

A. Matsumoto · Y. Tsumura

Evaluation of cleaved amplified polymorphic sequence markers for *Chamaecyparis obtusa* based on expressed sequence tag information from *Cryptomeria japonica*

Received: 11 March 2003 / Accepted: 2 June 2004 / Published online: 10 November 2004
© Springer-Verlag 2004

Abstract We have developed and evaluated sequence-tagged site (STS) primers based on expressed sequence-tag information derived from sugi (*Cryptomeria japonica*) for use in hinoki (*Chamaecyparis obtusa*), a species that belongs to a different family (although it appears to be fairly closely related to sugi). Of the 417 *C. japonica* STS primer pairs we screened, 120 (~30%) were transferable and provided specific PCR amplification products from 16 *C. obtusa* plus trees. We used haploid megagametophytes to investigate the homology of 80 STS fragments between *C. obtusa* and *C. japonica* and to identify orthologous loci. Nearly 90% of the fragments showed high (>70%) degrees of similarity between the species, and 35 STSs indicated homology to entries with the same putative function in a public DNA database. Of the 120 STS fragments amplified, 72 showed restriction fragment length polymorphisms; in addition, the CC2430 primers detected amplicon length polymorphism. We assessed the inheritance pattern of 27 cleaved amplified polymorphic sequence markers, using 20 individuals from the segregation population. All the markers analyzed were consistent with the marker inheritance patterns obtained from the screening panel, and no markers (except CC2716) showed significant ($P < 0.01$) deviation from the expected segregation ratio. In total, 136 polymorphic markers were developed using *C. japonica*-based STS primers without any sequence modification. In addition, the applicability of

STS-based markers developed in one species to other species was found to closely reflect the evolutionary distance between the species, which is roughly concordant with the difference between their *rbcL* sequences. We plan to use these markers for genetic studies in *C. obtusa*. Most of the markers should also provide reliable anchor loci for comparative mapping studies of the *C. obtusa* and *C. japonica* genomes.

Introduction

Sugi (*Cryptomeria japonica*) and hinoki (*Chamaecyparis obtusa*) are the two most widely cultivated timber conifers in Japan. Both species are economically important, and nationwide forest-tree breeding programs were initiated for them in the 1950s. Taxonomically, *C. japonica* belongs to the Taxodiaceae, whereas *C. obtusa* belongs to the Cupressaceae, but this classification has been questioned in several studies (Eckenwalder 1976; Hart 1987; Price and Lowenstein 1989). Recent molecular phylogenetic studies have clarified the evolutionary relationship between the two families, using *rbcL* sequence (Brunsfeld et al. 1994), 28S rRNA sequence (Stefanovic et al. 1998), and PCR-RFLP analyses of chloroplasts (Tsumura et al. 1995). In addition, Kusumi et al. (2000) determined the phylogenetic relationship between the Taxodiaceae and Cupressaceae, using nucleotide sequences from four regions of the chloroplast DNA. The results from these studies indicate that the two families form a monophyletic group. Kusumi et al. (2000) further strongly suggested that Cupressaceae were derived from representatives of the Taxodiaceae, being most closely related to the *C. japonica*/*Taxodium*/*Glyptostrobus* clade. Therefore, we assume that *C. japonica* and *C. obtusa* are closely related species and expect them to show high levels of synteny and colinearity.

Communicated by D.B. Neale

A. Matsumoto · Y. Tsumura (✉)
Department of Forest Genetics,
Forestry and Forest Products Research Institute,
Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8687,
Japan
E-mail: ytsumu@ffpri.affrc.go.jp
Tel.: +81-29-8733211
Fax: +81-29-8743720

During the last 5 years, *C. japonica* has been extensively studied under the *C. japonica* Genome project. In particular, we have obtained more than 8,000 partial sequences of expressed sequence tags (ESTs) from *C. japonica* cDNA libraries. These results were reported in part by Ujino-Ihara et al. (2000). Furthermore, many useful sequenced-tagged site (STS) markers for *C. japonica* genome mapping and population studies have been developed using previously published information (Nikaido et al. 2000; Iwata et al. 2001; Tani et al. 2003a, b).

Cleaved amplified polymorphic sequence [(CAPS) also known as PCR-RFLP] markers based on STSs derived from ESTs have been developed, and a genetic linkage map of *C. japonica* has been constructed (Iwata et al. 2001; Tani et al. 2003a). The CAPS molecular marker system has several advantages. First, since analysis of restriction fragment length polymorphisms is based on polymerase chain reaction (PCR) amplification, it is much easier and less time-consuming, especially for species with large genomes, such as conifers [e.g., the estimated C-values are 21–23 pg in loblolly pine (Wakamiya et al. 1993), 11 pg in *C. japonica*, and 10 pg in *C. obtusa* (Hizume et al. 2001)] than analyzing alternative types of markers that require Southern hybridizations. Second, the primers for CAPS markers based on ESTs are more useful as genetic markers for comparative mapping study than those based on anonymous, non-functional sequences such as microsatellite markers, because the coding regions of functional genes are generally well conserved, not only within but also between species. Third, CAPS markers are inherited mainly in a co-dominant manner.

PCR-based markers derived from ESTs have recently been developed as anchor markers for comparative mapping studies in conifers (Brown et al. 2001). Therefore, the availability of thousands of *C. japonica* ESTs is expected to present opportunities to develop new anchor loci for other conifer species to support comparative genome analysis. Exploiting this potential would increase the effectiveness of markers that have already been developed and reduce the cost of developing new markers in *C. obtusa*. In the present study, we applied *C. japonica* STS primers directly to the conifer *C. obtusa*, which is related but belongs to a different coniferous family, and developed CAPS markers for advanced genetic research and breeding programs in *C. obtusa*.

Materials and methods

Plant materials

Sixteen plus tree clones, selected from artificial forests in various regions of Japan, were used to detect polymorphism in order to develop CAPS markers. The segre-

gation population used to assess the inheritance patterns of the markers was developed from the backcross of an F₁ individual derived from the plus tree clones 'Fudago-2' and 'Izu-3'. The progeny were produced between an F₁ individual as the female parent and an 'Izu-3' individual as the male parent. A total of 20 individuals of the segregation population were used to determine the marker inheritance patterns.

PCR amplification of STSs in *C. obtusa*, using *C. japonica* STS primers

Fresh leaves were collected from the 16 plus tree clones to evaluate the polymorphism for each CAPS marker and from the grandparents, 'Fudago-2' and 'Izu-3', the F₁ tree, and the 20 segregation progeny to determine the modes of marker inheritance. Genomic DNA was extracted from 50 mg of leaf material, using a Dneasy Plant Mini Kit (Qiagen), and STS primers homologous to sequences in the *C. japonica* cDNA library were used to test their transferability to *C. obtusa*. Some of the primers in this set have already been reported by Iwata et al. (2001) and Tani et al. (2003a, b). PCR amplification was performed by the method according to Iwata et al. (2001) with minor modifications, i.e., containing 10 ng DNA, 1.0 U *Taq* polymerase (Promega or TaKaRa), and carried out in a thermal cycler (GeneAmp PCR Instrument Systems 9600, Applied Biosystems) programmed for 5 min of preheating at 94°C followed, by 40 cycles of 1 min at 94°C, 1 min at 50°C, and 1 min 30 s at 72°C, with a final incubation of 5 min at 72°C. For annealing, three other temperatures (55, 60, and 65°C) were tested for all primer pairs. The PCR products were separated on 2% agarose gels and stained with ethidium bromide to check whether single bands had been amplified.

Sequence analysis and homology determination of STSs

C. obtusa and *C. japonica* genomic DNAs were extracted from haploid megagametophyte tissues in seeds by the CTAB method and used for PCR amplification. PCR products that showed single bands were each purified in a Multiscreen FB plate (Millipore) and used as templates for the sequencing reactions. Cycle sequencing was performed from both ends of each purified, amplified fragment with the forward and reverse STS primers and a Big Dye Terminator Cycle Sequencing Ready Reaction Kit (Applied Biosystems). Each sequence was detected using an ABI377 automatic sequencer (Applied Biosystems) according to the manufacturer's instructions. We then analyzed the sequence data using Sequence Analysis Software, version 3.7 (Applied Biosystems).

Comparison of the transferability of STS markers to closely related species and their phylogenetic relationships

To assess the transferability of STS markers to other species and their phylogenetic relationships, the chloroplast *rbcL* gene sequences of nine coniferous species were compared. To test the transferability of *C. japonica* STSs, we selected two species, *C. obtusa* and *Taxodium* (Tsumura et al. 1999), which are closely related to *C. japonica* (Kusumi et al. 2000), and for *Pinus taeda* STSs (Brown et al. 2001), we compared five species of pine and one of *Pseudotsuga*. All sequence data were obtained from the DDBJ database, and 1,258 nucleotides and 418 amino acids were compared amongst the nine species.

Polymorphism detection from STSs

Primers that successfully supported amplification of a single fragment from *C. obtusa* were identified and used for the detection of restriction site polymorphisms in a screening panel comprising 16 *C. obtusa* plus trees, including the grandparents of the segregation progeny. Amplified fragments were first digested with each of 14 restriction enzymes (*AluI*, *Bst0I*, *DdeI*, *HaeII*, *HaeIII*, *HhaI*, *HinfI*, *MspI*, *NciI*, *NdeII*, *RsaI*, *StyI*, *SinI*, and *TaqI*); if none of these enzymes revealed polymorphism, samples were digested with each of 12 additional restriction enzymes (*AvaI*, *BamHI*, *BanII*, *BglI*, *BglII*, *DraI*, *Eco0109I*, *EcoRI*, *HincII*, *HindIII*, *NsiI*, and *SspI*). Out of 36 restriction enzymes utilized in *C. japonica* (Iwata et al. 2001), the above 26 enzymes were higher in rank for polymorphism detection. We may expect effective polymorphism detection using these enzymes and supposed that time and cost could be saved in present study. The restricted PCR products were resolved by electrophoresis on 2% agarose gels containing ethidium bromide, and polymorphic STSs were detected as described for CAPS markers (Iwata et al. 2001).

To identify informative markers, we evaluated the degree of polymorphism they each detected using the polymorphic information content [(PIC) Botstein et al. 1980] as an index for all the polymorphic markers generated by the various combinations of STSs and restriction enzymes.

Segregation analysis

To determine the mode of inheritance of the polymorphic STSs (i.e., the CAPS markers), we randomly chose 20 individuals from the segregation population, derived (as described above) from a backcross between the F₁ hybrid and 'Izu-3'. Segregation data were evaluated by

χ^2 -tests for goodness of fit to the expected Mendelian distribution.

Results

PCR amplification of STSs

We expected more than half of the 417 *C. japonica* STS primer pairs tested to provide single-band amplification in *C. obtusa* at one of the four annealing temperatures (50, 55, 60, or 65°C) used during the first screening. Eventually, after fine-tuning the annealing temperature, 120 primer pairs that met our criteria were obtained (Appendix). These results indicate that approximately 29% of STS primers derived from *C. japonica* EST sequences can be used directly as STS primers for *C. obtusa* species. Of the remaining 297 primer pairs, 221 yielded multiple bands, and 76 failed to support amplification. Of the 120 successful primer pairs, eight (CC1908, CC2930, CC3055, CC3106, CC3152, C3414, CC3455, and CC3861) provided single-band amplification in *C. obtusa*, but not in *C. japonica*. For 90 of the 120 STS primer pairs, agarose gel electrophoresis roughly distinguished amplified products that differed in size between *C. obtusa* and *C. japonica*.

Sequence comparison between *C. obtusa* and *C. japonica*

We amplified STS fragments from one individual each of *C. japonica* and *C. obtusa* for sequence analysis. The partial nucleotide sequences obtained using the same primer pairs as for the amplification confirmed the similarities between these two species. Generally, orthologous loci of closely related species are theoretically expected to exhibit high nucleotide similarity. We sequenced and compared the level of nucleotide identity between these products from the two species, but excluding large indel regions (more than 100 nucleotides). Of the 80 STSs successfully compared (Table 1), 70 (87.5%) showed a nucleotide identity of 72% to 100% between *C. obtusa* and *C. japonica*, while the other ten showed low (< 50% identity) levels of similarity between the two species. The results of a BLAST homology search using the sequence data from these 70 STSs as queries showed homology to known protein sequences for 35 of them, with BLAST values higher than 50.

Polymorphism detection for developing CAPS

To develop CAPS markers, genomic DNA templates prepared from the 16 *C. obtusa* plus trees (including

Table 1 Putative function of *Chamaecyparis* sequence-tagged sites (STSs) and nucleotide identity between *C. obtusa* and *Cryptomeria japonica*

STS	Accession no.	Nucleotide identity ^a	BLAST score	Functional annotation ^b
CC0277	AB127118	373/379 (98%)	111	Putative senescence-associated protein
CC0278	AB127119	318/347 (91%)	< 50	Low score
CC0281	AB127120	321/331 (97%)	79	Unknown protein
CC0285	AB127121	267/295 (90%)	–	No hit
CC0286	AB127185	315/334 (94%)	172	Similarity to phosphate/phosphoenolpyruvate translocator
CC0292	AB127122	591/670 (88%)	96	Unknown protein
CC0316	AB127123	506/516 (98%)	128	Auxin-induced protein
CC0336	AB127124	429/495 (86%)	115	Similar to mandelonitrile lyase
CC0344	AB127125	241/271 (89%)	< 50	Low score
CC0352	AB127188	Low similarity	–	Not determined
CC0374	AB127142	631/666 (94%)	134	Quinone oxidoreductase-like protein
CC0421	AB127187	Low similarity	–	Not determined
CC0428	AB127126	416/456 (91%)	95	Glutamate decarboxylase 1
CC0438-1	AB127127	450/465 (96%)	128	Light-independent protochlorophyllide reductase subunits
CC0550	AB127184	349/390 (89%)	175	Chitinase
CC0674	AB127186	216/254 (85%)	77	Unknown protein
CC0702	AB127128	380/462 (84%)	< 50	Low score
CC0708	AB127129	394/448 (87%)	50	Unknown protein
CC0725	AB127130	581/634 (91%)	169	SKIP nuclear coactivator-like protein
CC0731	AB127131	422/499 (85%)	409	60S ribosomal protein
CC0737	AB127132	469/531 (88%)	75	60S acidic ribosomal protein
CC0790	AB127133	525/539 (97%)	157	Putative senescence-associated protein
CC0822	AB127134	605/734 (84%)	106	Similarity to ubiquitin fusion degradation protein 1
CC0831	AB127189, AB127190	1,162/1,404 (83%)	247	Hypothetical protein
CC0838	AB127135	412/476 (86%)	217	Thaumatococin-like protein mRNA
CC0854	AB127136	364/394 (91%)	230	40S ribosomal protein S16
CC0858	AB127183	645/729 (88%)	280	erg-1 mRNA
CC0860	AB127144	244/267 (91%)	67	HistoneH3-D
CC0951	AB127191	Low similarity	–	Not determined
CC0958	AB127182	412/466 (88%)	–	No hit
CC0983	AB127143	276/327 (84%)	< 50	Low score
CC1015	AB127181	617/675 (91%)	53	Similarity to storage protein
CC1017	AB127145	475/650 (73%)	–	No hit
CC1104	AB164397	Low similarity	–	Not determined
CC1112	AB127180	608/690 (88%)	< 50	Low score
CC1135	AB127137	434/501 (86%)	< 50	Low score
CC1145	AB127138	388/439 (88%)	140	Unknown protein
CC1147	AB127192	625/693 (90%)	< 50	Low score
CC1172	AB164398	298/332 (89%)	111	60S ribosomal protein L2
CC1187	AB127146	397/430 (92%)	< 50	Low score
CC1287	AB127147	Low similarity	–	Not determined
CC1319	AB127148	306/425 (72%)	54	Dehydrin mRNA
CC1371	AB127149	443/491 (90%)	73	Similarity to MSP1 protein
CC1415	AB127150	287/314 (91%)	68	Unknown protein
CC1432	AB127193, AB127194	1,146/1,336 (86%)	90	Unknown protein
CC1463	AB127151	594/641 (93%)	92	Hypothetical protein
CC1555	AB127153	317/345 (91%)	184	Similarity to glycosyl transferase IgtC
CC1531	AB127152	Low similarity	–	Not determined
CC1606	AB127154	728/837 (86%)	361	Myb gene for Myb transcription factor
CC1625	AB127155	348/394 (88%)	< 50	Low score
CC1697	AB164399	Low similarity	–	Not determined
CC1711	AB127156	1,134/1,375 (82%)	< 50	Low score
CC1787	AB164400	Low similarity	< 50	Low score
CC1798	AB127157	520/719 (72%)	209	Chitinase mRNA
CC1799	AB127158	506/630 (80%)	< 50	Low score
CC1974	AB127159	302/305 (99%)	< 50	Low score
CC2188	AB127160	128/142 (90%)	94	Methionine adenosyltransferase
CC2196	AB127161	499/553 (90%)	269	WD-repeat protein 5
CC2237	AB127162	596/687 (88%)	< 50	Low score
CC2286	AB127179	387/431 (90%)	< 50	Low score
CC2288	AB127163	Low similarity	–	Not determined
CC2427	AB127164	485/526 (92%)	117	Hypothetical protein

Table 1 (Contd.)

STS	Accession no.	Nucleotide identity ^a	BLAST score	Functional annotation ^b
CC2435	AB164401	536/650 (82%)	60	Similarity to zinc finger protein 216
CC2448	AB127165	366/407 (90%)	83	Flavone synthase mRNA
CC2478	AB164402, AB164403	764/840 (91%)	53	Unknown protein
CC2483	AB127166	526/613 (86%)	68	Hypothetical protein
CC2588	AB127167	604/713 (84%)	–	No hit
CC2716	AB127178	856/951 (90%)	86	EIN3-like protein mRNA
CC2777	AB127177	Low similarity	–	Not determined
CC2860	AB127168	570/649 (88%)	< 50	Low score
CC2865	AB127169	533/552 (96%)	140	Putative lysophospholipase isologue mRNA
CC2916	AB127170	626/668 (93%)	266	DNA-directed RNA polymerase beta'' chain
CC2917	AB127171	440/472 (93%)	130	Unknown protein
CC2920	AB127172	595/674 (88%)	247	mRNA for elicitor inducible chitinase Nt-SubE76
CC2976	AB127176	384/431 (89%)	< 50	Low score
CC3133	AB127173	583/625 (93%)	254	Unknown protein
CC3162	AB127174	517/590 (87%)	195	Cell death associated protein
CC3807	AB127175	640/640 (100%)	125	Putative retroelement protein
CC3816	AB127195, AB127139	579/667 (87%)	< 50	Low score
CC3872	AB127140, AB127141	474/524 (90%)	210	Ethylene-insensitive-like mRNA

^aNumber of nucleotides identical/number of nucleotides compared between *C. obtusa* and *C. japonica* (nucleotide identity). *Low similarity* indicates nucleotide identity less than 50%

^bFrom BLAST search of GenBank with a *Chamaecyparis* STS as query. *Low score* indicates a BLAST value less than 50

the grandparents of the segregation population) were PCR-amplified using the 120 identified STS primer pairs, and the PCR products were digested with either 14 or 26 restriction enzymes. Electrophoresis in agarose gels revealed that 72 STSs (60%) showed polymorphisms after digestion with at least one restriction enzyme. In total, the combination of these 72 STSs and various restriction enzymes provided 135 different banding patterns of CAPS markers. Additionally, primer set CC2340 provided amplification products (without restriction digestion) of differing sizes amongst the 16 *C. obtusa* plus trees, and thus identified amplicon length polymorphism. The polymorphisms observed could be divided into two types of inheritance patterns, dominant and co-dominant. The PIC values calculated for the polymorphic markers ranged from 0.06 to 0.58, averaging approximately 0.30.

Segregation analysis

We verified the marker inheritance patterns, using 20 individuals from the segregation population. Of the 72 CAPS markers identified, we expected that 27 would segregate in the progeny, because one or both of the parental genotypes was/were heterozygous (Table 2). In fact, five CAPS markers (CC0344, CC1319, CC2588, CC2920, and CC3872), which displayed dominant inheritance patterns in the screening panel, were practically co-dominant, according to the results of the segregation analysis. All the 27 markers analyzed were inherited in a Mendelian manner. Furthermore, no

significant ($P < 0.01$) deviation from the expected segregation ratio was found for any markers except CC2716.

Discussion

Transferability of EST-based STS markers in conifers

Primers that are widely transferable across taxonomic borders are very attractive, because they offer the potential to avoid duplication of many complicated, costly, and time-consuming processes (e.g., constructing genomic/cDNA libraries, sequencing clones, designing and synthesizing primers). In this study, we directly applied more than 400 STS primer pairs designed from *C. japonica* EST sequences to PCR amplification in *C. obtusa*.

Tsumura et al. (1997) previously evaluated the rate of conservation of EST sequences from *C. japonica* among several conifer species on a smaller scale than here. In both our present study and that of Tsumura et al. (1997), about 30% of the tested STS primers could be transferred from *C. japonica* to *C. obtusa*. In comparison, Brown et al. (2001) evaluated 90 primer sets based on ESTs of loblolly pine (*P. taeda* L.). They observed that nearly 90% of primers, on average, were transferable at the subgenus level. Furthermore, 22% were useful in Douglas fir, which belongs to a different genus (*Pseudotsuga*) but the same family.

The genetic relationship between *C. obtusa* and *C. japonica* (which belong to different taxonomic

Table 2 Segregation analysis of 27 cleaved amplified polymorphic sequence (CAPS) markers in 20 progeny of the cross between 'Izu-3' and F₁ individual 2a of *C. obtusa*

CAPS marker ^a		Genotype ^c		Expected segregation ratio	Observed segregation ratio	χ^2 -test probability
STS	Restriction enzyme	'Izu'	2a			
CC0292	<i>MspI</i>	<i>AB</i>	<i>AA</i>	1:1	12:8	0.37
CC0344 ^b	<i>RsaI</i>	<i>AB</i>	<i>AB</i>	1:2:1	5:9:6	0.75
CC0530	<i>Bst0I</i>	<i>AB</i>	<i>AB</i>	1:2:1	4:8:8	0.44
CC0550	<i>MspI</i>	<i>AB</i>	<i>BB</i>	1:1	13:7	0.18
CC0737	<i>DraI</i>	<i>Aa</i>	<i>aa</i>	1:1	11:9	0.65
CC0831	<i>NdeII</i>	<i>Aa</i>	<i>aa</i>	1:1	12:8	0.37
CC0838	<i>HaeIII</i>	<i>aa</i>	<i>Aa</i>	1:1	7:13	0.18
CC0858	<i>SinI</i>	<i>AB</i>	<i>AB</i>	1:2:1	5:11:4	0.75
CC1287	<i>SspI</i>	<i>AB</i>	<i>BB</i>	1:1	6:13	0.11
CC1319 ^b	<i>DdeI</i>	<i>AB</i>	<i>AB</i>	1:2:1	5:7:7	0.41
CC1606	<i>AluI</i>	<i>AB</i>	<i>AB</i>	1:2:1	4:8:4	1.00
CC2196	<i>AluI</i>	<i>AA</i>	<i>AB</i>	1:1	14:6	0.07
CC2237	<i>TaqI</i>	<i>AB</i>	<i>AB</i>	1:2:1	6:10:3	0.55
CC2427	<i>AluI</i>	<i>Aa</i>	<i>aa</i>	1:1	12:8	0.37
CC2478	<i>HaeIII</i>	<i>aa</i>	<i>Aa</i>	1:1	10:10	1.00
CC2588 ^b	<i>MspI</i>	<i>AB</i>	<i>AB</i>	1:2:1	8:9:3	0.17
CC2716	<i>MspI</i>	<i>Aa</i>	<i>Aa</i>	3:1	7:12	< 0.01
CC2752	<i>AluI</i>	<i>aa</i>	<i>Aa</i>	1:1	9:11	0.65
CC2839	<i>AluI</i>	<i>AB</i>	<i>AB</i>	1:2:1	13:7	0.67
CC2860	<i>DdeI</i>	<i>AB</i>	<i>AB</i>	1:2:1	7:10:2	0.30
CC2920 ^b	<i>MspI</i>	<i>AB</i>	<i>AB</i>	1:2:1	6:11:3	0.58
CC2930	<i>HaeIII</i>	<i>AB</i>	<i>AB</i>	1:2:1	5:8:5	0.68
CC3133	<i>EcoRI</i>	<i>aa</i>	<i>Aa</i>	1:1	10:10	1.00
CC3152	<i>HinPI</i>	<i>AB</i>	<i>AB</i>	1:2:1	8:7:4	0.22
CC3455	<i>RsaI</i>	<i>AB</i>	<i>AB</i>	1:2:1	4:7:9	0.12
CC3816	<i>RsaI</i>	<i>AB</i>	<i>BB</i>	1:1	8:12	0.37
CC3872 ^b	<i>NdeII</i>	<i>AB</i>	<i>AB</i>	1:2:1	7:9:4	0.58

^aCAPS markers developed from the combination of the listed STSs (from *C. japonica*) and restriction enzymes

^bThe markers were re-evaluated as co-dominant after segregation analysis

^cParental genotypes are presented in *capital letters* for co-dominant markers and *lowercase letters* for dominant markers

families) is probably much closer than has generally been recognized. The chloroplast *rbcL* gene sequence is frequently used to evaluate phylogenetic relationships between species. Therefore, we compared nucleotide and amino acid sequences of *rbcL* among nine coniferous species (Table 3). Nucleotide differences were detected between the *rbcL* genes of *C. japonica* and *Taxodium distichum* at 18 out of 1,258 nucleotide sites evaluated. In comparison, there was a 34-nucleotide difference between *C. japonica* and *C. obtusa* and a 108-nucleotide difference between *C. japonica* and *P. taeda*.

Approximately half of the STSs developed in *C. japonica* by Tsumura et al. (1999) were specifically amplified in *T. distichum*, and approximately 30% of the *C. japonica* STSs occurred in *C. obtusa*. Although the cited authors also evaluated *P. taeda*, the amplification success in this case was only 6%. As the number of differences in the *rbcL* nucleotide sequences increased between the species of interest, the transferability of markers decreased. In another example, the transferability of STSs developed in *P. taeda* was found to be over 80% in *P. elliotii*, *P. radiata*, *P. pinaster*,

Table 3 Pairwise comparison of chloroplast *rbcL* gene sequences among species. A total of 1,258 nucleotides and 418 amino acid sites were compared. The numerals *above the diagonal* are the numbers of nucleotide differences and *below the diagonal* are the

numbers of amino acid differences between the species. Sequence data for *rbcL* gene of nine species were obtained from DDBJ database

	<i>C. japonica</i>	<i>Taxodium distichum</i>	<i>C. obtusa</i>	<i>Pinus taeda</i>	<i>P. elliotii</i>	<i>P. radiata</i>	<i>P. pinaster</i>	<i>P. sylvestris</i>	<i>P. menziesii</i>
<i>C. japonica</i> ^a	—	18	34	108	107	109	109	113	104
<i>T. distichum</i>	7	—	32	100	100	102	105	103	101
<i>C. obtusa</i>	5	5	—	108	107	110	109	110	106
<i>P. taeda</i>	8	4	6	—	0	2	8	8	31
<i>P. elliotii</i>	9	4	6	0	—	2	9	9	32
<i>P. radiata</i>	10	5	7	1	1	—	11	10	34
<i>P. pinaster</i>	10	9	7	4	4	6	—	4	31
<i>P. sylvestris</i>	10	7	7	3	3	4	2	—	33
<i>P. menziesii</i>	7	7	5	5	5	6	6	6	—

^aAccession numbers in DDBJ database: *C. japonica*, L25751; *T. distichum*, AF119185; *C. obtusa*, L12570; *P. taeda*, AF119177; *P. elliotii*, AB081075; *P. radiata*, AB063383; *P. pinaster*, AB019818; *P. sylvestris*, AB019809; *P. menziesii*, X52937, S53466

and *P. sylvestris* (Brown et al. 2001), in which the *rbcL* nucleotide sequence differs by only zero to eight nucleotides from that of *P. taeda*. In comparison, 22% transferability was obtained when the *P. taeda*-based STSs were applied to *P. menziesii*. These findings suggest that the level of nucleotide difference in the *rbcL* sequences is a good indicator for the transferability of markers between species. However, despite the similarity of their *rbcL* genes at the nucleotide level, the transferability of *C. japonica* markers to *C. obtusa* was slightly higher than the transferability of *P. taeda* markers to *P. menziesii* (Brown et al. 2001). This difference in transferability might reflect differences in the type of region for which the primers were designed. The primers we designed are positioned within exons (Iwata et al. 2001) whose sequences are likely to be highly conserved between related species, whereas Temesgen et al. (2001) used reverse primers that were based on sequences in the 3' untranslated region, which is likely to be more genetically variable. Another factor that influences the transferability of markers may be genome size. The genome sizes of *C. japonica* and *C. obtusa* were estimated to be $\sim 1 \times 10^{10}$ bp, whereas those of pine species were 2–3 times larger ($2\text{--}3 \times 10^{10}$ bp). Therefore, identifying STS markers that amplify specific PCR products (i.e., amplification of a single locus) in pine would be more difficult than identifying such markers in *C. japonica* or *C. obtusa*.

Importance of PCR-based co-dominant markers in conifers

Transferable markers not only provide economic benefits, they also accommodate comparative mapping between different species. To date, markers used for comparative mapping have mainly been heterologous RFLPs, which have been detected by conserved-sequence probes in many species (e.g., rice, maize, pearl millet, foxtail millet, sorghum, sugarcane, wheat, barley, and rye; Gale and Devos 1998). In the comparative mapping of tree species, PCR-based markers are much more convenient and useful than RFLP markers, especially for conifers, because of their large genome size. In pine species, multigene families and pseudogenes (Kinlaw and Neale 1997) also obstructed the progress of genome mapping study with RFLP markers. Recently, Brown et al. (2001) examined anchored reference loci, using PCR-based markers in pine species for integrating pine genomics. To confirm the orthology of candidate loci, they investigated the sequence similarities of PCR amplification products between loblolly and slash pines, using a reference panel of ten anchor loci. Of the 88 STS fragments sequenced in both species, more than 90% showed high nucleotide similarity, and homologous sequences with the same putative function were found in public databases. In comparison, eight of our primer pairs (CC1908,

CC2930, CC3055, CC3106, CC3152, CC3414, CC3455, and CC3861) failed to support PCR amplification of a single band in *C. japonica*. With these primers, no amplification occurred at annealing temperatures of 55°C and 60°C, and multiple bands appeared at 50°C (data not shown). Although we used primers designed to bind mainly to sites within exons, the specificity of these primer sequences with respect to the *C. japonica* genome may have been slightly lower than that for *C. obtusa* simply by chance. The level of nucleotide similarity that distinguishes paralogues from orthologues is subjective (Brown et al. 2001). Komulaine et al. (2003), and Chagne et al. (2003), for instance, loci orthology in pine species requires higher nucleotide identity (more than 95%). Therefore, we recognized that further investigation would be needed, although our results likely provide a useful indicator for comparative mapping analyses.

CAPS markers are theoretically expected to be inherited in a co-dominant manner when the marker is derived from a single-copy gene. According to Iwata et al. (2001), co-dominant inheritance encompasses the following three scenarios: (1) bi-allelic co-dominant patterns for which two homozygotic and one heterozygotic forms are found; (2) bi-allelic co-dominant patterns for which only two homozygotic (and no heterozygotic) forms occur; and (3) multi-allelic co-dominant patterns, which apparently correspond to genotypes with multiple alleles. In comparison, dominant inheritance is manifested as bi-allelic dominance patterns, which can be scored only in terms of presence or absence. In this study, 31 STSs showed co-dominant patterns, and 41 showed only dominant patterns. However, five CAPS markers that showed dominant patterns in the screening panel were re-categorized after the segregation analysis as having co-dominant inheritance, bringing the rate up to 50%. According to Iwata et al. (2001), because of the limited number of individuals assessed during the screening process, homozygotes with rare alleles at the corresponding loci may not have been sampled. The 16 plus trees we selected for this study were all from central Japan, and thus are unlikely to represent all of the genotypes, considering the broad natural distribution of *C. obtusa*, which ranges from Fukushima Prefecture (37°10'N) in the north to the Kyusyu area (30°15'N) in the south. Most of the 150 CAPS markers used to analyze natural populations of *C. japonica* showed co-dominant inheritance (Tsumura et al., unpublished data). Therefore, extended segregation analysis will likely show that the remaining 37 of our CAPS markers are actually co-dominant.

Polymorphism of CAPS markers

The true level of polymorphisms (i.e., the development efficiency of CAPS markers) in *C. obtusa* is likely to be

higher than the level we detected. Using 26 restriction enzymes, we eventually determined that more than half of the *C. japonica*-based STSs were polymorphic in *C. obtusa*. The informativeness of these markers was measured by PIC, the average value of which was found to be 0.30. In a previous study, Iwata et al. (2001) reported that 267 of 361 STSs originally developed in *C. japonica* were polymorphic in a screening experiment based on 36 restriction enzymes and 15 individuals, and the average PIC value was 0.31 for bi-allelic co-dominant markers, corresponding to two homozygote and one heterozygote forms. Generally, the STS primers developed from one species that support DNA amplification in another may not accurately reflect the level of polymorphism in the other species. However, even though we used fewer restriction enzymes than the previous study in *C. japonica* (Iwata et al. 2001), more than 50% of our *C. japonica*-based STSs showed polymorphisms. Therefore, it seems that we could efficiently detect polymorphic regions, using the transferable primers in *C. obtusa*.

Our newly developed CAPS markers will likely be effective in diverse applications, for example, genome mapping, population analysis of *C. obtusa*, and comparative mapping studies of coniferous species (especially species of the Cupressaceae). The genetic diversity among natural populations of *C. japonica* has been evaluated using several CAPS markers (Tsumura and Tomaru 1999). Population studies using larger numbers of CAPS markers may provide us more precise information. In this study, we successfully developed 136 polymorphic markers, using STS-based *C. japonica* primers without any modification of the primer sequences. We plan to use these markers for a genetic study of *C. obtusa*. Most of the markers developed could also provide reliable anchor loci for comparative mapping studies between the *C. obtusa* and *C. japonica* genomes.

Acknowledgements The authors would like to thank T. Kondo and M. Okamura, who provided plant materials. We also thank K. Aoyagi, M. Koshiba, Y. Kawamata, and Y. Taguchi for their technical support and N. Tani, H. Iwata, T. Ujino-Ihara, K. Yoshimura, H. Yoshimaru, and K. Nagasaka for their helpful suggestions during this study, which was supported by a grant from the Program for Promotion of Basic Research Activities for Innovative Biosciences (PROBRAIN) and the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B), No. 16380112.

Appendix

Table 4 shows size and polymorphic information content (PIC) of sequence-tagged site (STS) markers detected in hinoki (*Chamaecyparis obtusa*), using primers developed in sugi (*Cryptomeria japonica*)

Table 4

STS	Forward primer	Reverse primer	Annealing temperature (°C)	Size ^a		Restriction enzymes used, and resulting PIC ^b
				<i>Chamaecyparis</i>	<i>Cryptomeria</i>	
CC0272	GGCGTTCGACTCAGTTGATT	TTGGCCAGCCTTTC	57	500	400	<i>DdeI</i> (0.26), <i>NciI</i> (0.16)
CC0277	GCAGCCAAGCGTTCATAGC	CCGATCGAAGGTAGCCAATG	57	400	400	<i>MspI</i> (0.06)
CC0278	GTGCTGACATGCCAGGATTT	ATTTGACCCGCCACTCATT	57	350	320	-
CC0281	GATAACGCAGGTGTCCTAAGA	CCTGTCTCACGACGGTCTA	57	350	350	<i>AhaI</i> (0.37)
CC0285 ^c	TTGGATAAACTCTGCAGAC	GAGGAGCCTGGCATCA	57	300	400	-
CC0286	TGACTGTCCCCTGGCTGTT	TGTCACTACTCTCGCCGTCCTC	54	400	380	-
CC0292 ^c	AGGCGCGTTCGAAGC	TGCCAAGCAATCTGAGAGAG	57	700	700	<i>MspI</i> (0.40)
CC0311	CTTCAAACCTCGCAAGACAAA	TTGGTGGATCAGTTGGAACAT	57	350	370	-
CC0316	AGGCTTGCACACTGATTGAT	GGCACATTCCTGGTGT	57	600	600	-
CC0336 ^c	ATCAGCTGGCTCCAGT	TCTCATCCACTCCATCTCTC	57	550	550	-
CC0344 ^c	TTATAGTAATGGCGGATTC	TCTCCGCATTTACAAGA	57	450	500	<i>RsaI</i> (0.35), <i>DdeI</i> (0.37)
CC0352	GAAATTTCAAAGCGGTGT	CGAATATGGCAGATAGTCAAT	57	> 1,500	380	<i>TaqI</i> (0.36), <i>HaeIII</i> (0.37)
CC0374 ^c	AGGTGTGGCGTTCAAAGA	TATTTGCCACGTTTCTCTCTG	57	1,000	1,000	-
CC0421	CAGAGTGCAGGCGCTGTATC	TCTTTTCATGCAAGGTGCAAGTC	57	350	600	-
CC0428 ^c	CAATCCAAAAGACCGCTGCTT	TTGGCTTTTCTGCCCACCTA	57	1,000	550	-
CC0438-1	ATGCAAATCGAACGGGAAGTG	GAGTGTCTTCCCTGTGGTG	57	600	700	-
CC0482 ^c	TGGAACGTCACTCGGAAAC	TTGTAATTAAGCCGCCATCTCT	57	800	900	-
CC0530 ^c	GGCATGCTGTAGTGAATGTC	TAGACCTCAGGTTCCCAAGTA	57	> 1,500	2,000	<i>Bsr0I</i> (0.56)
CC0550	TCAAAGCCAACTTCTGTGTCGT	ATGCCATCTTCCCAATCTGT	55	600	600	<i>MspI</i> (0.16)

Table 4 (Contd.)

STS	Forward primer	Reverse primer	Annealing temperature (°C)	Size ^a		Restriction enzymes used, and resulting PIC ^b
				<i>Chamaecyparis</i>	<i>Cryptomeria</i>	
CC0592	ATTTGAGTTAGTTTGGCGATGG	AGAAGATCCTCTCGGTAAT	57	> 1,500	> 1,000	<i>RsaI</i> (0.50), <i>AluI</i> (0.50), <i>MboII</i> (0.50), <i>HinfI</i> (0.50), <i>DdeI</i> (0.50), <i>NciI</i> (0.50), <i>BsrOI</i> (0.50)
CC0674	AGCGATCGCATGTTATCTGA	TCCATGGCCCTTCTGTAGA	57	> 1,500	> 1,000	—
CC0702	TTTACCACAAATTACACCCCA	GTTCTGCAGAGTTTGCCTT	62	450	500	—
CC0708 ^c	TCCTGGGAGAAATCATCA	AAATGTCTGGTCACTGGAGC	57	500	500	—
CC0725	CGTCTTGGTGTGTGGT	GATCCAGCACTTGCCTTCATA	57	700	650	—
CC0731 ^c	TGCGCGCTTTCGGAGTTT	GTCCACGCAGACACCAGTTC	57	600	700	<i>HinfI</i> (0.11)
CC0737 ^c	TCTTAATGTGGCAGCTCTTT	TGGAACCTTAIGTACACTCCCT	57	600	600	<i>DraI</i> (0.28)
CC0738 ^c	GGGCTCCTCTCTCA	TAAACCCAAATTACAATTGCT	57	300	1,400	—
CC0790	GGCCTATCGATCCTTTAGACT	GCCACTCTGCCACTTACAATA	57	600	550	<i>TaqI</i> (0.06)
CC0822	TGTCTGCCCCATTGAGAAGT	TCAGATGCCATGTTGATAAGA	57	600	700	<i>AluI</i> (0.19), <i>HinfI</i> (0.11)
CC0831	GCTCGTGATCAAGGA	TGGGTTAAAATAAATACTGGACA	54	> 1,500	1,200	<i>RsaI</i> (0.35), <i>SspI</i> (0.40), <i>NdeII</i> (0.33)
CC0832 ^c	AAAGATCAAGCGTATCAATGC	CAGAAATCTCTCTCGGTAAT	57	> 1,500	1,300	<i>HaeIII</i> (0.28), <i>NdeII</i> (0.06), <i>HinfI</i> (0.37)
CC0838	TGCGGGGATTACTCA	TCCCTATTCTGACTGCATAAAG	57	500	500	<i>RsaI</i> (0.11), <i>HaeIII</i> (0.18), <i>NciI</i> (0.06)
CC0854	AGTAATGGCCCGAGTGGAGT	TCTCAGAACCGGGAAGATGAA	57	450	400	—
CC0858	GGTGGAAGAAAGAGCCGCTTGT	AAACTGGCGCCCATTTAGTC	62	900	800	<i>HaeIII</i> (0.16), <i>SinI</i> (0.38)
CC0860 ^c	AACAGGCGCAAGTCTACA	CTAAGCCCTTTTCCACCAGAT	57	1,000	1,300	<i>HhaI</i> (0.06), <i>HaeIII</i> (0.06)
CC0951	CGAAAGGCATTTGATGATAA	CAGACCAGCCGTCACAGTT	60	1,300	850	<i>RsaI</i> (0.30)
CC0958 ^c	CTCAATGGCGCTAATTCACAT	GAAAGCCAAACGAGAAGCAATG	57	500	500	<i>SpyI</i> (0.48)
CC0975 ^c	CCGGTGTGGTTACAGG	AGTACACAGCTATGGCAGACT	57	700	600	<i>MspI</i> (0.38), <i>DdeI</i> (0.19)
CC0983	GTTCCGATGGGATCAACA	AAATGACTCTCTTACCACCAC	62	700	500	<i>AluI</i> (0.36), <i>HaeIII</i> (0.25)
CC0991 ^c	ATGCCAGGCTGATTTCTACAA	GACACAAGCCAAACATTCACA	57	> 1,500	1,600	—
CC1015 ^c	GGAGAAATGGAGGGCATAG	AAAGCTTAAAGCAACCGAATGG	62	1,200	1,200	—
CC1017	GAAAGAGCCGCATCGTG	GCAAGCGTCCATAAATGATA	60	650	600	<i>AluI</i> (0.16)
CC1104	TTTCTACATGCGTCCAAATGC	GCTGAGATGTCCGAGCCCTA	57	800	600	—
CC1112 ^c	GGGACACTAAAGAGAAGAAAC	ATTCAGAGTCCAGCTATCAA	55	800	800	—
CC1135	TGCTGGCTGGAATTAATCAGA	GCTCGAGTGGCCTTACACAT	57	550	500	—
CC1145	TCAACAAATGGCTGAGAACGA	GTCTTCATGCCCTTGCCTCTG	57	500	650	—
CC1147	GCACCCATCTCACACTTGTCT	CCACCCTTTCATGTGATTTCT	57	700	600	<i>HinfI</i> (0.40)
CC1172 ^c	GCGCGCTTTCGTAGTTTGGAC	GGAGCATCACGAGGCACTGTA	60	600	600	<i>RsaI</i> (0.45)
CC1187 ^c	CAGATCTGCACCATGTGGAA	CAAACTGCCATGGCCAGACT	62	450	450	—
CC1195	ATGGTGCATTTGGGTGTA	ATGCTGGATCTATGGCTTTA	57	1,200	1,100	—
CC1204 ^c	CGAGGCTCTGGAAACAT	TCTGATGATTTGCCCTTACGAG	57	> 1,500	1,300	—
CC1262 ^c	GAGAAACGGGCATAGTGAG	ACATATTTCTTCCCAACTCCA	62	> 1,500	1,300	—
CC1287 ^c	TCAACTACTAGTGGGCATCTG	ACCACCTTGGCTCCTTCTT	57	500	1,500	<i>SspI</i> (0.35)
CC1319 ^c	ATAGTAATGGGGATTCAAAT	CGCCACTTACAAGAACCAACT	60	450	400	<i>DdeI</i> (0.37), <i>SspI</i> (0.35)
CC1371	TCCGCAAGCATTTTGAAGTAGG	GCCACACTCCCAACCAACT	60	700	650	<i>TaqI</i> (0.38)
CC1415	AATTAACCTTATCCGCTCGTT	ACAATAAGAGTGGCGATGC	57	> 1,500	1,500	<i>AluI</i> (0.37), <i>HinfI</i> (0.37), <i>SpyI</i> (0.38)
CC1432 ^c	TGGTGAATGACACGCTGGTT	CGTTGAAATTTCTGGGAGCAT	62	1,200	1,500	<i>MspI</i> (0.32), <i>RsaI</i> (0.32)
CC1463	TGGATGATGCTGCTGTC	CACCGGAGATTCACCTCTAC	57	800	850	<i>HaeIII</i> (0.35)
CC1531 ^c	AAACGGAGTCGAGAGATGAG	CAGTCTGTGGCGAAGAGCAAA	62	600	650	—
CC1555	CTGCCGCTTGTGTGGA	CAGTCTGTGGCGAAGAGCAAA	57	750	700	—
CC1606 ^c	TAACCAAGCTTGGCCCTCAG	ATACAATTCGGGCTACCATA	62	1,000	900	<i>AluI</i> (0.12)
CC1625 ^c	CTCCAGACAGCGGTTCTTATG	TGCCATGGACTTCTCTTCT	62	1,100	1,100	<i>RsaI</i> (0.46)

CC1689 ^c	CAGGAAGCAAACTGCCACTA	ATCCCCGGTATCCACCACATTTA	56	1,000	1,100	<i>HaeIII</i> (0.58), <i>NdeII</i> (0.50)
CC1697	GCCAGGCTGATTTCTACAA	AGACAAGACCCAAACATTCAC	62	> 1,500	1,500	<i>RsaI</i> (0.06), <i>DraI</i> (0.06)
CC1711	GGCAAGCATGAATACTGTT	AATGAAGACTTGGGAAGAAC	55	> 1,500	1,500	—
CC1787	ACTAAGCGTGGGAGAACTG	CTGCCACGCCATTCITTAI	62	400	800	—
CC1798 ^c	GGCGGCGGAGATTACTGA	TAGAAGACCGGCATTTGAGAA	57	800	800	<i>AluI</i> (0.06), <i>HaeIII</i> (0.06), <i>HaeII</i> (0.06)
CC1799	AAACGCAGTCGAGGATGAG	CACCGCAGATTCAGTCTA	57	600	600	<i>HhaI</i> (0.16)
CC1908	AGCCCTGCATGGATGAC	ATCGGCTCTGTGATCTTT	62	450	—	<i>RsaI</i> (0.36)
CC1944	GAAGGATATGTGCACAT	GCGGTAAATACCTACTATATG	62	> 1,500	—	<i>RsaI</i> (0.37)
CC1974	TCACCTCGCCCTTTCA	CAACATAACCACITTCGCAAC	55	400	380	—
CC2051	GCGAAATATTTAGCAGAA	GAACCGAACCAGACACT	57	400	800	—
CC2188 ^d	AGCTGTGCATCAAGTTTCTG	ATGGCGTGCCTCCTAA	62	1,200	1,400	—
CC2196	CGCGTATTCACCTACAGAC	GCCAGAATAAAGTGCCTATG	62	600	600	<i>AluI</i> (0.35), <i>HhaI</i> (0.35)
CC2237	AGAAATGGCCAACTGCTGAG	TTGCCCTGAAAGTGAACCAA	57	700	700	<i>TaqI</i> (0.37)
CC2286 ^d	ATAATGCCACCTCCAGGAC	AGGCCAGTTTAAACAATGTCA	57	1,100	> 1,500	<i>SmaI</i> (0.11)
CC2288	TGTAGCGGAGAAATACCAAG	CTAGACCAATGGCATAAACAT	57	600	> 2,000	<i>SmaI</i> + <i>NciI</i> (0.19)
CC2340 ^d	TACAGGAGCGGAGGAC	CTCAAACTGCCAAACAACA	63	450	1,000	<i>ALP</i> ^c (0.19)
CC2388	ATACAGAACATGACGCC	AAATAGACCACCATGAAAC	57	600	2,000	<i>HinfI</i> (0.30)
CC2427	TGTTGCTGTCTGGCTAATC	CATCAAAAGCGAGGAGAG	57	550	550	<i>AluI</i> (0.19)
CC2435 ^d	GCAGGCAGTTCAGAGTTTT	TCCGAAAGAGAGTTTATGG	57	800	900	<i>MspI</i> (0.42)
CC2448 ^d	ATCCTAAGTCCCCAGAAAAGT	GAA TTGGAATGGCATAAAGA	57	> 1,500	2,000	<i>RsaI</i> (0.34), <i>HaeIII</i> (0.34), <i>TaqI</i> (0.26)
CC2478	CGGCAAGCATTTCTGTCT	AGTTTGAGGAGGCATTAAT	57	900	800	<i>HaeIII</i> (0.35), <i>BamI</i> (0.36)
CC2483	CTAAAATAACCGCACCGAC	GCGACTGTAACTCATCTGG	62	900	800	—
CC2588 ^d	CTGCCGCTGCCGTTTATCC	TTATCCACGACGTACACAC	57	700	900	<i>MspI</i> (0.30)
CC2646	GAGTACCGAGAAAGGCTGTGA	TGACCGCTTCTGTGATGCTG	57	650	600	—
CC2702 ^d	TTCCGCAAGCCACCATAGAC	CTGCCACCAACAACCCCTCC	57	500	500	—
CC2716 ^a	GTTGACATGATCCGAAAGAG	CAAAAGCAATACTGAAAAG	57	1,000	1,000	<i>MspI</i> (0.30), <i>DdeI</i> (0.30), <i>TaqI</i> (0.30), <i>Bsr0I</i> (0.30), <i>NciI</i> (0.30)
CC2750 ^d	GGCAGCACAGACAACACA	GATACTTCTCAGGCCCAACT	62	> 1,500	> 1,500	<i>RsaI</i> (0.06), <i>TaqI</i> (0.26)
CC2752 ^d	CCGCACTGCCATCTACGACT	AACCTCTCTCCAACTCAC	62	900	1,000	<i>MspI</i> (0.36), <i>RsaI</i> (0.06), <i>AluI</i> (0.30)
CC2777	AGAAGCAGAGGAGGATGGAG	CGACAGCGAATGATTTGACC	62	350	700	—
CC2831 ^d	GGCGATGGCAGCAACGAAAG	CACGCAACCTCCACCCTAC	62	500	500	—
CC2839	TACGTACGATGCGTGGTTG	GCTCCTCTGTTTCTTCT	57	600	2,000	<i>MspI</i> (0.32), <i>AluI</i> (0.32)
CC2857	ATCAGAGGCAGTAGCAGAG	TGGCATCATGAGAGACGAG	60	600	> 2,000	—
CC2860 ^d	CTAAAGGGAACAATCAGG	TACTCGTCTTCTAACCGTCA	57	800	1,100	<i>DdeI</i> (0.30), <i>TaqI</i> (0.37)
CC2865	TTACAGAAGGAAAGGGGAGGA	GGCAAGTAAGAAAGGGCACA	57	800	1,200	—
CC2916	TCCGAAGATAACAATCCA	CCTTCAAGCCCTCAACCAA	57	700	700	—
CC2917	GGCACTCCTCTGAAAAGC	TGGGAAGAGAGACAAAAGAC	57	500	500	—
CC2920	CCGCCACATTCACGCCCTCT	CGCAGTTCCAGTAGTTTCTC	62	900	800	<i>MspI</i> (0.36), <i>Bsr0I</i> (0.35), <i>DdeI</i> (0.19)
CC2921 ^d	TTTTGGCGTGGGAGGAATG	CAAGAACTCGGTGAAGAACAG	62	> 1,500	1,400	<i>HaeIII</i> (0.29), <i>TaqI</i> (0.16)
CC2930	TTCTAGAGCTGGCCAAAGAG	AGGGAACCTGCTGTCTT	50	500	—	<i>HaeIII</i> (0.43), <i>NdeII</i> (0.41), <i>Bsr0I</i> (0.32), <i>NsiI</i> (0.32)
CC2946 ^d	GTATCCAGGGATGCTCGAAA	AAATTGCCATCTCTCTCT	50	900	1,200	—
CC2976	TTCTCATGGGAGGACAAACC	CTACCGATGCAGAAAGCTCT	60	450	500	<i>BamII</i> + <i>AvaI</i> (0.38)
CC3055 ^d	GCCCTCAGAAAATTGGATTC	TAGAGTTCAATGGAAGGCG	51	500	—	<i>TaqI</i> (0.36), <i>SspI</i> (0.35)
CC3106	AACACTGCAAGGGAGATTGG	CATGCAGAATCGTTGCATTT	52	> 1,500	—	<i>RsaI</i> (0.40), <i>HaeII</i> (0.28), <i>HhaI</i> (0.32)
CC3133 ^d	AAGTTTCATCGCCCTATGTG	AGCTCCAACCTCAAAGACCA	60	800	900	<i>EcoRI</i> (0.06)
CC3142	CTAGGGTTGTGTGGTTTCC	CCGATCCAATGTTATTTCCG	50	700	600	—
CC3152	TGGCATCTTCATGTGTTTGG	CCAGATGGCCACCTTAGT	50	1,000	—	<i>HinfI</i> (0.44), <i>Bsr0I</i> (0.21), <i>SmaI</i> (0.45)
CC3162	ATGGAGTCGCCACAAAAGAC	GTCTCGCATCAAATCTCCGT	60	700	700	<i>HhaI</i> (0.26)
CC3367 ^d	AGAGATGGCGTCACTCAIT	TACTACACCAACCGTTGCGAG	65	1,200	900	<i>NsiI</i> (0.30)
CC3397 ^d	ATGAGAATTCGTCGTAGCGG	AACTAGCCATGTGAGCAGG	55	300	300	—

Table 4 (Contd.)

STS	Forward primer	Reverse primer	Annealing temperature (°C)	Size ^a		Restriction enzymes used, and resulting PIC ^b
				<i>Chamaecyparis</i>	<i>Cryptomeria</i>	
CC3414	TATTTGGAGCTTTTGGGG	TGGGTTGGTGTGGGAAGAAT	50	600	—	<i>Msp</i> I(0.26), <i>Taq</i> I(0.53)
CC3455	TAAACAAGGAAACACAGCA	CCGCATCCCATTTGAACAGCA	60	1,000	—	<i>Rsa</i> I(0.36), <i>Hinf</i> I(0.28)
CC3583	CCACATCATCTTGATAGGG	GCAGGGCTCCAAAGTTTACAG	60	> 1,500	> 2,000	<i>Taq</i> I(0.42), <i>Dde</i> I(0.42)
CC3807	CAATCCCGTAACCAAAAACG	GCGTTGCTGATATGCTTTGA	50	> 1,500	1,000	—
CC3816 ^d	AGTCAGAGCTGCCTGGAAAG	GCCACGAAGGGATTCATTTA	60	> 1,500	2,000	<i>Rsa</i> I(0.32), <i>Dde</i> I(0.06)
CC3823 ^d	CCCACAGGACATCAAAAAC	ACGCATTTCCATCACTTCC	50	1,000	900	—
CC3839 ^d	CTGCATTTCTCTGGAAATCG	TTGGGATAAACCTTTTTGCG	50	> 1,500	2,000	—
CC3861	CTGACACTGATGAGGCCAGA	TGCAAAAGATGGAAAACACCA	57	800	—	<i>Msp</i> I(0.37), <i>Rsa</i> I(0.37), <i>Alu</i> I(0.36), <i>Hae</i> III(0.35), <i>Dde</i> I(0.36), <i>Bam</i> HI(0.36)
CC3872 ^d	AGCGGAAGTACCCCTTGGAT	GGTCCCAGTGATTCCTGA	60	> 1,500	1,600	<i>Dde</i> I(0.36), <i>Nde</i> I(0.26)

^aApproximate size of STS fragment amplified (bp). —: No PCR amplification

^bThe names of restriction enzymes that detected the polymorphisms. — No polymorphism detected, using any of the 26 restriction enzymes, among the panel of 16 individuals. *Numbers*

in parentheses indicate PIC

^cIwata et al. (2001)

^dTani et al. (2003a, b)

^eALP Amplicon length polymorphism

References

- 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* 32:314–331
- Brown GR, Kandel EE III, Bassoni DL, Kiehne KL, Temesgen B, van Buijtnen JP, Sewell MM, Marshall KA, Neale DB (2001) Anchored reference loci in loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda* L.) for integrating pine genomics. *Genetics* 159:799–809
- Brunsfeld SJ, Soltis PS, Soltis DE, Gadek PA, Quinn CJ, Strenge DD, Ranker TA (1994) Phylogenetic relationships among the genera of Taxodiaceae and Cupressaceae: evidence from *rbcL* sequences. *Syst Bot* 19:253–262
- Chagne D, Brown G, Lalanne C, Madur D, Pot D, Neale D, Plomion C (2003) Comparative genome and QTL mapping between maritime and loblolly pines. *Mol Breed* 12:185–195
- Dirlwanger E, Cosson P, Tavaud M, Jaranzana M, Poizat C, Zanetto A, Arus P, Laigret F (2002) Development of microsatellite markers in peach [*Prunus persica* (L.) Batsch] and their use in genetic diversity analysis in peach and sweet cherry (*Prunus avium* L.). *Theor Appl Genet* 105:127–138
- Eckenwalder JE (1976) Re-evaluation of Cupressaceae and Taxodiaceae: a proposed merger. *Madrono* 23:237–300
- Gale MD, Devos KM (1998) Plant comparative genetics after 10 years. *Science* 282:656–659
- Hart JA (1987) A cladistic analysis of conifers: preliminary results. *J Arnold Arboretum* 68:269–307
- Hizume M, Kondo T, Shibata F, Ishizuka R (2001) Flow cytometric determination of genome size in the Taxodiaceae, Cupressaceae *sensu stricto* and Sciadopityaceae. *Cytologia* 66:307–311
- Isagi Y, Suhandono S (1997) PCR primers amplifying microsatellite loci of *Quercus myrsinifolia* Blume and their conservation between oak species. *Mol Ecol* 6:897–899
- Iwata H, Ujino-Ihara T, Yoshimura K, Nagasaka K, Mukai Y, Tsumura Y (2001) Cleaved amplified polymorphic sequence markers in sugi, *Cryptomeria japonica* D. Don, and their location on a linkage map. *Theor Appl Genet* 103:881–895
- Kinlaw CS, Neale DB (1997) Complex gene families in pine genomes. *Trends Plant Sci* 2:356–359
- Komulainen P, Brown GR, Mikkonen M, Karhu A, Garcia-Gil MR, O'Malley D, Lee B, Neale DB, Savolainen O (2003) Comparing EST-based genetic maps between *Pinus sylvestris* and *Pinus taeda*. *Theor Appl Genet* 107:667–678
- Kusumi J, Tsumura Y, Yoshimaru H, Tachida H (2000) Phylogenetic relationships in Taxodiaceae and Cupressaceae *sensu stricto* based on *matK* gene, *chlL* gene, *trnL-trnF* IGS region, and *trnL* intron sequences. *Am J Bot* 87(10):1480–1488
- Nikaido AM, Ujino T, Iwata H, Yoshimura K, Yoshimaru H, Suyama Y, Murai M, Nagasaka K, Tsumura Y (2000) AFLP and CAPS linkage maps of *Cryptomeria japonica*. *Theor Appl Genet* 100:825–831
- Price RA, Lowenstein JM (1989) An immunological comparison of the Sciadopityaceae, Taxodiaceae, and Cupressaceae. *Syst Bot* 14:141–149
- Stefanovic S, Jager M, Broutin DJ, Masselot M (1998) Phylogenetic relationships of conifers inferred from partial 28S rRNA gene sequences. *Am J Bot* 85:688–697
- Steinkellner H, Lexer C, Turetschek E, Glossl J (1997) Conservation of (GA)_n microsatellite loci between *Quercus* species. *Mol Ecol* 6:1189–1194
- Tani N, Takahashi T, Iwata H, Mukai Y, Ujino-Ihara T, Matsumoto A, Yoshimura K, Yoshimaru H, Murai M, Nagasaka K, Tsumura Y (2003a) A consensus linkage map for sugi (*Cryptomeria japonica*) from two pedigrees, based on microsatellites and expressed sequence tags. *Genetics* 165:1551–1568
- Tani N, Tsumura Y, Sato H (2003b) Nuclear gene sequences and DNA variation of *Cryptomeria japonica* samples from the postglacial period. *Mol Ecol* 12(4):859–868

- Temesgen B, Brown GR, Harry DE, Kinlaw CS, Sewell MM, Neale DB (2001) Genetic mapping of expressed sequence tag polymorphism (EST) markers in loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda* L.). *Theor Appl Genet* 102:664–675
- Tsumura Y, Tomaru N (1999) Genetic diversity of *Cryptomeria japonica* using co-dominant DNA markers based on sequenced-tagged sites. *Theor Appl Genet* 98:396–404
- Tsumura Y, Yoshimura K, Tomaru N, Ohba K (1995) Molecular phylogeny of conifers using RFLP analysis of PCR-amplified specific chloroplast genes. *Theor Appl Genet* 91:1222–1236
- Tsumura Y, Suyama Y, Yoshimura K, Shirato N, Mukai Y (1997) Sequence-tagged-sites (STSS) of cDNA clones in *Cryptomeria japonica* and their evaluation as molecular markers in conifers. *Theor Appl Genet* 94:764–772
- Tsumura Y, Tomaru N, Suyama Y, Bacchus S (1999) Genetic diversity and differentiation of *Taxodium* in the southeastern United States using cleaved amplified polymorphic sequences. *Heredity* 83:229–238
- Ujino T, Kawahara T, Tsumura Y, Nagamitsu T, Yoshimaru H, Ratnam W (1998) Development and polymorphism of simple sequence repeat DNA markers for *Shorea cuetisii* and Dipterocarpaceae species. *Heredity* 81:422–428
- Ujino-Ihara T, Yoshimura K, Yoshimaru H, Nagasaka K, Tsumura Y (2000) Expression analysis of ESTs derived from the inner bark of *Cryptomeria japonica*. *Plant Mol Biol* 43:451–457
- Ujino-Ihara T, Matsumoto A, Iwata H, Yoshimura K, Tsumura Y (2002) Single-strand conformation polymorphism of sequence-tagged site markers based on partial sequences of cDNA clones in *Cryptomeria japonica*. *Genes Genet Syst* 77:251–257
- Wakamiya I, Newton RJ, Johnston JS, Price HJ (1993) Genome size and environmental factors in the genus *Pinus*. *Am J Bot* 80:1235–1241