

D. Chagné · P. Chaumeil · A. Ramboer · C. Collada ·  
A. Guevara · M. T. Cervera · G. G. Vendramin ·  
V. Garcia · J-M Frigerio · C. Echt · T. Richardson ·  
C. Plomion

## Cross-species transferability and mapping of genomic and cDNA SSRs in pines

Received: 3 December 2004 / Accepted: 30 March 2004 / Published online: 22 September 2004  
© Springer-Verlag 2004

**Abstract** Two unigene datasets of *Pinus taeda* and *Pinus pinaster* were screened to detect di-, tri- and tetranucleotide repeated motifs using the *SSRIT* script. A total of 419 simple sequence repeats (SSRs) were identified, from which only 12.8% overlapped between the two sets. The position of the SSRs within their coding sequences were

Communicated by D.B. Neale

**Electronic Supplementary Material** Supplementary material is available for this article at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00122-004-1683-z>

D. Chagné · P. Chaumeil · A. Ramboer · J.-M. Frigerio ·  
C. Plomion (✉)  
UMR 1202 BIOGECO-INRA,  
Equipe de génétique, 69 route d'Arcachon,  
33610 Cestas Cédex, France  
e-mail: [plomion@pierroton.inra.fr](mailto:plomion@pierroton.inra.fr)  
Tel.: +33-557-122838  
Fax: +33-557-122881

C. Collada  
Departamento de Biotecnología, Escuela Técnica Superior de  
Ingenieros de Montes de Madrid, UPM, Ciudad Universitaria  
sn,  
28040 Madrid, Spain

A. Guevara · M. T. Cervera  
Departamento de Genética Forestal, CIFOR-INIA,  
Carretera de la Coruna Km 7,  
28040 Madrid, Spain

G. G. Vendramin  
Istituto di Genetica Vegetale, Sezione di Firenze, Consiglio  
Nazionale delle Ricerche,  
Via Madonna del Piano,  
50019, Sesto Fiorentino,  
Firenze, Italy

V. Garcia  
UMR Physiologie et Biotechnologie Végétale, INRA  
Bordeaux,  
71 avenue E. Bourleaux,  
33883 Villenave d'Ormon Cédex, France

C. Echt · T. Richardson  
New Zealand Forest Research Institute Ltd,  
Private Bag 3020 Rotorua, New Zealand

predicted using *FrameD*. Trinucleotides appeared to be the most abundant repeated motif (63 and 51% in *P. taeda* and *P. pinaster*, respectively) and tended to be found within translated regions (76% in both species), whereas dinucleotide repeats were preferentially found within the 5'- and 3'-untranslated regions (75 and 65%, respectively). Fifty-three primer pairs amplifying a single PCR fragment in the source species (mainly *P. taeda*), were tested for amplification in six other pine species. The amplification rate with other pine species was high and corresponded with the phylogenetic distance between species, varying from 64.6% in *P. canariensis* to 94.2% in *P. radiata*. Genomic SSRs were found to be less transferable; 58 of the 107 primer pairs (i.e., 54%) derived from *P. radiata* amplified a single fragment in *P. pinaster*. Nine cDNA-SSRs were located to their chromosomes in two *P. pinaster* linkage maps. The level of polymorphism of these cDNA-SSRs was compared to that of previously and newly developed genomic-SSRs. Overall, genomic SSRs tend to perform better in terms of heterozygosity and number of alleles. This study suggests that useful SSR markers can be developed from pine ESTs.

### Introduction

In contrast to other plant species, few polymorphic single-copy nuclear microsatellite markers or simple sequence repeats (SSR) have been reported in the Pinaceae (reviewed in Table 1). The genome structure of these species, characterised by a large physical size (22 pg/C, Leitch et al. 2001) with a large amount of repeated sequence (Kriebel 1985; Kamm et al. 1996; Kossack and Kinlaw 1999; Elsik and Williams 2000) has been the main obstacle to the development of useful markers. In addition, the ancient divergence time between coniferous species (Price et al. 1998) and the complexity of their genomes means that transferability of single-copy SSRs among genera and even within *Pinus* (the most studied genus) is generally poor, resulting in a large proportion of amplification failure, non-specific amplification, multi-banding

patterns or lack of polymorphism (Echt et al. 1999; Mariette et al. 2001). Given the high cost of developing useful SSR markers, cross-species transferability is a valuable attribute.

In an attempt to circumvent these genome-related problems, Elsik and Williams (2001) removed most of the repetitive portion of the genome using a DNA reassociation kinetics-based method, and Zhou et al. (2002) targeted the low-copy portion of the genome using an undermethylated region enrichment method. Both approaches yielded remarkable enrichment for useful SSR markers in *Pinus taeda*. Scotti et al. (2002a, b) used an alternative strategy based on the pre-screening of single-copy microsatellite containing clones, using dot blot hybridisation analysis, and also obtained a high number of single-copy polymorphic SSR markers in *Picea abies*. *Pinus taeda* SSRs developed by Elsik and Williams (2001) and Zhou et al. (2002) transferred quite well between American hard pines (Shepherd et al. 2002), but were shown to be less transferable in the phylogenetically divergent Mediterranean hard pines (Gonzalez-Martinez et al. 2004). Interestingly, perfect trinucleotide SSRs transferred from American to Mediterranean pines better than other motifs (Kutil and Williams 2001).

Simple sequence repeats have been found in all genomic regions, including coding regions (Toth et al. 2000). By developing a cDNA library enriched in SSRs, Scotti et al. (2000) showed the presence of microsatellites within the coding regions of Norway spruce (*Picea abies*), a species belonging to the Pinaceae. The availability of expressed sequence tags (ESTs) resulting from large sequencing projects is potentially a valuable source of SSRs that can be evaluated with less intensive laboratory development. Recently, cDNA-SSRs were obtained from EST databases developed in several plant species such as grape (Scott et al. 2000), cereals (Temnykh et al. 2000, 2001; Cho et al. 2000; Cordeiro et al. 2001; Kantety et al. 2002; Eujayl et al. 2002; Varshney et al. 2002; Gao et al. 2003) and *Arabidopsis* (Cardle et al. 2000; Morgante et al. 2002). These EST-derived markers showed good transferability between phylogenetically related species (Eujayl et al. 2003; Gupta et al. 2003).

The objectives of this study were threefold: (1) to investigate the relative occurrence and types of SSRs present in the coding regions of two pine genomes, (2) compare polymorphism levels of SSRs derived from cDNA and genomic sources, and (3) compare the transferability of cDNA-SSRs and genomic SSR markers across several pine species.

## Materials and methods

### In silico SSR detection in pine ESTs

Public EST database were independently assembled for *Pinus pinaster* and *P. taeda* using StackPack (Christoffels et al. 2001). A total of 18,498 *P. pinaster* ESTs provided 2,893 contigs and 5,001 singletons (<http://cbl.labri.fr/>

[outils/SAM/COMPLETE/index.php](http://cbl.labri.fr/outils/SAM/COMPLETE/index.php)). For *P. taeda*, 8,070 contigs and 12,307 singletons resulted from 75,047 ESTs ([http://web.ahc.umn.edu/biodata/nsfpine/contig\\_dir16/](http://web.ahc.umn.edu/biodata/nsfpine/contig_dir16/)).

*Pinus pinaster* and *P. taeda* unigene sets were searched for tandemly repeated motifs of 2, 3 and 4 bp using the *SSRIT* SSR search tool (Temnykh et al. 2001; <http://www.gramene.org/db/searches/ssrtool>), with 14, 15 and 20 as the minimum repeat length, respectively. We associated the *SSRIT* Perl script with the *FrameD* gene prediction software (Schiex et al. 2003) to determine if the detected repeat motifs were located in the 5' or 3' untranslated regions (UTRs) or in the open reading frames (ORF). *FrameD* was developed to predict the position of the translated regions in EST sequences. Because *FrameD* uses interpolated Markov models (IMM; Salzberg et al. 1998) to build probabilistic models of coding sequences, a pine-specific IMM was constructed to enhance the prediction in *P. taeda* and *P. pinaster* sequences. We used 67 kb from 65 pine full-length coding sequences to build the *Pinus* IMM (Table S2). Finally, the sequences containing microsatellites in *P. pinaster* and *P. taeda* were compared in order to check the redundancy of the sequences containing SSRs in both species.

### PCR primer design and amplification

We designed 56 PCR primer pairs (set no. 1) flanking the microsatellites identified with our in silico analysis using Primer v3.0 software ([http://www-genome.wi.mit.edu/cgi-bin/primer/primer3\\_www.cgi](http://www-genome.wi.mit.edu/cgi-bin/primer/primer3_www.cgi)) with default parameters, except that we used a range of 40–55% for the primer GC%, GC clamps of 2 bases and a maximum  $T_m$  difference of 10. We kept the expected amplified fragment length below 500 bp to avoid the risk of the presence of introns, which may induce PCR failure. Fifty-three out of 56 PCR primers were designed based on *P. taeda* sequences and three were developed from *P. pinaster* sequences. The PCR primers were chosen to represent the broadest range of SSRs possible considering the repeat type (di-, tri- or tetranucleotide), the motif (e.g., AG, AT), the length (5–26 repeats) and the position (UTR or ORF). In addition to these new SSRs, we also included a set of 16 cDNA-SSRs previously developed from *P. taeda* sequences (set no. 2, C. Echt, [http://dendrome.ucdavis.edu/Gen\\_res.htm](http://dendrome.ucdavis.edu/Gen_res.htm)). This second set resulted from a SSR search using a preliminary sequence dataset of about 10,000 *P. taeda* ESTs.

A third set of 107 PCR primers (set no. 3) was developed from *P. radiata* genomic SSRs and screened for amplification success in pine species (C. Echt and T. Richardson, unpublished data). A fourth set of three SSR markers described by Mariette et al. (2001) was also used (set no. 4).

DNA was isolated using the protocol described by Doyle and Doyle (1990). PCR reactions were performed with 15 ng of genomic DNA in a total reaction volume of 10  $\mu$ l, with 1 $\times$  reaction buffer (Gibco BRL), 2 mM MgCl<sub>2</sub>, 1  $\mu$ M of each primer, 0.2 mM of dNTP and 0.5 U of *Taq*

polymerase (Gibco BRL) on a Stratagene Robocycler Gradient 96 (Stratagene, La Jolla, Calif., USA) using the following cycles: preliminary denaturing (94°C, 5 min) followed by 30 cycles of denaturing (94°C, 30 s), annealing (locus-specific temperature, 30 s), and extension (72°C, 1 min), and a final extension (72°C, 10 min). An additional touchdown was performed for some loci (10 cycles with the annealing temperature decreasing by 1°C for every cycle).

Amplification success was checked on 1.5% agarose gels. We checked that the amplification showed a single band pattern with a size corresponding to the expected length. Amplifications resulting in multiple bands were discarded from further analysis since they could result from non-specific amplification or paralogous loci. The useful loci were then run on a LICOR automated sequencer using the same conditions described by Mariette

**Table 1** Di-, tri- and tetranucleotide SSR detection in *Pinus pinaster* and *P. taeda* unigenes using *SSRIT* software

Species	Development of SSR loci				Transfer of SSR loci		
	SSR origin	Number of primer pairs tested	Number of polymorphic single copy SSR loci	Reference	Number of markers tested in other conifers	Number of successfully transferred markers	Reference
<i>Pinus radiata</i> <sup>H-am</sup>	EGL	2	2	Smith and Devey 1994	2	2 <sup>H</sup> 0 <sup>S</sup> 0 <sup>P</sup>	Echt et al. 1999
					2	1 <sup>H-me</sup>	Karhu et al. 2000
					2	0 <sup>H-me</sup>	Mariette et al. 2001
					2	0 <sup>H-am</sup>	Shepherd et al. 2002
<i>Pinus radiata</i> <sup>H-am</sup>	TGL	43*	2	Fisher et al. 1998	7	7 <sup>H</sup> 3 <sup>S</sup> 1 <sup>P</sup>	Fisher et al. 1998
	EGL		11		4	3 <sup>H-me</sup> 3 <sup>H-am</sup> 0 <sup>S</sup> 0 <sup>P</sup>	Echt et al. 1999
					2	0 <sup>H-me</sup>	Mariette et al. 2001
					7	4 <sup>H-am</sup>	Shepherd et al. 2002
					20	11 <sup>H-am</sup>	Devey et al. 1999
<i>Pinus radiata</i> <sup>H-am</sup>	EGL	50	10	Devey et al. 2002			
<i>Pinus taeda</i> <sup>H-am</sup>	ELCL	18	16	Elsik et al. 2000b	7	7 <sup>H-am</sup> 5 <sup>H-me</sup>	Kutil and Williams 2001
					25**	13 <sup>H-am</sup>	Shepherd et al. 2002
					19**	10 <sup>H-me</sup>	Gonzalez-Martinez et al. 2003
<i>Pinus taeda</i> <sup>H-am</sup>	ELCL	29	15	Elsik and Williams 2001			
	EGL	37	8				
<i>Pinus taeda</i> <sup>H-am</sup>	ELCL	8	8	Kutil and Williams 2001	8	8 <sup>H-am</sup> 2 <sup>H-me</sup>	Kutil and Williams 2001
<i>Pinus taeda</i> <sup>H-am</sup>	EUML	36	19	Zhou et al. 2002			
<i>Pinus contorta</i> <sup>H-am</sup>	EGL	5	5	Hicks et al. 1998			
<i>Pinus sylvestris</i> <sup>H-me</sup>	TGL	2	0	Kostia et al. 1995			
<i>Pinus sylvestris</i> <sup>H-me</sup>	EGL	37	7	Soranzo et al. 1998	3	3 <sup>H-me</sup>	Gonzalez-Martinez et al. 2003
<i>Pinus halepensis</i> <sup>H-me</sup>	EGL	25	8	Keys et al. 2000	8	7 <sup>H-me</sup>	Keys et al. 2000
					8	1 <sup>H-me</sup>	Mariette et al. 2001
<i>Pinus pinaster</i> <sup>H-me</sup>	EGL	29	2	Mariette et al. 2001			
<i>Pinus densiflora</i> <sup>H-as</sup>	EGL	14	6	Lian et al. 2000	6	6 <sup>H-as</sup> 5 <sup>H-am</sup> 0 <sup>S</sup>	Lian et al. 2000
<i>Pinus strobus</i> <sup>S</sup>	EGL	77	19	Echt et al. 1996	15	12 <sup>S</sup> 0 <sup>H</sup> 0 <sup>P</sup>	Echt et al. 1999
					28	3 <sup>H</sup>	Karhu et al. 2000
					4	0 <sup>H</sup>	Mariette et al. 2001
					5	0 <sup>H</sup>	Shepherd et al. 2002
					4	0 <sup>S</sup>	Echt et al. 1999
<i>Pinus strobus</i> <sup>S</sup>	EGL	4	0	Echt et al. 1999			
<i>Picea sitchensis</i> <sup>SP</sup>	EGL	7	4	van de Ven and Mac Nicol 1996			
<i>Picea abies</i> <sup>SP</sup>	EGL	36	7	Pfeiffer et al. 1997			
<i>Picea abies</i> <sup>SP</sup>	EGL	96	34	Paglia et al. 1998			
<i>Picea abies</i> <sup>SP</sup>	ECDL	6	6	Scotti et al. 2000			
<i>Picea abies</i> <sup>SP</sup>	EGL	55	16	Scotti et al. 2002a (tri)			
<i>Picea abies</i> <sup>SP</sup>	EGL	53	16	Scotti et al. 2002b			
<i>Picea glauca</i> <sup>SP</sup>	EGL	13	13	Hodgetts et al. 2001	13	12 <sup>SP</sup>	Hodgetts et al. 2001
<i>Picea glauca</i> <sup>SP</sup>	EGL	16	6	Rajora et al. 2001	6	6 <sup>SP</sup>	Rajora et al. 2001
<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> <sup>P</sup>	EGL	102	48	Amarasinghe and Carlson 2002	50	31 <sup>P</sup>	Amarasinghe and Carlson 2002
<i>Tsuga heterophylla</i> <sup>P</sup>	EGL	16	11	Amarasinghe et al. 2003			
<i>Cryptomeria japonica</i> <sup>P</sup>	EST	3	2	Moriguchi et al. 2003			
	EGL	67*	31				
	TGL		1				
<b>Total</b>	-	776	333 (43%)		213	108 (50%)	

et al. (2001) to precisely determine the length of each amplification product (i.e., allele).

### Sequencing


Amplified fragments in *P. pinaster* were cloned and sequenced as described by Dubos and Plomion (2003) in order to check the orthology of the same markers as based on sequence identity.

### Plant material

Polymorphism and reliable co-dominant inheritance were tested in three *P. pinaster* mapping pedigrees (the INRA-F2 pedigree, Costa et al. 2000; the INRA-G2 pedigree Chagné et al. 2002; and the AFOCEL-F1 pedigree, Ritter et al. 2002) for which saturated genetic maps are available, and a fourth (INIA-F1) which is under construction (M.T. Cervera, unpublished data). Loci that were polymorphic in at least one mapping pedigree were also tested on 26 unrelated *P. pinaster* elite trees from the Aquitaine region (south-western France). These trees are first generation selections for the *P. pinaster* breeding programme and were used to estimate the level of diversity (heterozygosity and number of alleles) of the SSRs.

Samples from seven species belonging to the genus *Pinus* (subgenus *Pinus*): *P. canariensis*, *P. halepensis*, *P. pinaster*, *P. pinea*, *P. radiata*, *P. sylvestris*, and *P. taeda* were used to test the amplification rate of the cDNA-SSR markers.

**Fig. 1** Distribution of the different classes of di- and trinucleotide SSRs in *Pinus taeda* (grey boxes) and *P. pinaster* (black boxes) unigenes



### Mapping

Markers segregating in the INRA-G2 and INRA-F2 mapping pedigree were visually scored and assigned two allele genotypes. We used Joinmap v3.0 (Van Oijen and Voorrips 2001) using a minimum LOD of 6.0 for genetic map construction. The Arlequin software (Schneider et al. 2000) was used to estimate genetic diversity parameters based on the genotypes of the 26 unrelated *P. pinaster* individuals.

### Results

#### SSR detection in pine ESTs and sequence annotation

A total of 251 and 168 SSRs were found in *P. taeda* and *P. pinaster* unigene sets (Table S3). This corresponds to enrichment rates of 1.2 and 2.1%, respectively (Table 1). The most common repeat types were trinucleotides (63% in *P. taeda* and 51% in *P. pinaster*), followed by dinucleotides (36% in *P. taeda* and 45% in *P. pinaster*). Tetranucleotide repeats were almost absent (1% in *P. taeda* and 3% in *P. pinaster*). These results were obtained for a minimum repeat number of 7, 5 and 5 for di-, tri- and tetranucleotide motifs, respectively. These thresholds are comparable to those used by Cardle et al. (2000) and Scott et al. (2000), and correspond to perfect motifs only. If we used less stringent detection criteria (e.g., minimum of 5 repeats for dinucleotides, as in Morgante et al. 2002) and allowed the detection of compound motifs we have estimated that the SSR enrichment would increase by twofold.

these 53 cDNA-SSR markers in seven pine species. Overall, the amplification rates in non-source species ranged between 64.6% in *P. canariensis* and 94.2% in *P. radiata*. This transferability rate was comparable to the result obtained with EST-derived markers in pines (Brown et al. 2001; Chagné et al. 2003; Komulainen et al. 2003). Fifty-eight out of 107 (54%) of the set no. 3 *P. radiata* SSR markers amplified a single band in *P. pinaster*. This transferability rate was higher than of Gonzalez-Martinez et al. (2004) in *P. pinaster* using *P. taeda*-derived SSRs (42%), and that of Shepherd et al. (2002) in *P. elliotii* and *P. caribaea* using *P. radiata*-derived SSRs (44%). Overall, the interspecific transferability of cDNA-SSR markers was higher than that of the genomic SSRs.

Polyorphism, orthology, and genetic mapping of cDNA and genomic SSRs in *Pinus pinaster*

Among the 46 single-copy cDNA and 58 genomic SSR loci that amplified in *P. pinaster*, nine (19.5%) and seven (12%) were found to be polymorphic in at least one of the four mapping pedigrees, respectively. Six out of 18 (33%) of the cDNA-SSRs located in UTRs were polymorphic, compared to three out of 30 (10%) of those located in ORFs. This result suggests that a pre-annotation of the sequences containing SSRs can be used to enrich for primer pairs that yield polymorphic cDNA-SSR markers. If we consider the repeat type and position of the cDNA-SSRs (Table 2), then it should be noted that five out of 17 dinucleotide cDNA-SSRs (29%) were polymorphic in at least one *P. pinaster* mapping pedigree whereas four out of 35 (11%) trinucleotide cDNA-SSRs were polymorphic.

We verified the orthology for the seven polymorphic SSR loci originated from *P. radiata* genomic library by sequencing PCR products obtained by amplifying *P. pinaster* DNA. The high levels of sequence identity found for six of the loci (Table 3) were comparable to the levels found between orthologous pine ESTs in previous studies (Brown et al. 2001; Chagné et al. 2003; Komulainen et al. 2003). Interestingly, one locus (NZPR1702\_b) was not homologous between the species and did not contain an SSR motif. Electrophoresis on an acrylamide gel showed that this locus presented two distinct bands, 30 bp apart (i.e., two alleles corresponding to an insertion-deletion polymorphism). This locus presented the lowest genetic diversity ( $H=0.38$ ), and was subsequently discarded for the comparison between genomic and cDNA SSRs (see next section).

The chromosomal assignments of 19 polymorphic SSR markers in the NRA-G2 and NRA-F2 genetic maps (Chagné et al. 2002; Costa et al. 2000) and their polymorphism state in two other *P. pinaster* pedigrees are presented in Table 4. All the loci were linked with a minimum LOD of 6.0, except for locus *ssrPt\_cig275* that was not linked to any linkage group in either of the maps. The three SSR markers of set No. 4 previously developed by Mariette et al. (2001) were also mapped in both pedigrees. Overall, these SSRs made it possible to align

Regarding the types of repeated motif (Fig. 1), the AT and AG motifs were the most represented among the dinucleotides (76 and 19% in *P. taeda*, and 47 and 51% in *P. pinaster*, respectively), whereas the AC and CG types were rare (<3% in both species). Regarding trinucleotides, the AAG motif was the most common repeat type (23.9 and 19.3% in *P. taeda* and *P. pinaster*, respectively), followed by AGC and AGG motifs.

Figure 2 shows the position of the detected SSRs in the gene sequences of both species based on the results obtained with *Framed* (Schix et al. 2003). Significant differences between di- and trinucleotide SSRs were observed. Dinucleotides were found mostly in the UTRs (75 and 65% in *P. taeda* and *P. pinaster*, respectively), whereas trinucleotides were more frequent in the ORFs (76% in both species). For both type of repeats, SSRs were less abundant in the 5' UTR than in the 3' UTR.

By assembling the *P. taeda* and *P. pinaster* contigs and singletons that contained SSRs using StackPack (Chittotoff et al. 2001), we found that only 22 of the 171 (12.8%) *P. pinaster* sequences matched contig sequences in the *P. taeda* unigene set, providing a catalogue of 397 non-redundant putative SSR markers for pines.

Transferability of cDNA and genomic SSRs in pines

As a representative sample, 72 primer pairs (sets no. 1 and 2) were designed from cDNA-SSR sequences. Fifty-two out of the 69 *P. taeda* and one out of the three *P. pinaster* cDNA-SSRs amplified a single band of the expected size in the source species. The multi-banding pattern observed for five loci could be attributed to non-specific amplifications or the presence of multi-gene families that are frequent in pines (Kinlaw and Neale 1997). The lack of amplification obtained for 14 loci, could be explained by the quality of the primer pairs and/or the presence of introns. Table 2 summarizes the amplification success for




Fig. 2 Distribution of the di- and trinucleotide SSRs within the open reading frame (ORF, in white) or in the 5' untranslated regions (UTR, dark grey) and 3' UTR (light grey) in *P. taeda* and *P. pinaster* contigs. Sequences for which no ORF could be detected were not considered

**Table 2** Cross-specific amplification of 53 cDNA-SSR markers: locus ID and amplification in seven hard pine species. The locus nomenclature follows the recommendations of the Treegenes database ([http://dendrome.ucdavis.edu/Tree\\_Page.htm](http://dendrome.ucdavis.edu/Tree_Page.htm)) for pine STS, also described by Brown et al. (2001). Position in the gene: *UTR* untranslated region, *ORF* open reading frame, *NP* no protein. The annealing temperature (°C) or touchdown

set	Locus name	Identification	Repeated motif	Number of repeat	Position in gene	Forward primer	Reverse primer	Annealing temperature	Expected length (bp)	Amplification						
										<i>Pp</i>	<i>Pt</i>	<i>Pr</i>	<i>Ps</i>	<i>Ph</i>	<i>Ppi</i>	<i>Pc</i>
1	SrPp_cn524	Contig524 <sup>c</sup>	AG	14	5'UTR	cgatgttttcgcccttaagc	aaatattgcggcggtgtgic	50	156	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
1	SrPt_AA739797	AA739797 <sup>b</sup>	AT	11	3'UTR	actttgcggtgcaatcagacc	aaagtatggctctgtctatga	51	281	+	+	+	-	-	-	-
1	SrPt_AW010960	AW010960 <sup>b</sup>	AT	9	ORF	atcgactagcagcaggtgg	tcctctgtagccccccttta	49	225	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1	SrPt_AW225917	AW225917 <sup>b</sup>	AT	9	3'UTR	tgcattgaanaatacagccgg	attatgtaagagagcccccaca	49	198	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1	SrPt_AW981642	AW981642 <sup>b</sup>	AAG	7	ORF	gtggcacagggctttcttgat	caaaccttcggtagagcccat	60-50	245	-	+	+	NA	NA	NA	NA
1	SrPt_AW981772	AW981772 <sup>b</sup>	CCT	4	ORF	gaticcgttccctccctcc	ccgggacaggaacagccaaca	49	266	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1	SrPt_BF049767	BF049767 <sup>b</sup>	AG	22	ORF	tthgggtcgtatggaaacctg	taaacggggctctctctcgg	51	227	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
1	SrPt_BF778306	BF778306 <sup>b</sup>	AG	7	NP	gaagatggagagacagcaggg	tthcagctctgttgccttgg	60-50	172	-	+	+	NA	NA	NA	NA
1	SrPt_cig1376	Contig1376 <sup>a</sup>	AT	20	NP	cgatataatgattttctctgtga	aaatcagctcccaacttaaatac	60-50	145	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
1	SrPt_cig1525	Contig1525 <sup>a</sup>	AGG	7	ORF	tgaaccataaagaacagacc	agaccctgggtgaaggaggc	60-50	173	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1	SrPt_cig16480	Contig16480 <sup>a</sup>	AAAT	13	NP	ctaaacatcgtgctcggaaagc	attatgacagccctctctgc	60-50	151	+	+	+	NA	NA	NA	NA
1	SrPt_cig16811	Contig16811 <sup>a</sup>	AT	11	5'UTR	gtccatgatgttgcagatggg	tgtcccnaatggctctctgc	56	199	+	+	+	-	-	-	+
1	SrPt_cig17601	Contig17607 <sup>a</sup>	AAG	9	ORF	cgccatataatagctctaccg	atctctgcctcttggaaat	54	225	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1	SrPt_cig18103	Contig18103 <sup>a</sup>	AT	10	NP	ccctggattcatttgggctaa	catggccaactcttgcatttg	60	184	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1	SrPt_cig2300	Contig2300 <sup>a</sup>	CCG	6	ORF	cactttgcgagagactgcaac	acgctgaaagcnaatcgaagaa	49	173	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1	SrPt_cig275	Contig275 <sup>a</sup>	AT	16	3'UTR	acggagatataatgtctggcg	aaagaatacagctgaaacaaacc	60-50	137	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
1	SrPt_cig3021	Contig3021 <sup>a</sup>	AGC	14	ORF	ctcagattctccaatggcg	catgcaacataatgcaaacccg	60-50	234	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1	SrPt_cig3089	Contig3089 <sup>a</sup>	AT	17	NP	ctttctacgtttggagctctt	ttagccatggagaggtggcagga	45	482	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
1	SrPt_cig3754	Contig3754 <sup>a</sup>	AGC	6	5'UTR	tccttgggtttctggagctgg	gctgttgcctgttctcttgg	60-50	421	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1	SrPt_cig4363	Contig4363 <sup>a</sup>	AT	10	3'UTR	taataatcaagccaaccgg	agcaggcctataataacaacagc	60-50	100	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1	SrPt_cig4487a	Contig4487 <sup>a</sup>	CCG	5	ORF	tcctcctgttggagacaacct	tcttggctccaanaatctcgg	60-50	155	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
1	SrPt_cig4487b	Contig4487 <sup>a</sup>	CCG	10	3'UTR	atgaccgataltaacaggggaa	tggcacaagaaagcaggtttg	45	254	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
1	SrPt_cig4698	Contig4698 <sup>a</sup>	ATC	10	ORF	cgaanaaggttggctctgatgg	tttccgctgggatttaaac	49	246	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1	SrPt_cig5167	Contig5167 <sup>a</sup>	AAC	7	ORF	tgcagagagatgatgggg	attttgtttgtttctggc	60-50	293	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1	SrPt_cig5333	Contig5333 <sup>a</sup>	AGC	7	ORF	gaaaggatcggcgataaacag	gggaatcagacctggaagaa	49	163	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
1	SrPt_cig6390	Contig6390 <sup>a</sup>	AAG	8	5'UTR	atccacgacttggcagcgc	atcaaccnaacttaggcagcgc	45	440	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
1	SrPt_cig64	Contig64 <sup>a</sup>	CCG	7	ORF	ggaaagctgttaacaagctggc	atcggagaaagagagggagggc	60-50	284	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1	SrPt_cig7024	Contig7024 <sup>a</sup>	AAG	7	ORF	gggaattctcaagagacaaggc	aaactaacctcggagagccccc	60-50	277	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
1	SrPt_cig7081	Contig7081 <sup>a</sup>	CCG	7	ORF	gtcaatcagcttcaatggc	tcacaactgcaaccnaactggcc	60-50	442	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
1	SrPt_cig7141	Contig7141 <sup>a</sup>	CCG	8	ORF	gtaatgacgattatcagggg	tcaccttcaacctctggcc	45	381	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
1	SrPt_cig7170	Contig7170 <sup>a</sup>	AGC	5	ORF	ggttttgcgattatcagggg	aaacaggtgycacaatagccc	60-50	385	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
1	SrPt_cig7425	Contig7425 <sup>a</sup>	AAG	6	ORF	aaataagcccacagagagacc	gacgctttcacaatataagcc	60-50	384	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
1	SrPt_cig7444	Contig7444 <sup>a</sup>	AT	10	5'UTR	ttcaaccatcgtttctcc	tggatctgttcaacctctcaatc	58	285	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1	SrPt_cig7731	Contig7731 <sup>a</sup>	AT	12	5'UTR	agttgggtgagggctccatcg	gatalaacacaanaagccagaca	51	217	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Table 2 (continued)

Primer		Locus information				Amplification										
set	Locus name	Identification	Repeated motif	Number of repeat	Position in gene	Forward primer	Reverse primer	Amplification temperature	Expected length (bp)	<i>Pp</i>	<i>Pt</i>	<i>Pr</i>	<i>Ps</i>	<i>Ph</i>	<i>Ppi</i>	<i>Pc</i>
1	SrPt_c1g7824	Contig7824 <sup>a</sup>	AT	12	3'UTR	tgacctgtctggagagcgc	tttgaacaagattgcagcc	60–50	501	+	+	+	+	+	–	–
1	SrPt_c1g7867	Contig7867 <sup>a</sup>	CCG	6	5'UTR	ggctcgtggagaggtgggg	actgataacaagctgcccc	45	154	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1	SrPt_c1g8064	Contig8064 <sup>a</sup>	ACC	6	ORF	gaacgtlgtltagcggtag	tcgltggcaaatctctccc	50	147	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1	SrPt_c1g865	Contig865 <sup>a</sup>	AT	15	3'UTR	ttcagaagctcccggatttg	cttgggacaatgthaaag	45	232	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1	SrPt_c1g8767	Contig8767 <sup>a</sup>	AGC	8	ORF	tggggaaaatgacatacat	ggagcagacaccatggact	55	180	+	+	+	–	–	–	–
1	SrPt_c1g9249	Contig9249 <sup>a</sup>	AAG	7	5'UTR	ctgtcccctcagctctcc	agacgtcacttgcattacc	55	156	+	+	–	–	–	–	–
1	SrPt_c1g946	Contig946 <sup>a</sup>	AGG	9	3'UTR	tatcagrtatggctctccgc	aaataggagccctctggga	53	287	+	+	+	–	–	–	–
1	SrPt_c1g988	Contig988 <sup>a</sup>	AT	7	3'UTR	taataatcaagccacccc	aacatttggacagatagccc	51	319	+	+	+	–	–	–	–
2	RPltest1	Contig4518 <sup>a</sup>	AAT	7	5'UTR	gatcgttatctctctcgcca	ttcgatactctccctgttg	50	125	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2	RPltest5	Contig6309 <sup>a</sup>	AAC	6	ORF	acaacaataaacggggggc	acgcttagatctctctgca	55	197	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2	RPltest6	Contig3845 <sup>a</sup>	TGC	5	ORF	aggattccaacagcatalcacc	ctgaaacatggaagcggcaggt	55	147	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2	RPltest8	Contig8048 <sup>a</sup>	CCG	6	ORF	ggltggagattggaattcgt	tttgcagctctgttgcctttg	60–50	196	–	–	–	–	NA	NA	NA
2	RPltest9	Contig1667 <sup>a</sup>	AGC	10	ORF	ccagacaacccaatgaaagg	gccctgctatcgaatcagaa	51	289	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2	RPltest11	Contig3631 <sup>a</sup>	ATC	7	3'UTR	aggatggcctatgatatggcg	aaacataacaagaaggctcg	56	213	+	+	+	+	–	–	–
2	RPltest13	AA739656 <sup>b</sup>	CTG	5	ORF	gattttcaggaagaacccc	tgtaaggcacaagaacctctt	51	277	+	+	+	+	–	–	–
2	RPltest15	Contig8064 <sup>a</sup>	ACC	6	ORF	gaacgtlgtltagcggtag	ccaggggacagataccagcat	56	246	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2	RPltest16	AA739818 <sup>b</sup>	AGT	5	ORF	cagaaatggcgtccaattc	accoccatlatalcccagc	56	132	+	+	+	+	–	–	–
2	RPltest20	Contig6393 <sup>a</sup>	AGC	5	ORF	gttcccactcaagggttggaa	acatcatgttggcgcata	56	259	+	+	+	+	–	–	–
2	RPltestLP5	AF013805 <sup>b</sup>	AAT	6	5'UTR	agagggttccaacggagagt	tcgactctgattcttaccatgaa	60–50	176	–	–	–	–	NA	NA	NA
Amplification rate (%)								86.8	100	94.2	85.4	72.9	70.8	64.6		

<sup>a</sup>*Pinus taeda* unigene contig numbering ([http://web.ahc.umn.edu/biodata/nsfpine/contig\\_dir16/](http://web.ahc.umn.edu/biodata/nsfpine/contig_dir16/))<sup>b</sup>GenBank accession<sup>c</sup>*Pinus pinaster* unigene contig numbering (<http://cbi.labri.fr/outils/SAM/COMPLETE/index.php>)

**Table 3** *Pinus radiata* genomic SSR markers that were mapped in *P. pinaster* and marker sequence homologies between *P. pinaster* and *P. radiata*

Primer set	Locus name	Repeated motif	Forward primer	Reverse primer	Annealing temperature (°C)	Expected length (bp)	Sequence homology (%)
3	NZPR1078	AC <sub>10</sub>	tggtgatcaagccttttcc	ggtgatgagtgatggcatgg	53	342	91.5
3	NZPR114	CA <sub>15</sub> ... CA <sub>13</sub> TA <sub>22</sub>	aagatgaccacatgaagtgg	ggagcttataacatatctcgatgc	56	193	88.2
3	NZPR1702_b	AC <sub>15</sub> CA <sub>13</sub> ...AT <sub>5</sub>	tatgattggaccattgggt	ccaaaccctcctccacatac	53	187	No homology
3	NZPR413	TG <sub>23</sub> GT <sub>6</sub>	tgaacctcgatggaatagcc	cccgccttgcatcaatta	53	253	89.1
3	NZPR472	AC <sub>13</sub>	gagaaaattcaaccaccgga	ggttgtagggcagtgatcc	53	309	89.4
3	NZPR544	CA <sub>5</sub> AC <sub>12</sub> TA <sub>5</sub>	gcgatgtgcaacccttgata	tgctattccgcaaaaacc	56	286	86.1
3	NZPR823_a	AC <sub>57</sub>	tatcgggagcaagttatgcc	tcactctttttgctccca	53	296	92.5

eight of the 12 linkage groups between the two maps. Linkage group homology was also confirmed using a set of ESTPs mapped in the INRA-G2 (Chagné et al. 2003) and INRA-F2 pedigrees (D. Chagné and P. Semat, unpublished data).

#### Level of diversity of cDNA and genomic SSRs in *Pinus pinaster*

The nine polymorphic cDNA-SSR loci and 10 polymorphic genomic SSR loci were genotyped in 26 unrelated *P. pinaster* trees. Their expected heterozygosities (*H*) and number of alleles (*A*) are shown in Table 4. Within the cDNA-SSRs, there was no significant difference between the heterozygosity values obtained in the ORF and the UTRs, or between tri- and dinucleotide SSRs (F test with a *P* value of 0.46). Within the genomic SSRs, a significant difference (F test with a *P* value of 0.11) of the diversity

parameters was found between the loci transferred from *P. radiata* and those were developed from *P. pinaster* and *P. halepensis* by Mariette et al. (2001). This difference suggests that genomic SSRs tend to be less polymorphic when transferred from phylogenetically distant species; *P. radiata* belongs to the Oocarpeae subsection, whereas *P. pinaster* and *P. halepensis* belongs to the Sylvestres subsection of the pine genus (Mirov 1967). Finally, the level of diversity was not different between the transferred *P. radiata* genomic SSRs and the cDNA-SSRs (F test with a *P* value of 0.27).

**Table 4** Chromosomal assignment and genetic diversity parameters of the three classes of microsatellites genotyped on 26 unrelated *P. pinaster* trees. The mapping location in the INRA-G2 (following linkage group numbering of Chagné et al. 2002) and INRA-F2 maps (following linkage group numbering of Costa et al. 2000) are indicated. *M* Monomorphic, *P* polymorphic, *UL* unlinked, *H* heterozygosity, *A* number of alleles

Marker type	Primer set	Locus ID	Mapping pedigree				Genetic diversity	
			INRA-G2	INRA-F2	AFOCEL-F1	INIA-F1	<i>H</i>	<i>A</i>
cDNA-SSR	1	RPtEST11	5	2	P	M	0.74	4
	1	RPtEST13	10	M	M	M	0.66	3
	2	SsrPp_cn524	6	1	P	M	0.81	5
	2	SsrPt_ctg275	P/UL	P/UL	P	P	0.74	8
	2	SsrPt_ctg4363	M	12	P	M	0.68	4
	2	SsrPt_ctg7824	10	M	M	M	0.35	2
	2	SsrPt_ctg988	11	M	P	M	0.55	3
	2	SsrPt_ctg1525	M	11	M	M	0.16	2
	2	SsrPt_ctg64	3	3	M	P	0.68	4
	<i>P. radiata</i> genomic SSR	3	NZPR1078	2	7	P	M	0.68
3		NZPR114	M	5	M	P	0.68	5
3		NZPR1702_b	11	6	P	M	0.38 <sup>a</sup>	2 <sup>a</sup>
3		NZPR413	4	8	P	P	0.58	4
3		NZPR472	1	M	P	P	0.67	4
3		NZPR544	M	3	M	P	0.41	4
3		NZPR823_a	5	M	P	P	0.67	3
<i>P. pinaster</i> and <i>P. halepensis</i> genomic SSR	4	FRPp91	1	9	P	P	0.85	9
	4	FRPp94	10	5	P	P	0.80	8
	4	ITPh4516	3	3	P	P	0.84	8

<sup>a</sup>These values were not taken into account for the comparison of diversity parameters between cDNA and genomic SSRs

## Discussion

Composition and distribution of SSRs in the expressed genome of pine

The SSR composition of the coding region of the pine genome was first compared to the results published in other plant species. In dicotyledonous species where cDNA-SSR evaluations have been reported: i.e., *Vitis vinifera* (Scott et al. 2000) and *Arabidopsis thaliana* (Cardle et al. 2000; Morgante et al. 2002), the most represented repeat types, i.e., AG, AT, AAG, AGG and AGC, were also found to be the most frequent in pines (Fig. 1). Conversely, the most common repeated motif in monocotyledonous species (Varshney et al. 2002), CCG, was quite rare in pines (5.2 and 7.2% in *P. pinaster* and *P. taeda*, respectively). This result suggests that the SSR composition of gymnosperms genes is more similar to that of dicots than monocots. However, given the few number of species analysed, this interpretation remains to be confirmed.

The presence of a majority of trinucleotides in the ORFs (Fig. 2) was also in agreement with that which has been described in other plants. Morgante et al. (2002) showed a strong positive selection for trinucleotides in the translated regions of *A. thaliana*. Metzgar et al. (2000) explained the excess of triplet repeat microsatellites in the coding regions by the effect of important mutation pressures. Indeed, a mutation in a mono-, di-, tetra- or pentanucleotide SSR in the ORFs would result in a frameshift that could change the translated protein structure and function.

Morgante et al. (2002) detected much higher levels of SSRs in the 5' UTRs, especially AG/CT repeats. The rather small number of SSRs detected in the 5' UTRs of pine genes (17.4%, Table S3) contrasted with their results and could reflect a true feature of pine genes or it could simply be that the low coverage of the 5'-end in the pine ESTs has provided a bias. Some support for the latter view comes from ESTs obtained from the sequencing of the 5' ends of 3' anchored cDNAs (Frigerio et al. 2004; Kirst et al. 2003). Therefore, the 5' UTRs were probably under-represented in the two pine EST collections analysed.

### Transferability of cDNA and genomic SSRs in pines

From 64.6 to 94.2% of the pine cDNA-SSRs transferred to one or more of the seven pine species tested (Table 2). It has been clearly shown that the transferability of molecular markers (including SSRs) depends on the phylogenetic distance between species. Most of the markers developed in this study originated from *P. taeda*, an American pine which belongs to the *Pinus* section of the subgenus *Pinus* (Mirov 1967). It is not surprising, therefore, that the highest transfer rate was observed for *P. radiata* markers (94.2%), another American pine belonging to the same section. Similarly, the transfer rate decreased for SSR markers of Mediterranean pines of the same section (*P. pinaster*, 86.8%; *P. sylvestris*, 85.4%; *P.*

*halepensis*, 72.9%), and was even lower with Mediterranean pine markers of the more distant section *Pinus* (*P. pinea*, 70.8%; *P. canariensis*, 64.6%). We also anticipate a lower transferability of cDNA-SSR markers in the subgenus *Strobus*, or even within other genera of the Pinaceae family. However, the transferability rates in these more distant species should be higher for cDNA-SSR markers compared to genomic SSRs (Echt et al. 1999).

Similar rates of cross-species transferability were reported using EST-derived SSR markers in the genus *Medicago* (Eujayl et al. 2003, 89%) and within the Poaceae (Gupta et al. 2003, 55%). Comparatively, genomic SSR markers have shown to be less transferable in pine (54% between *P. radiata* and *P. pinaster*, this study; 29% between *P. strobus* and *P. radiata*, Echt et al. 1999; and 42% between *P. taeda* and *P. pinaster*, Gonzalez-Martinez et al. 2004). This rate is low compared to other plant genera (e.g., up to 85% between *Glycine* spp., Peakall et al. 1998). These results suggest that the data mining of pine cDNA libraries is a valuable approach to develop transferable SSR markers. Furthermore, it should be noted that the cDNA-SSR markers were obtained without library screening. Clearly the development of pine sequence databases and the *in silico* approach described here provides a cost-effective approach to SSR marker development.

In rice and wheat, EST-derived SSR markers have been reported to have lower rate of polymorphisms compared to SSR markers derived from genomic libraries (Cho et al. 2000; Eujayl et al. 2002). However, such differences were not found in *Medicago* (Eujayl et al. 2003) and *Picea* (Scotti et al. 2000) two highly polymorphic genera compared to the highly domesticated cereal crops. Our findings in *P. pinaster* revealed that non-source species genomic SSRs and cDNA-SSRs have similar levels of diversity and thus cDNA-SSRs are not less polymorphic.

At the intraspecific level, these markers have been mapped within the different genetic maps of *P. pinaster*, which will make it possible to construct a consensus map of this species. Nevertheless, more markers will be needed to reach the saturation levels desired. The markers developed in this study were also mapped in the *P. pinaster* genetic map that was aligned with the loblolly pine map using comparative genome mapping (Chagné et al. 2003) and so can be used as orthologous markers in other conifer species.

### Conclusion

We have shown in this study that database-sourced cDNA-SSRs can be efficiently developed for, and transferred across, pine species. Pine SSR markers developed in this way are less expensive to produce and are as informative as SSR markers derived from other (genomic-based) methods. However, since these markers correspond to transcribed regions, further study is necessary to determine if they behave as neutral markers or not, if they are to be

used in genetic diversity analysis and in association studies

**Acknowledgements** D.C. was funded by the French Ministry of Research. This research was supported by grants from France (Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Pêche-DERF No. 61.45.80.15/02) and the European Union (TREESNIPS project: QLK3-CT-2002-01973). The maritime pine ESTs were produced with the support of the Aquitaine Région (n°2002 0307002A) and INRA (Lignome) as well as the European Union (GEMINI: QLK5-CT-1999-00942). The work at New Zealand Forest Research was funded by New Zealand's Foundation for Research, Science and Technology (CO4X005).

## References

- Brown GR, Kadel EE III, Bassoni DL, Kiehne KL, Temesgen B, Van Buijtenen 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
- Cardle L, Ramsay L, Milbourne D, Macaulay M, Marshall D, Waugh R (2000) Computational and experimental characterization of physically clustered simple sequence repeats in plants. *Genetics* 156:847–854
- Chagné D, Lalanne C, Madur D, Kumar S, Frigerio JM, Krier C, Decroocq S, Savoure A, Bou-Dagher KM, Bertocchi E, Brach J, Plomion C (2002) A high density genetic map of maritime pine based on AFLPs. *Ann For Sci* 59:627–636
- Chagné 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
- Cho YG, Ishii T, Temnykh S, Chen X, Lipovich L, McCough SR, Park WD, Ayer N, Cartinhour S (2000) Diversity of microsatellites derived from genomic libraries and GenBank sequences in rice (*Oryza sativa*). *Theor Appl Genet* 100:713–722
- Christoffels A, van Gelder A, Greyling G, Miller R, Hide T, Hide W (2001) STACK: sequence tag alignment and consensus knowledgebase. *Nucleic Acids Res* 29:238–238
- Cordeiro GM, Casu R, McIntyre CL, Manners JM, Henry RJ (2001) Microsatellite markers from sugarcane (*Saccharum* spp.) ESTs cross-transferable to erianthus and sorghum. *Plant Sci* 160:1115–1123
- Costa P, Pot D, Dubos C, Frigerio J-M, Pionneau C, Bodénès C, Bertocchi E, Cervera MT, Remington DL, Plomion C (2000) A genetic map of maritime pine based on AFLP, RAPD and protein markers. *Theor Appl Genet* 100:39–48
- Doyle JJ, Doyle JL (1990) Isolation of plant DNA from fresh tissue. *Focus* 12:13–15
- Dubos C, Plomion C (2003) Identification of water-deficit responsive genes in maritime pine (*Pinus pinaster* Ait.) roots. *Plant Mol Biol* 51:249–262
- Echt CS, Vendramin GG, Nelson CD, May-Marquardt P (1999) Microsatellite DNA as shared genetic markers among conifer species. *Can J For Res* 29:365–371
- Elsik CG, Williams CG (2000) Retroelements contribute to the excess low-copy number DNA in pine. *Mol Gen Genet* 264:47–55
- Elsik CG, Williams CG (2001) Low-copy microsatellite recovery from a conifer genome. *Theor Appl Genet* 103:1189–1195
- Elsik CG, Minihan VT, Hall SE, Scarpa AM, Williams CG (2000) Low-copy microsatellite markers for *Pinus taeda* L. *Genome* 43:550–555
- Eujayl I, Sorrells ME, Baum M, Wolters P, Powell W (2002) Isolation of EST-derived microsatellite markers for genotyping the A and B genomes of wheat. *Theor Appl Genet* 104:399–407
- Eujayl I, Sledge MK, Wang L, May GD, Chekhovskiy K, Zwonitzer JC, Mian MAR (2003) *Medicago truncatula* EST-SSRs reveal cross-species genetic markers for *Medicago* spp. *Theor Appl Genet* 108:414–422
- Frigerio JM, Dubos C, Chaumeil P, Salin F, Garcia V, Barré A, Plomion C (2004) Using transcriptome analysis to identify osmotic stress candidate genes in maritime pine (*Pinus pinaster* Ait.). In: Sustainable forestry, wood products and biotechnology, BIOFOR Proceedings (in press)
- Gao L, Tang J, Li H, Jia J (2003) Analysis of microsatellites in major crops assessed by computational and experimental approaches. *Mol Breed* 12:245–261
- Gonzalez-Martinez SC, Robledo-Arancio JJ, Collada C, Diaz A, Williams CG, Alia R, Cervera MT (2004) Cross-amplification and sequence variation of microsatellite loci in Eurasian hard pines. *Theor Appl Genet* 109:103–111
- Gupta PK, Rustgi S, Sharma S, Singh R, Kumar N, Balyan HS (2003) Transferable EST-SSR markers for the study of polymorphism and genetic diversity in bread wheat. *Mol Genet Genom* 270:315–323
- Kamm A, Doudrick RL, Heslop-Harrison JS, Schmidt T (1996) The genomic and physical organization of *Ty1-copia*-like sequences as component of large genomes in *Pinus elliotii* var. *elliottii* and other gymnosperms. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 93:2708–2713
- Kantety RV, LaRota M, Matthews DE, Sorrells ME (2002) Data mining for simple sequence repeats in expressed sequence tags from barley, maize, rice, sorghum wheat. *Plant Mol Biol* 48:501–510
- Kinlaw CG, Neale DB (1997) Complex gene families in pine genomes. *Trends Plant Sci* 2:356–359
- Kirst M, Johnston AF, Baucom C, Ulrich E, Hubbard K, Staggs R, Paule C, Retzel E, Whetten R, Sederoff R (2003) Apparent homology of expressed genes from wood-forming tissues of loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda* L.) with *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 100:7383–7388
- 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
- Kossack DS, Kinlaw CS (1999) *IFG*, a gypsy-like retrotransposon in *Pinus* (Pinaceae), has an extensive history in pines. *Plant Mol Biol* 39:417–426
- Kriebel HB (1985) DNA sequences components in the *Pinus strobus* nuclear genome. *Can J For Res* 15:1–4
- Kutil BL, Williams CG (2001) Triplet-repeat microsatellites shared among hard and soft pines. *J Hered* 92:327–332
- Leitch IJ, Hanson L, Winfield M, Parker J, Bennett MD (2001) Nuclear DNA C-values complete familial representation in gymnosperms. *Ann Bot* 88:843–849
- Mariette S, Chagné D, Decroocq S, Vendramin GG, Lalanne C, Madur D, Plomion C (2001) Microsatellite markers for *Pinus pinaster* Ait. *Ann For Sci* 58:203–206
- Metzgar D, Bytof J, Wills C (2000) Selection against frameshift mutations limits microsatellite expansion in coding DNA. *Genome Res* 10:72–80
- Mirov NT (1967) The genus *Pinus*. Ronald, New York
- Morgante M, Hanafey M, Powell W (2002) Microsatellites are preferentially associated with nonrepetitive DNA in plant genomes. *Nat Genet* 30:194–200
- Peakall R, Gilmore S, Keys W, Morgante M, Rafalski A (1998) Cross-species amplification of soybean (*Glycine max*) simple sequence repeats (SSRs) within the genus and other legume genera: implications for the transferability of SSRs in plants. *Mol Biol Evol* 15:1275–1287
- Price RA, Liston A, Strauss SH (1998) Phylogeny and systematics of *Pinus*. In: Richardson DM (ed) Ecology and biogeography of *Pinus*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 49–68
- Ritter E, Aragonés A, Markussen T, Achere V, Espinel S, Fladung M, Wrobel S, Faivre-Rampant P, Jeandroz S, Favre J-M (2002) Construction and exploitation of a multifunctional and saturated genetic map for coniferous species. *Ann For Sci* 59:637–643

- Salzberg SL, Delcher AL, Kasif F, White O (1998) Microbial gene identification using Markov interpolated models. *Nucleic Acids Res* 26:544–548
- Schiex T, Gouzy J, Moisan A, de Oliveira Y (2003) FrameD: a flexible program for quality check and gene prediction in prokaryotic genomes and noisy matured eukaryotic sequences. *Nucleic Acids Res* 31:3738–3741
- Schneider S, Roessli D, Excoffier L (2000) ARLEQUIN v.2000, Genetics and Biometry Laboratory, University of Geneva, Switzerland
- Scott KD, Egger P, Seaton G, Rossetto M, Ablett EM, Lee LS, Henry RJ (2000) Analysis of SSRs derived from grape ESTs. *Theor Appl Genet* 100:723–726
- Scotti I, Magni F, Fink R, Powell W, Binelli G, Hedley PE (2000) Microsatellite repeats are not randomly distributed within Norway spruce (*Picea abies* K.) expressed sequences. *Genome* 43:41–46
- Scotti I, Magni F, Paglia GP, Morgante M (2002a) Trinucleotide microsatellites in Norway spruce (*Picea abies*): their features and the development of molecular markers. *Theor Appl Genet* 106:40–50
- Scotti I, Paglia GP, Magni F, Morgante M (2002b) Efficient development of dinucleotide microsatellite markers in Norway spruce (*Picea abies* Karst.) through dot-blot selection. *Theor Appl Genet* 104:1035–1041
- Shepherd M, Cross M, Maguire TL, Dieters MJ, Williams CG, Henry RJ (2002) Transpecific microsatellites for hard pines. *Theor Appl Genet* 104:819–827
- Temnykh S, Park WD, Ayres N, Cartinhour S, Hauck N, Lipovich L, Cho YG, Ishii T, McCough SR (2000) Mapping and genome organization of microsatellite sequences in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Theor Appl Genet* 100:697–712
- Temnykh S, DeClerck G, Lukashova A, Lipovich L, Cartinhour S, McCouch S (2001) Computational and experimental analysis of microsatellites in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.): frequency, length variation, transposon associations, and genetic marker potential. *Genet Res* 11:1441–1452
- Toth G, Gaspari Z, Jurka J (2000) Microsatellites in different eukaryotic genomes: survey and analysis. *Genet Res* 10:967–981
- Van Ooijen JW, Voorrips RE (2001) Joinmap 3.0, software for the calculation of genetic linkage maps. Plant Research International, Wageningen. Website: <http://www.joinmap.nl>
- Varshney RK, Thiel T, Stein N, Langridge P, Graner A (2002) In silico analysis on frequency and distribution of microsatellites in ESTs of some cereal species. *Cell Mol Biol* 7:537–546
- Zhou Y, Bui T, Auckland LD, Williams CG (2002) Undermethylated DNA as a source of microsatellite from a conifer genome. *Genome* 45:91–99