. TAGCATTCAGGCAACTC 5860 0.856 MDacIRR Da AGGCATCGGGGAAAGGAGG	YM30 A	Da	200–390	F: GGTCCTCTTCTATCCCAACAA	55	0.853	i	YM86	Dca	176	F: GCGCAAAGCTGTATCTGGC	59/61	0.652	
VM02 Dea 285 F: TAGATITECACTAGE Taminu YM82 Dea 275 F: TAGATITECACTAGE 58167 0.7.49 el.l				R: CACGTATTAACTCCATCTATCCAA							R: CTGTCCCATTAGGGCACTTG			
HM2 265 R: COTANTCATCATCATCATCCATCGTCATC 309 0.148 2015 F: GTGAATAACC F: GTGAATAACC YM07 Dca 203 F: AGCATTGGGTCG TTTCATCCC 59 0.882 YM89 Da 50 0.836 YM09 Dca 7 ACAATTCACCAAAGCATGGC 59 0.887 MDaCIR17 Da 288-236 F: GTGTGTGGATGGAACTGACCAACTACCCAACTAACTAC 0.859 2017 YM09 Dca 348 F: ACCAAATTCCCCCATTAACAAAGCT 57 0.894 MDaCIR17 Da 288-236 F: GATTGGGTCGCACTCAACCAACGC 0.859 2017 YM10 Dca 348 F: ACCCAAATTCTCCCCATTAATTCCCCCATTAACTACTATTAT	YM02 YM07	Dca	263 203	F: TAGATTTCGCTTTTCCACTAGC	58/57 59	0.749 0.882	Tamiru et al. 2015	YM88	Dca Dca	257 304	F: CTTTATCCATTAGAGCTTTGGG	57	0.873	
VM07Dea203F: AGCATTGGGTCC TTTCATCCC590.882VM90DeaF: GIGTGTGAAGAGAGAGATTCCAAAAGCATTGAAT570.835VM09Pa193F: AGGAACTTCCACCAAAGCGGGG590.867MDaCIR17Da228-25F: GATTAGGCTGAACTGCACTAACGC22177VM10Da348F: AGGAACTCTCCCATTATAC R: TGACACTCATCTTATATTGCTC570.894MDaCIR20DaF: ACCACGAAATACTC0.889VM12Dea215F: TGACGATCATCTTATATGCTC570.894MDaCIR20DaF: ACACGCGACAAATACTC0.889VM12Dea215F: TGACGATCATCTTGTTTGCCG R: CTTCAGGGCGTCCATGG58600.881MDaCIR80DaF: ACAGGACAAAATACTC0.889VM12Dea215F: CCATGTCCCCCTTATCTACAC R: CTTCCAGGCGTCCATGG570.894MDaCIR80DaF: CAAGGACCAGGAGAGGG0.881VM17Dea485F: CCATGTCGCCCTGAACGCT R: AGCACCCAAAATACTGCCC570.836MDaCIR60DaF: CTAACCCCCCCAAAGGCTG0.814VM18Dea226F: GACATTGGGGATCTTGCTC59600.856MDaCIR60DaF: CTAACCCCCCCAAAGCTG0.877VM18Dea226F: GACATTGGGGACTTGGGC59600.856MDaCIR60DaF: CTAACCCCGCCAAGGC510.814VM18Dea226F: ACGGAAGGAGGAGGGF: ACGGAAGGAGGAGAF: CTAACCCCCCCCCAAAGCTT510.824VM19Dea226F: ACGAAGCAGCAAAGGGAAGGGGF: ACGGACTTAGGCTCGGGC59600.856MDaCIR60 </td <td>R: CCTAATCATCATCATCGTCATC</td> <td></td> <td>R: GTGAAATAACCTAGCAAATCCC</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				R: CCTAATCATCATCATCGTCATC							R: GTGAAATAACCTAGCAAATCCC			
INDUC R. ACANTICACACAAAGCATIGC ISS OUD2 R. Cancel Control Contrecontrol Control Contrecontrol Control Control Contr		Dca		F: AGCATTGGGTCC TTTCATCCC				YM90				57	0.836	
$ \begin{array}{c} \mbox{MM9} & \mbox{MD2} & \mbox{MD2} & \mbox{F: AGGAAGCATTOCCACTCAGTTATG} & \mbox{MD2} & \mbox{F: AGTAGGATGACTCACTCACTAGC} & \mbox{MD2} & \mbox{F: AGTAGGATGACATCACCCATCATAGC} & \mbox{MD2} & F: AGTAGGATGACTCACCACCACCACCACCACCACCACCACCACCACCACC$				R: ACAATTCACACAAAGCATGGC										
INNOINNOR: ATTGGGCAAGTGTGGTGTG90.807R: ACCACTGCACTCAACAGC2017YM10Dea348F: ACCCAAAATATTCTCCCCATTATAC R: TTGACACTCATCTTATATTGCTC570.894MDaCIR20Da $172-206$ F: CACGCATGCATCTA0.889YM12Dea215F: TGAGCATTCTTGTTTTGCGG R: GTTTGAGGCGTGCATGG58600.881MDaCIR80DaF: CAGGCAGCAAAATACTG0.889YM12Dea485F: CCATCTCCCCCTTATCTACAC R: GGGATTGAGGTCC AGAGACTA570.8300.881MDaCIR60DaF: CAAGCAGCAGGAGAAGGG0.814YM17Dea485F: CCATCTCCAATTAAAGCATAGCCTC R: AGCCACCCAAACATCTTGCTC59600.856MDaCIR60DaF: CTAACCCCTCCCAAAGCTG R: GGGATTCACGAGAGCAGGG0.814YM18Dea219F: ACGCAGCAGCAGCAGGAGGG R: GTGTCATACGAGCACCGAGAGGGG59600.852(D2)160-162F: ATAATCGGCCACAACAT R: ATGGCGCACAACATCT0.824YM19Dea219F: ACGGAAGCAGCAGAGAGGAG R: GTGTCATACGCAGCAGCAGGAGGA570.894(D3)20-36F: GACTTGGGACTACAGCAT R: ATGGCTACGCAACACTAA0.888YM21Dea200F: ATGAGCATCGAGGAGGAG R: GTGCTATTCGAGGATAGGGT570.894(D3)20-36F: GACGCATGGGACAGAG510.814YM19Dea219F: ACGGAGCAGCAGAGGGGG59600.852(D2)160-162F: GACGTAGGCAACAACACAACA510.888YM21DeaGGGTATTGTAGGCAACGCAGGGAGGGF: GAGGGTATGGGAGGGAGGGAGGGAGG60.894(D3)20-36 <t< td=""><td rowspan="4">YM09 YM10</td><td rowspan="4">Dca Dca</td><td rowspan="4">193 348</td><td>F: AGGAACATTCCCACTCAGTTATG</td><td>50</td><td rowspan="4">0.867 0.894</td><td rowspan="4"></td><td>MDaCIR17</td><td rowspan="4">Da Da</td><td rowspan="4">228–236 172–206</td><td>F: GATTAGGTTGGACTTTGCAT</td><td></td><td>0.859</td><td>Arnau et. al.</td></t<>	YM09 YM10	Dca Dca	193 348	F: AGGAACATTCCCACTCAGTTATG	50	0.867 0.894		MDaCIR17	Da Da	228–236 172–206	F: GATTAGGTTGGACTTTGCAT		0.859	Arnau et. al.
VM10Dea $_{28}$ $_{12}^{12}$ CCCAAAATAITCTCCCCATTATC R: TIGACACTCAICTTATTGCTC $_{77}$ 0.894 $_{MDaCIR20$ $_{172-206}^{12}$ $_{122-206}^{12}$ $_{122-206}^{12}$ $_{122-206}^{12}$ $_{122-206}^{12}$ $_{122-206}^{12}$ $_{122-206}^{12}$ $_{122-206}^{12}$ $_{122-206}^{12}$ $_{122-206}^{12}$ $_{122-206}^{12}$ $_{122-206}^{12}$ $_{122-206}^{12}$ $_{122-206}^{12}$ <th< td=""><td>R: ATTGGGCAAGTGTGGTGTG</td><td>29</td><td></td><td>R: ACCACTGCACTCAACAGC</td><td></td><td></td><td>2017</td></th<>				R: ATTGGGCAAGTGTGGTGTG	29						R: ACCACTGCACTCAACAGC			2017
YM10348R: TIGACACTCATCITIATAITGCTC570.894Machal MName of MR: CATGGTGCTCCGATTCTAName of MYM12Dca215F: TGAGCATTCTTGTTTTGCCG R: CTTTCAGGCGCGGCATGG58/600.881MDaCIR8DaF: ACAGCAGCAAAATAACTG0.800Name of MYM15Dca485F: CCATCTCCTCCCTATTCTACAC R: GGGATTGAAGTTCC AGAGACTA570.830MDaCIR60DaF: CAAAGACCAGGGAATGTG R: AGAATGCAGCAGGGAATGTG0.814YM17Dca181F: TCCCTCAATTAAAGCATAGCCTC R: AGCCACCAAACATCTTGCTC59/600.856MDaCIR61DaF: CTAACCCCCTCCAAAGCTG R: GGGCATTCAGCATTTAT0.877YM18Dca212266F: GACATTGGGAAGCAGGAGGG R: GTGCATCAGCATTCAGGCATTGGGC59/600.852(D2)160-162F: GATGCATCAGCATGAGGA R: CATGGCACACATGAGGA10.811et al. 2006YM19Dca219F: AGCGGAGGCAGGAAGGGAGG R: GTGCATCAGCATTGAGGATGGG570.894(D3)20-386F: GCTTTGTGCAACCATCAT R: AATGGTCAACCATCAT10.888YM21Dca219F: ATGATGCATCTGAGGATGGG R: GTGCTATAGCAACCTGGGC58/690.7190.304159-173F: AATGGTGCAGGGA10.888YM23DcaF: TAGGGATGAGGAAGGGAAGG R: AGCGCTAGGGATAGGGAAGG58/690.719Da3G04Da159-173F: AATGGTGCTGGT0.877YM33DcaF: ACCAGGGATGAGGGAAGG R: ACCAGGGATGAGGAAGGGF: MCGAGCATAGGGAAGG600.8840.8140.0100.00000000000000000000000000000000000				F: ACCCAAAATATTCTCCCCATTATAC				MDaCIR20			F: TGCCTTAATCTGCTGACAC		0.889	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				R: TTGACACTCATCTTATATTGCTC	57						R: CATGGTGCTCCGATTCTA		0.000	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	YM12 YM15 YM17 YM18 YM19 YM21	Dca	215 485 181 266 219 340	F: TGAGCATTCTTGTTTTGCCG	59/60	0.001			MDaCIR8 Da MDaCIR60 Da MDaCIR61 Da Da1A01 (D1) Da Da1C12 Da (D2)		F: ACAGCAGCAAAATAACTG		0 880	Nemorii
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				R: CTTTCAGGGCGTGCATGG	58/60	0.881		WDdGINO			R: TCTTTGCAGGAGAAGAGG		0.000	2013
YM15485 R: GGGATTGAAGTTCC AGAGACTA R: AGCATCACATTAAAGCATAGCCTC R: AGCACCCAACAATTAAAGCATAGCCTC R: AGCACCCAAACATTGCTC570.830MUBLINGOR: AGAATGCAGAGCATGGTG0.814YM17Dca P181F: TCCCCAATTAAAGCATAGCCTC R: AGCACCCAAACATCTTGCTC59/600.856 $MDaCIR61$ DaF: CTAACCCCTCCAAAGCTG R: GGGCATTCACGCTCTTAT0.877YM18Dca R: TAGCAGCAGCAGCAGCAGCAGCAGAGGAG R: GTGTCATCAGCATCTGGGCF: GACATTGGGGAACGTTAAGGAA510.811 et al. 2006Toetain P: Obtain 2006YM19Dca R: GTGTCATCAGCATCTGGGCF: ACGGAAGCAGCAGAGAGGAG R: GTGTCATCAGCATCTGGGC0.852(D2)160-162F: GCCTTTGGCGAACACTAA R: ATGCGCTACACTCAT510.824YM21Dca R: GATGCTATAGCACACCTTGAF: AATGATGCAGCATCGAGGAAGG R: GATGCTATAAGCAACCTTGA570.894(D3)320-358F: GATGCTATGAACACAACTAA R: TTGACAGTGAGAATGGA510.888YM23Dca PF: TAAGACTTGCAGGGTTAAAGG R: GTGGCTAGTTTTGGGCAACAGC580.698(D4)159-173F: AATGCTTCGTAATCCAAC R: GATTGCTTGAGCCTGTACCTATC10.888YM33Dca PF: ACCATGGGATGAAGGAAGG R: AGGAGCATAGGGAAGG58/590.719Da3G04Da318-341R: TTATTCAGGCGCTGT510.877YM33Dca PF: ACCATGGGATGAAGGAAGG R: AGGAGCATGAGGAAGGF: ACCATGGGAAGGAAGG R: ACCATGGGAAGAGGAAGG600.8840.8840.8100.884		Dca		F: CCATCTCCTCCCTTATCTACAC							F: CAAAGACCAGGGAATGTG		0.044	
VM17Dca R: AGCCACCAAACATCTTGCTCF: CCCTCAATTAAAGCATAGCCTC R: AGCCACCAAACATCTTGCTC 0.856 $MDaCIR61$ Da R: GGCATTACCGTCTTAT $R: GGCATTCACGTCTTTATR: GGCATTCACGTCTTTAT0.877YM18DcaR: TACCAGCAGTAGCGTAAGCGTAAGCGTAAGGGAR: TAGCAGCAGAAGCAGAGAGGAGR: GTGTCATCAGCATCTGGGC57R: 0.8560.856Da1C12DaDaDa1D10DaDa212-256F: TATAATCGGCCACGAGGR: GTGTCAACGAGCATAAGGAAR: GTGTCAACGCATAAGGAAR: GTGTCATCAGCATCTGGGC0.877R: 0.811Da1C12DaDaDa1D08DaDaDaDaDaDa1D08F: GCTTTGTGCGCAGCAGGAGGAR: GTGCTATGAACACAACTAAR: TTTGACAGTGAGAAGGAGR: GTGCTATTACGACAACCTTGAR: GTGGCTAGTTACGACAACCTTGADa160DaDaDa1D08DaDaDaDaDa1D08F: GATGCTATGAACACAACTAAR: TTTGACAGTGAGGAAGGGAR: GTGCTATGAACACAACTAAR: TTTGACAGTGAGAATGGGADa160R: GTGCTAGCAACCTACR: GTGCTATGAACACAACTAAR: GTGCTAGAACGAAGGGAR: GTGGCTAGTTTGGAGGGATAAGGGR: GTGGCTAGTTTGGAGGGAAAGGGR: AGGAGCATAGGGAAAGGGDa30R: AGGAGCATAGGGAAGGR: AGGAGCATAGGGAAGGGDa30R: AGGAGCATAGGGAAGGR: ACCATGGGATGAAGGGAAGGGR: ACCATGGGATGAAGGGAAGGGDa30R: AGGAGCATAGGCAACGP: AATGCTTCGTAACCCAACCTAAR: CATGCGGCTGGTGDa30R: AGGAGCATAGGGAAGGR: AGGAGCATAGGGAAGGDa30R: AGGAGCATAGGCAACCTTCP: AATGCTTCGTAACCAACCTACR: GATTTCCGTGCCP: ATGCTTGCTAACCAACCTACR: GATGCTTGCGTACCCAACCR: GATGCTTGCGTGTDa30Da30R: AGGGCTGCCP: ATGCGCCCCCCCAACCCAACCTAAR: CATAGGGATGGGCCP: ATGCATGCTTTCCTACCAACCR: GATGCTTGCCCP: ATGCATGCTTTCCCACCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC$				R: GGGATTGAAGTTCC AGAGACTA	57	0.830		MDaCIROU			R: AGAATGCAGAGCATGGTG		0.014	
VM17 Use 181 R: AGCCACCAAAACATCTTGCTC 59/60 0.856 MUACINENT R: GGCATTCACGTCTTAT 0.877 YM18 Dca 266 F: GACATTGGGGATCTCTTATCAT 57 0.846 Da1A01 (D1) Da 212-236 F: TATAATCGGCCACGAGAGGA 51 0.811 et al. 2006 YM19 Dca 219 F: ACGGAAGCAGCAGCAGGAAGGGAG 59/60 0.852 (D2) 160-162 F: GATGCTATGAGCATCATCT 51 0.824 YM19 Dca 219 F: AATGATGCATCTGAGGATAGGG 59/60 0.852 (D2) 160-162 F: GATGCTATGAACACTCATCT 51 0.824 YM21 Dca 340 F: AATGATGCATCTGAGGATAGTG 57 0.894 (D3) 320-358 F: GATGCTATGAACACAACTAA F: AATGCATGGAGGAA 51 0.888 YM23 Dca F: TTAAGACTTGCAGGGTTAAAGG 58 0.698 (D4) 159-173 F: AATGCTGCGGCTGGTG 51 0.788 YM27 Dca F: CCAGCTTTAGCACAGG 58/59 0.719 Da3G04 Da 318-341 R: TATTCAGGCTGCTGGT 51 0.877 YM33 Dca 199 </td <td>Dca</td> <td>F. TCCCTCAATTAAAGCATAGCCTC</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>F: CTAACCCCTCCAAAGCTG</td> <td></td> <td>0 077</td> <td></td>		Dca		F. TCCCTCAATTAAAGCATAGCCTC							F: CTAACCCCTCCAAAGCTG		0 077	
YM18Dca R: TAGCAGCAGTAACGTTAAGGAAF: GACATTGGGGGATCTCTTATCAT R: TAGCAGCAGTAACGTTAAGGAA570.846Da1A01 (D1)Da 212-236F: TATAATCGGCCAGAGG R: TGTTGGAAGCATAGGAATostain 2006YM19Dca R: GTGTCATCAGCATCTGGGCF: ACGGAAGCAGCAGAGAGGAG R: GTGTCATCAGCATCTGGGC59/600.852(D2)160-162F: GCCTTTGTGCGTATCT510.824YM21Dca R: GATGCTATCAGCATCTGAGGATAGTG R: GATGCTATCAGCACCTGAGF: AATGGTGCATCTGAGGGATAGGG R: GATGCTATTACGACACACCTGA570.894(D3)Da 160-162F: GATGCTATGAACACACACACAACTAA R: ATCGGCTAGACACACACACACAACTAA510.824YM21Dca R: GATGCTATTACGACAGCACTGAGGGATAAGG R: GTGGCTAGTTTAGGACACACACTGA570.894(D3)Da 160-162F: GATGCTATGAACACACACACAACTAA R: TTGACAGTGAGAAGGGA510.888YM23Dca PM23Pca PCa PM33F: TAAGACTTGGGGATGAAGGGAAAGG R: ACGAGGATGAGGGAAAGGG R: ACGAGGATGAGGGAAAGGG58/590.7190.8364Da 318-341R: TTATCAGGCGTGGTG510.877 R: GATTGCTTGAGGCTGGTYM33Dca PM33Dca PF: ACC ATGGGATGAAGGGAAGG R: ACC ATGGGATGAAGGGAAGG R: ACC ATGGGATGAAGGGAAGG600.8840.8840.000, Dioscorea abyssinica (Dab), Dioscorea praehensilis (Dpr), Dioscorea cayenensis (Dca).		500		R: AGCCACCAAACATCTTGCTC	59/60	0.856		MDaCIR61			R: GGGCATTCACGTCTTTAT		0.877	
YM18Ze6KETAGCAGCAGTAACGTTAAGGAA570.846Data(101)Ze220R: TGTTGGAAGCATAGAGAA510.824YM19Ze19F: ACGGAAGCAGCAGAAGAGGAG R: GTGCATCAGCATCTGGGC59600.852(D2)160-162R: AATCGGCTACACTCACTCT510.824YM21Dca340F: AATGATGCATCTGAGGATAGTG R: GATGCTATCAGCACCTGAG570.894(D3)320-358F: GATGCTATGAACACAAACTAA R: TTTGACAGTGAAGCAGAAACGAA510.888YM21Dca340F: AATGATGCATCTGAGGATAAGG R: GATGCTATTACGACAACCTGA570.894(D3)320-358F: AATGCTTCGTAACACAAACTAA R: TTTGACAGTGAGAAAGGA510.888YM23Dca200F: TTAAGACTTGCAAGGGTTAAAGG R: GTGGCTAGTTTTGTAGCTGGT580.698(D4)F: AATGCTTCGTAATCCAAC R: CTATAAGGATTGGTGCC510.788YM27Dca201F: TCCAGCTCTTTAGCACAGG R: AGGAGCATAGGCAACAAGC58/590.719Da3G04Da318-341R: TTATTCAGGGCTGGTG510.877YM33Dca199F: ACC ATGGGATGAAGGGAAGG R: ACC ATGGGATGAAGGGAAGG600.8840.8840.8840.09, Dioscorea abyssinica (Dab), Dioscorea praehensilis (Dpr), Dioscorea cayenensis (Dca).		Dca		F: GACATTGGGGGATCTCTTATCAT				Da1401 (D1)		212_236	F: TATAATCGGCCAGAGG	51	0.811	Tostain et al
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				R' TAGCAGCAGTAACGTTAAGGAA	57	0.846		Dainoi (D1)		212-200	R: TGTTGGAAGCATAGAGAA		0.011	2006
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Dca		F: ACGGAAGCAGCAAGAGGAG				Da1C12		160–162	F: GCCTTTGTGCGTATCT	51	0.824	
YM21 Dca 340 F: AATGATGCATCTGAGGATAGTG 57 0.894 (D3) 320-36 F: GATGCTATGAACAACAACTAA YM23 Dca 200 F: TTAAGACTTGCAGGGTTAAAGG 57 0.894 (D3) Ba1D08 Da R: TTTGACAGTGGAACTGGA 51 0.888 YM23 Dca 200 F: TTAAGACTTGCAGGGTTAAAGG 58 0.698 (D4) 159-173 F: AATGCTTCGTAATCCAAC F: CATGGAGATGGGA 51 0.788 YM27 Dca 231 F: TCCAGCTCTTTAGCACAGG 58 0.698 (D4) 159-173 F: CATGGCTTGACCTACCAAC F: CATGGGATGGGCC 51 0.788 YM27 Dca 231 F: TCCAGCTCTTTAGCACAGG 58/59 0.719 Da3G04 Da 318-341 R: TTATCAGGGCTGGTG 51 0.877 YM33 Dca 199 F: ACC ATGGGATGAAGGGAAGG 60 0.884 0.884 00.0884 00.0884		500			59/60	0.852		(D2)			R: AATCGGCTACACTCATCT			
YM21 Dea 340 F: AATGATGCATCTGAGGATAGGG 57 0.894 (D3) Dea R: TTTGACAGTGAGAATGGA YM23 Dea 200 F: TTAAGACTTGCAGGGTAAAGGG 57 0.894 (D3) Dat F08 Da TGTGACAGTGAGAATGGA YM23 Dea 200 F: TTAAGACTTGCAGGGTAAAGGG 58 0.698 (D4) 159–173 F: ATGCTTCGTAATCCAAC 51 0.788 YM27 Dea 231 F: TCCAGCTCTTTAGCACAGG 58/59 0.719 Da3G04 Da 318–341 R: TTTGACGGGCTGGTG 51 0.877 YM33 Dea 199 F: ACC ATGGGATGAAGGGAAGG 60 0.884 0.884 Note: Dioscorea alata (Da), Dioscorea abyssinica (Dab), Dioscorea praehensilis (Dpr), Dioscorea cayenensis (Dca),		Dee						Da1D08	Da	320-358	F: GATGCTATGAACACAACTAA	51	0.888	
Markowski Marko		Dca			57	0.894		(D3)		020 000	R: TTTGACAGTGAGAATGGA		0.000	
Dca F: TIAAGACITIGCAGGGTTAAAGG 58 0.698 (D4) R: CTATAAGGAATTGGTGGCC YM23 200 R: GTGGCTAGTTTTTGTAGCTGGT 58 0.698 (D4) R: CTATAAGGAATTGGTGGCC YM27 Dca F: TCCAGGCTCTTTAGCACAGG 58/59 0.719 Da3G04 Da 318-341 R: TTATTCAGGGCTGGTG 51 0.877 YM33 Dca F: ACC ATGGGATGAAGGGAAGG 58/59 0.719 Da3G04 Da 318-341 R: TTATTCAGGGCTGGTG 51 0.877 YM33 Dca F: ACC ATGGGATGAAGGGAAGG 60 0.884 Note: Dioscorea alata (Da), Dioscorea abyssinica (Dab), Dioscorea praehensilis (Dpr), Dioscorea cayenensis (Dca).	YM23		200			0.698		Da1F08	Da	159–173	F: AATGCTTCGTAATCCAAC	51	0 788	
Price Price F: CCAGGCTAGTTITTGTAGCAGGG F: CCAGGCTTGACCTATC YM27 Price F: TCCAGGCATAGGCAACAAGC Da3G04 Da 318-341 R: TTATTCAGGGCTGGTG 51 0.877 YM27 Price F: ACGAGCATAGGCAACAAGC S8/59 0.719 R: GATTGCTTTGAGCTCGTG 51 0.877 YM33 Price F: ACC ATGGGATGAAGGGAAGG 60 0.884 0.884 Note: Dioscorea alata (Da), Dioscorea abyssinica (Dab), Dioscorea praehensilis (Dpr), Dioscorea cayenensis (Dca).		Dca		F: ITAAGACTTGCAGGGTTAAAGG	58			(D4)	(D4)		R: CTATAAGGAATTGGTGCC	51	0.100	
Dca F: TCCAGCTCTTTAGCACAGG Da3G04 Da 318-341 R: TTATTCAGGGCTGGTG 51 0.877 YM27 231 58/59 0.719 R: AGGAGCATAGGCAACAAGC R: GATTTGCTTTGAGTCCTT Dca F: ACC ATGGGATGAAGGGAAGG 60 0.884 YM33 199 R: ACC ATGGGATGAAGGGAAGG 60 0.884				R: GTGGCTAGTTTTTGTAGCTGGT					_		F: CACGGCTTGACCTATC			
Dca F: ACC ATGGGATGAAGGGAAGG Construction Note: Discorea alata (Da), Discorea abyssinica (Dab), Discorea praehensilis (Dpr), Discorea cayenensis (Dpr), Discorea cayenensis (Dca). YM33 199 R: ACC ATGGGATGAAGGGAAGG 60 0.884	YM27	Dca	231	F: TCCAGCTCTTTAGCACAGG	58/59	0 710	719	Da3G04	Da	318–341	R: TTATTCAGGGCTGGTG	51	0.877	
Dca F: ACC ATGGGATGAAGGGAAGG (Dca). YM33 199 60 0.884 (Dca). Vote: Dioscorea alata (Ua), Dioscorea abyssinica (Uab), Dioscorea praehensilis (Dpr), Dioscorea cayenensis (Dca).				R: AGGAGCATAGGCAACAAGC	30,00	5.7 13					K: GATTIGCTTIGAGTCCTT	(D) D'		
TINDD 199 DU U.884 T R: ACC ATGGGATGAAGGGAAGG	14400	Dca		F: ACC ATGGGATGAAGGGAAGG	~~	0.00.		Note: Dioscorea (Dca).	alata (Da	, Dioscorea	abyssinica (Uab), Dioscorea praehensili	is (Upr), Diosc	orea cay	renensis
	YM33		199	R: ACC ATGGGATGAAGGGAAGG	00	0.884								



Fig. 1. Cluster dendrogram of 148 greater yam (*Dioscorea alata* L.) accessions with AU/BP *p*-values (%) and bootstrapping of 5000 based on Jaccard dissimilarity index.

and the three remaining accessions (LA 083, LA 088, and LA 035) were from the VSU collections. Of the 15 greater yam accessions in Cluster III, PHL 9629 and PHL 33549 exhibited the lowest dissimilarity rate. For instance, the characteristics of PHL 9629 and PHL 33549 differed in the number of tubers they produced, shape of tuber, tuber width, presence and absence of cracks, hardness of tuber, tuber skin and flesh color, texture of flesh, and time of tuber oxidation.



Fig. 2. Tuber flesh of 16 ICROPS-UPLB greater yam (*Dioscorea alata* L.) accessions.

Most of the greater yam accessions (31) from the NPGRL greater yam collections were grouped in Cluster IV. Among the greater yam accessions, the lowest dissimilarity rate was derived from the comparison between 2 NPGRL greater yam collections (PHL 33479 and PHL 31881) from Cluster IV. The variation between PHL 33479 and PHL 31881 was observed in 9 out of 22 tuber morphological characteristics that were examined. On the other hand, Cluster V generated clustering of 2 NPGRL greater yam accessions (PHL 31880 and PHL 31889) with 75% dissimilarity. Cluster VI was formed with 4 accessions, with one accession from NPGRL greater yam collections (PHL 4641) and with the remaining 3 accessions from VSU collections. In this cluster, the NPGRL greater yam collection had a 69% dissimilarity rate with LA 182, a VSU collection. The cluster analysis also generated clustering (Cluster VII) that comprised different VSU greater yam collections. Among the VSU greater yam collections in this cluster, LA 147 and LA 148 exhibited the lowest dissimilarity rate. Cluster VIII grouped 27 accessions: 9 NPGRL greater yam collections, 2 VSU greater yam collections, and 16 ICROPS-UPLB greater yam collections. In the same cluster, it was observed that among the 16 ICROPS-UPLB greater yam collections, Tanay 2 greater yam accession clustered differently. However, all ICROPS-UPLB greater yam accessions exhibited a dark maroon tuber skin color. Nevertheless, it was observed that Tanay 2 exhibited white with purple flesh, while the other ICROPS-UPLB greater yam accessions had varying flesh colors-white, white with purple, purple with white, and purple (Fig. 2). At a 0.83 Jaccard's distance, three accessions (PHL 31896, PHL 9616, and LA 092) formed distinctly within the cluster, encompassing variations from the 24 yam accessions. The last cluster formed 31 greater yam accessions. Majority of the greater yam accessions in Cluster IX were from VSU greater yam collections, totaling 26 accessions, while the remaining 5 accessions were from the NPGRL greater yam collection. Cluster IX was further divided into two groups at a distance of 0.83, implying that the greater yam accessions differ at a rate of 83%.

The significance of the clustering was determined using the calculated *p*-values obtained from the multiscale bootstrap with 5000 times resampling. According to De Croos and Pálsson (2012), clusters with AU *p*-value > 0.95 are considered as significant at 0.05 level of significance as the hypothesis that 'the cluster does not exist' was rejected. Based on the hierarchical clustering, nine groups were generated with AU *p*-value > 0.95 (Fig. 1). Among the 9 significant groups, 1 group was observed in Cluster VIII, 2 groups from Clusters IX and II, and 4 groups from Cluster IV. The AU p-value obtained in the hierarchical clustering ranged from 1.0 to 0.96. Cluster II had 2 significant groups with AU *p*-value = 0.97 and AU *p*-value = 0.96 at a distance of 0.84, while only 1 group was obtained in Cluster VIII with AU *p*-value = 0.97 at a distance of 0.83. In Cluster IX, the further division of two groups within the cluster showed both significances with an AU p-value of 1.00 and an AU p-value of 0.96 grouped at a distance of 0.83. Lastly, Cluster IV generated most of the significant groupings having an AU p-value of 0.96 at 0.76 distance index, AU p-value of 0.97 at 0.81 distance index, AU p-value of 0.99 at 0.61 distance index, and AU p-value of 0.96 at 0.65 distance index. The significance observed in the AU p-value of the clustering proved that the nine groups observed in Clusters II, IV, VIII, and IX are more likely to exist compared to the other clustering.

The high Jaccard distance value inferred that the 148 greater yam accessions screened using 50 polymorphic SSR markers exhibit high genetic diversity. It was corroborated in the study of Siqueira et al. (2013) where 12 SSR markers revealed high genetic variation among the collected greater yam accessions (72 local varieties and 17 commercial accessions) from the four distinct regions of Brazil. On the other hand, various articles reported high genetic diversity despite considering lower genetic coefficients while clustering the population. Wu et al. (2019) clustered the greater yam population of China into two groups at a genetic coefficient of 0.62 and concluded that the greater yam population exhibited broad genetic variation. In terms of reproduction, greater yam has a high chance of cross-pollination that causes significant modification in the genetic makeup of the populations (Mulualem et al. 2018). Also, greater yam, an asexually propagated crop, often maintains a high level of heterozygosity that accounts for the high genetic diversity of greater yam (Olu-Olusegun et al. 2018). Aside from the cultural, social, and economic aspects, agricultural techniques might also contribute to the variation of greater yams (Siqueira et al. 2013).

CONCLUSION

The genomic DNA of all 148 yam accessions (71 from the National Plant Genetics Resources Laboratory [NPGRL], 61 from the Visayas State University [VSU], and 16 from and the Institute of Crop Science-University of the Philippines Los Baños [ICROPS-UPLB] greater yam collections) screened using 54 *Dioscorea*-based simple sequence repeat (SSR) markers amplified 50 markers polymorphic bands. The informativeness of the markers resulted in Polymorphic Information Content (PIC) values ranging from 0.65 to 0.89, with an average of 0.83. Thus, the SSR markers had high discriminatory power in identifying variation among the greater vam accessions. The gathered binary profile data was then analyzed using R statistical analysis which clustered the greater yam accessions at a 0.85 Jaccard's distance. The cluster analysis formed nine distinct groups: Cluster I (3 greater yam accessions), Cluster II (24 greater yam accessions), Cluster III (15 greater yam accessions), Cluster IV (31 greater yam accessions), Cluster V (2 greater yam accessions), Cluster VI (5 greater yam accessions), Cluster VII (11 greater yam accessions), Cluster VIII (27 greater yam accessions), and Cluster IX (31 greater yam accessions). The AU *p*-values generated nine significant (AU p-values > 0.95) clustering at Clusters II, IV, VIII, and IX which implies that the clusters exist at a 0.05 level of confidence. Considering the tuber morphology and clustering observed in the molecular diversity analysis of 148 greater yam accessions, eight greater yam accessions are recommended in the selection of promising parents for future breeding programs. The recommended accessions are PHL 33537, LA 068B, PHL 33550, PHL 31889, LA 110, LA147, TABACO, and LA 597. Among the eight greater yam accessions, white tuber flesh was observed in LA 110 and LA 068B, while white with purple flesh was observed in PHL 31889 and PHL 33550, and purple tuber flesh was observed in LA147, TABACO, PHL 33537, and LA 597. Overall, the results of this study revealed a high genetic diversity among the greater yam collections from NPGRL, VSU, and ICROPS-UPLB. This information from the genetic diversity analysis could be valuable in improving greater yam breeding programs and in contributing to the proper conservation and management of greater yam genetic resources.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors are genuinely grateful to the Institute of Crop Science and the Institute of Plant Breeding, College of Agriculture and Food Science, University of the Philippines Los Baños for granting them access to their field and laboratory facilities. They would like to express their sincere gratitude to the Department of Agriculture-Bureau of Agricultural Research (DA-BAR) for funding their research project on greater yam. Their support and assistance throughout the duration of the project enabled them to successfully complete this undertaking. Furthermore, the

first author would like to thank the Department of Science and Technology (DOST) for providing the scholarship.

REFERENCES CITED

- ARNAU G, BHATTACHARJEE R, MN S, CHAIR H, MALAPA R, LEBOT V K A, PERRIER X, PETRO D, PENET L, PAVIS C. 2017. Understanding the genetic diversity and population structure of yam (*Dioscorea alata* L.) using microsatellite markers. PLoS ONE. 12(3):e0174150. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0174150.
- BAQUIRAN PB. 2012. Ubi production guide. Tuguegarao City, Cagayan (Philippines): Department of Agriculture, Regional Field Office No. 02. High Value Crops Development Program. https://cagayanvalley.da.gov. ph/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/ube_production_ guide.pdf.
- BOGUERO APB, PARDUCHO MAL, MENDOZA MRDR, ABUSTAN MAM, LALUSIN AG. 2016. Molecular screening of abaca (*Musa textilis* L. Nee) accessions using microsatellite markers associated with resistance to bunchy top virus. Philipp J Crop Sci. 41(2):13–19. https://www.ukdr.uplb.edu.ph/journal-articles/4886/.
- BOTSTEIN D, WHITE RL, SKOLNICK M, DAVIS RW. 1980. Construction of a genetic linkage map in man using restriction fragment length polymorphisms. Am J Hum Genet. 32(3):314–331. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/ pmc/articles/PMC1686077/.
- CAO Q, LU B-R, XIA H, RONG J, SALA F, SPADA A, GRASSI F. 2006. Genetic diversity and origin of weedy rice (*Oryza sativa* f. *spontanea*) populations found in North-eastern China revealed by simple sequence repeat (SSR) markers. Ann Bot. 98(6):1241–1252. doi:10.1093/aob/mcl210.
- COURSEY DG. 1967. Yams. An account of the nature, origins, cultivation and utilisation of the useful members of the Dioscoreaceae. London: Longmans.
- DE CROOS MDST, PÁLSSON S. 2012. Present status of the multi-gear shrimp fishery off the west coast of Sri Lanka: gear-based species diversity and selectivity. J Appl Ichthyol. 29(1):93–107. doi:10.1111/j.1439-0426.2012.02043.x.
- DOYLE JJ, DOYLE JL. 1990. A rapid total DNA preparation procedure for fresh plant tissue. Focus. 12:13–15. https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=1111586.

- EGESI CN, ASIEDU R, EGUNJOBI JK. 2001. Flowering in yams (*Dioscorea* spp.). Proceedings of the 7th Triennial Symposium of the International Society for Tropical Root Crops Africa Branch: Cotonou (Benin): International Society for Tropical Root Crops Africa Branch.
- EGESI CN, PILLAY M, ASIEDU R, EGUNJOBI JK. 2002. Ploidy analysis in water yam (*Dioscorea alata* L.) germplasm. Euphytica. 128:225–230. doi:10.1023/A:1020868218902.
- GIRMA G, GEDIL M, SPILLANE C. 2015. Morphological, SSR and ploidy analysis of water yam (*Dioscorea alata* L.) accessions for utilization of aerial tubers as planting materials. Genet Resour Crop Ev. 64:291–305. doi:10.1007/s10722-015-0351-2.
- GOVINDARAJ M, VETRIVENTHAN M, SRINIVASAN M. 2015. Importance of genetic diversity assessment in crop plants and its recent advances: an overview of its analytical perspectives. Genet Res Int. 2015:431487. doi:10.1155/2015/431487.
- [IPGRI/IITA] International Plant Genetic Resources Institute/ International Institute of Tropical Agriculture. 1997. Descriptors for yam (*Dioscorea* spp.). Ibadan (Nigeria)/ Rome (Italy): International Institute of Tropical Agriculture, Ibadan, Nigeria/International Plant Genetic Resources Institute, Rome, Italy. https:// cropgenebank.sgrp.cgiar.org/images/file/learning_ space/descriptors_yam.pdf.
- JYOTHY A, SHEELA MN, KRISHNA RADHIKA N, ANWAR I, KUMAR V, ABHILASH PV. 2017. Morphological characterization of greater yam (*Dioscorea alata* L.) landraces in Kerala. J Root Crops. 43(1):3–10. http:// journal.isrc.in/index.php/jrc/article/view/449.
- KORSA F, FEYISSA T, DESSALEGN O, MEKONNEN T. 2022. Genetic diversity and population structure of Yam (Dioscorea species) from Western Ethiopia as revealed by simple sequence repeat markers. Research Square. doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-1905131/v1.
- LUBAG AJM JR, LAURENA AC, TECSON-MENDOZA EM. 2008. Antioxidants of purple and white greater yam (*Dioscorea alata* L.) varieties from the Philippines. Philipp J Sci. 137(1):61–67. https://philjournalsci.dost.gov.ph/ images/pdf/pjs_pdf/vol137no1/pdfs/Antioxidants_ of_Purple_and_Whte_Greater_Yam.pdf.
- MARTIN FW, DELPIN H. 1978. New, superior varieties of *Dioscorea alata*, the Asian greater yam. J Agric Univ Puerto Rico. 62(1):64–75. doi:10.46429/jaupr.v62i1.10399.
- MIAH G, RAFII MY, ISMAIL MR, PUTEH AB, RAHIM HA, ISLAM KN, LATIF MA. 2013. A review of microsatellite

markers and their applications in rice breeding programs to improve blast disease resistance. Int J Mol Sci. 14(11):22499–22528. doi:10.3390/ijms141122499.

- MOHAMMADI SA, PRASANNA BM. 2003. Analysis of genetic diversity in crop plants—salient statistical tools and considerations. Crop Sci. 43(4):1235–1248. doi:10.2135/cropsci2003.1235.
- MULUALEM T, MEKBIB F, SHIMELIS H, GEBRE E, AMELEWORK B. 2018. Genetic diversity of yam (*Dioscorea* spp.) landrace collections from Ethiopia using simple sequence repeat markers. Aust J Crop Sci. 12(08):1223–1230. doi:10.21475/ajcs.18.12.08.PNE885.
- NADEEM MA, NAWAZ MA, SHAHID MQ, DO AN Y, COMERTPAY G, YILDIZ M, HATIPO LU R, AHMAD F, ALSALEH A, LABHANE A, ÖZKAN H, CHUNG G, BALOCH FS. 2018. DNA molecular markers in plant breeding: current status and recent advancements in genomic selection and genome editing. Biotechnol Biotec Eq. 32(2):261–285. doi:10.1080/13102818.2017.1400401.
- NEMORIN A, DAVID J, MALEDON E, NUDOL E, DALON J, ARNAU G. 2013. Microsatellite and flow cytometry analysis to help understand the origin of *Dioscorea alata* polyploids. Ann Bot. 112(5):811–819. doi:10.1093/aob/mct145.
- NI J, COLOWIT PM, MACKILL DJ. 2002. Evaluation of genetic diversity in rice subspecies using microsatellite markers. Crop Sci. 42(2):601. doi:10.2135/cropsci2002.6010.
- OBIDIEGWU J, RODRIGUEZ E, ENE-OBONG E, LOUREIRO J, MUONEKE C, SANTOS C, KOLESNIKOVA-ALLEN M, ASIEDU R. 2009. Ploidy levels of *Dioscorea alata* L. germplasm determined by flow cytometry. Genet Resour Crop Ev. 57(3):351–356. doi:10.1007/s10722-009-9473-8.
- OLU-OLUSEGUN F, BABIL P, KIKUNO H, IRIE K, TOYOHARA H, SHIWACHI H. 2018. Intra-specific genetic diversity in water yam (*Dioscorea alata* L.) accessions collected from Myanmar, Papua New Guinea and Japan. J ISSAAS. 24(1):107–117. https://www. cabidigitallibrary.org/doi/pdf/10.5555/20183221279.
- OTOO E, ANOKYE M, ASARE P, TETTEH J. 2015. Molecular categorization of some water yam (*Dioscorea alata* L.) germplasm in Ghana using microsatellite (SSR) markers. J Agr Sci. 7(10). doi:10.5539/jas.v7n10p225.
- PANDIT M, CHAKRABORTY M, HAIDER ZA, PANDE A, SAH RP, SOURAV K. 2016. Genetic diversity assay of maize (*Zea mays* L.) inbreds based on morphometric traits and SSR markers. Afr J Agr Res. 11(24):2118–2128. doi:10.5897/AJAR2015.10404.

- PARK Y-J, LEE JK, KIM N-S. 2009. Simple sequence repeat polymorphisms (SSRPs) for evaluation of molecular diversity and germplasm classification of minor crops. Molecules. 14(11):4546–4569. doi:10.3390/ molecules14114546.
- R CORE TEAM. 2023. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna (Austria): R Foundation for Statistical Computing. http://www.R-project.org/.
- SALDA VB, YOON JW, BALDAZAN BC, GIBSON N, SAGALLA EJD. 2005. Yam production, processing, and marketing for the Luzon [Philippines] poverty zones. Philippine Journal of Crop Science (Philippines), 30(1).
- SINGH AK, SINGH NK, SINGH VK, SINGH DP, SINGH NP. 2016. Tools for simple sequence repeat (SSR) markers. Agric Update. 11(2):163–172. doi:10.15740/HAS/ AU/11.2/163-172.
- SIQUEIRA MVBM, BONATELLI ML, GÜNTHER T, GAWENDA I, SCHMID KJ, PAVINATO VAC, VEASEY EA. 2013. Water yam (*Dioscorea alata* L.) diversity pattern in Brazil: an analysis with SSR and morphological markers. Genet Resour Crop Ev. 61(3):611–624. doi:10.1007/s10722-013-0063-4.
- SIQUEIRA MVBM, DEQUIGIOVANNI G, CORAZON-GUIVIN MA, FELTRAN JC, VEASEY EA. 2012. DNA fingerprinting of water yam (*Dioscorea alata*) cultivars in Brazil based on microsatellite markers. Hortic Bras. 30(4):653–659. doi:10.1590/s0102-05362012000400015.
- SIQUEIRA MVBM, MARCONI TG, BONATELLI ML, ZUCCHI MI, VEASEY EA. 2011. New microsatellite loci for water yam (*Dioscorea alata, Dioscoreaceae*) and cross-amplification for other *Dioscorea* species. Am J Bot. 98(6):e144–e146. doi:10.3732/ajb.1000513.

- TAMIRU M, YAMANAKA S, MITSUOKA C, BABIL P, TAKAGI H, LOPEZ-MONTES A, SARTIE A, ASIEDU R, TERAUCHI R. 2015. Development of genomic simple sequence repeat markers for yam. Crop Sci. 55(5):2191– 2200. doi:10.2135/cropsci2014.10.0725.
- TOSTAIN S, SCARCELLI N, BROTTIER P, MARCHAND J-L, PHAM J-L, NOYER J-L. 2006. Development of DNA microsatellite markers in tropical yam (*Dioscorea* sp.). Mol Ecol Notes. 6(1):173–175. doi:10.1111/j.1471-8286.2005.01182.x.
- WANG L, GUAN R, ZHANGXIONG L, CHANG R, QIU L. 2006. Genetic diversity of Chinese cultivated soybean revealed by SSR markers. Crop Sci. 46(3):1032–1038. doi:10.2135/cropsci2005.0051.
- WU W, CHEN C, ZHANG Q, AHMED JZ, XU Y, HUANG X, XIE J, XIA W, HUANG D. 2019. A comparative assessment of diversity of greater yam (*Dioscorea alata*) in China. Sci Hortic – Amsterdam. 243:116–124. doi:10.1016/j. scienta.2018.08.016.
- YANG X-S, SU W-J, WANG L-J, LEI J, CHAI S-S, LIU Q-C. 2015. Molecular diversity and genetic structure of 380 sweetpotato accessions as revealed by SSR markers. J Integr Agr. 14(4):633–641. doi:10.1016/s2095-3119(14)60794-2.