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#### Abstract

This study dealt with 89 accessions representing 40 populations of five species (Lolium perenne, Lolium multiflorum, Lolium rigidum, Lolium temulentum and Lolium persicum) distributed over 14 Mediterranean and Middle Eastern countries (Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libya, Egypt, Palestine, Jordan, Iraq, Iran, Turkey, Cyprus, Romania, Greece and Albania) distributed over three continents (Africa, Asia and Europe). We depended on 80 qualitative and quantitative morphological characters with 172 character states. The genetic polymorphism and gene diversity was assessed using five polymorphic inter simple sequence repeat primers. Based on Morphological observations, the studied species were separated into two groups, the first combines $L$. perenne, L. multiflorum and $L$. rigidum, where, L. perenne is more associated to $L$. multiflorum than to $L$. rigidum; the second combines $L$. temulentum and $L$. persicum; to some extent geographical distribution influenced the relationships among the populations. High degree of gene diversity with polymorphism percentage of $95.62 \%$ was detected among the studied species. Genetically, high degrees of genetic distance are observed among the studied populations; the geographical distribution has a great influence on the population's relationships. The Molecular


data also confirmed the separation of two groups, the first combines $L$. perenne, L. multiflorum and L. rigidum (as resulted from morphological data), but here, L. perenne is more associated to L. rigidum than to L. multiflorum; and the second combines $L$. temulentum and $L$. persicum. No infraspecific taxa below the studied species were observed.
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## Introduction

The grass family (Poaceae) is one of the largest families that developed 60 million years ago. It includes some 10000 species with high economic importance, especially the essential cereal crops that are obligate in the daily diet (Kellogg, 2001). The family involves great morphological, physiological, ecological, and genetic diversity (Kellogg, 1998). Based on cytological and molecular studies, the genus Lolium L. belongs to the monophyletic tribe Poeae, which is one of 12 tribes belonging to subfamily Pooideae (Catalan et al., 1997; Kellogg, 1998; Gaut, 2001). Lolium consists of about eight recognized diploid species with a chromosome number of $2 \mathrm{n}=14$ (Terrell, 1968).

Lolium is native to Europe, temperate Asia and North Africa, most of its species are distributed around the temperate regions of the world (Polok, 2007). The Mediterranean basin was supposed to be the origin of all ryegrasses (Charmet and Balfourier, 1994). It is believed that the coastal region of Syria may be the geographical origin of this genus (Dinelli et al., 2004).

According to Zohary (1946), three species of Lolium were recognized in Iraq. Cuénod et al., (1954) discussed four species from Tunisia including three varieties. Quezel and Santa (1962) described five species from Algeria including two subspecies, while Bor (1970) recorded six species from Iran. Mill (1985) discussed the morphological characters of the genus Lolium L. in the Turkish flora and provided six species including 11 varieties. Meikle (1985) recorded five species from Cyprus and Feinbrun (1986) depended on morphological characters and chromosome number to differentiate six species in Palestine including three subspecies, two varieties and two
formas, Sherif and Siddiqi (1988) recognized four species in Libya, Cope and Hosni (1991) recorded presence of four species in Egypt, Boulos (1995) considered four species in Egypt including three formas, Cope (2005) recorded presence of four species in Egypt, also, Boulos (2009) considered four species in Egypt.

Lolium (ryegrasses) straws can be fermented into liquid fuel at high temperatures (Lawford and Rousseau, 2003; Schell et al., 2003) and can be treated with cellulases during the fermentation process to improve the liberation of free sugars to convert plant biomass into biofuels, also, their cell wall composition can be altered through genetic modification to improve the nutritional value for animal consumption and convert the plant biomass into bioethanol (Baldwin et al., 2007).

Lolium perenne L. (perennial ryegrass) is used in temperate region due to its rapid establishment, adaptability, and nutrition values (Thorogood, 2003), where it is considered as the most appreciated temperate grass in Europe (Bothe et al., 2016). Lolium temulentum L. (Poison ryegrass) is very similar to wheat and in some regions it is referred to as true wheat (Triticum species), it is very difficult to separate the seeds of both from each other, in addition, its seeds are poisonous to people and livestock; it can be used for fodder and for erosion control (CABI: www.cabi.org/isc/ 2011). L. temulentum was proposed as a model species for genomic studies of coolseason forage and turf grasses because it is closely related to the important cultivated Lolium species and its short life cycle '2-3 months' (Baldwin and Dombrowski, 2006). Lolium persicum is resistant to herbicides and can produce seeds following herbicide applications; it is a competitive weed in dry land wheat and oat production (Bussan and Trainor, 2001).

Lolium multiflorum (Italian ryegrass) is an excellent model for increasing organic matter and improving soil structure, for providing erosion control, for quick growth and establishment, and very good for taking up and storing excess nitrogen, for animal grazing and for providing lasting residue (Evensen et al., 1998); it tolerates wet, moderate acidity and high levels of soil pH and poorly drained soils (Hannaway et al., 1999). Lolium rigidum (Rigid ryegrass) is planted in Australia as a forage crop (Niknam et al., 2002), it can hybridize with L. perenne and L. multiflorum, as well as
some species of Festuca (Terrell, op. cit.); it tolerates a wide range of pH and salt and osmotic stress (Chauhan et al., 2006).

The studies dealing with the phylogeny of Lolium agreed that it is a monophyletic genus, while the debate was about the common ancestor of the genus. The total nuclear DNA content in $L$. perenne present in lower amount $(4.2 \mathrm{pg})$ than in the other species, which indicates that $L$. perenne may be the common ancestor of the genus (Thomas, 1981); also, protein studies suggested that the ancestral form of Lolium is most like the present L. perenne (BulińskaRadomska and Lester, 1988). In contrast, other authors agreed that the common ancestor may be L. rigidum (Malik, 1967; Charmet and Balfourier, 1994), while Polok (2007) concluded that the subgenus Schedonorus may be the common ancestor of this genus.

The relationships among Lolium species was studied using different markers. Based on RAPD (Stammers et al., 1995; Ma et al., 2013) and AFLP data (Polok et al., 2006), it is found that L. perenne, L. multiflorum and L. rigidum are closely related to each other with $L$. multiflorum is closer to $L$. perenne than to $L$. rigidum and $L$. temulentum is closer to $L$. persicum. On other hand, $L$. multiflorum was observed to be closer to L. rigidum than to L. perenne according to the isozyme data (Charmet and Balfourier op. cit.; Bennett et al., 2002).

Polok (2007) speculated that $L$. perenne and $L$. multiflorum populations always mixed completely and there is no strong species boundary or reproductive barriers between them.

According to different marker analyzed, she proposed that the two species have nearly the same level of polymorphism and could be considered as one species (L. perenne subsp. perenne and $L$. perenne subsp. multiflorum); and $L$. rigidum is closely related to them, while $L$. temulentum and $L$. persicum are very close to each other. Also, Zielinski et al. (1997) proposed L. perenne and L. multiflorum as one species based on isoenzymes and RAPD.

Guan et al. (2017) suggested high genetic diversity of nine Lolium species based on SSR markers; they found that there were great differentiations between populations of
L. perenne and within populations of L. multiflorum. In dependence on some morphological characters, Gasior et al. (2016) found less phenotypic variation in accessions of L. perenne collected from across Europe.

Morphological traits are very important and significant in discrimination between taxa, but they have a number of limitations including low polymorphism, low heritability, late expression and susceptibility to environmental influences (Smith and Smith, 1992).

On the other hand, DNA molecular markers do not have such limitations. They can be used to detect variation at the DNA level and are effective tools to distinguish between closely related genotypes and the choice of the technique depends on the objective of the study, skills and facilities available (Beyene et al., 2005); in addition to their advantages: fast and useful for analyzing large collections of populations to determine the amount of genetic diversity within single populations and to identify genetic relationships among the populations (Peter-Schmid et al., 2008).

Inter simple sequence repeat (ISSR) technique is a PCR based method, which involves amplification of DNA fragment present between two identical microsatellite repeats oriented in opposite direction. In this method, primers ( $16-25 \mathrm{bp}$ ) which may be di-nucleotide, tri-nucleotide, tetra-nucleotide or penta-nucleotide are used in a single primer PCR targeting multiple genomic loci to amplify inter- SSR sequences of different sizes (Reddy, 2002).

The present study was carried out to assess the taxonomic relationships among the studied species that represent the Mediterranean basin and Middle East region by using morphological markers and ISSR molecular marker, that provide successful numerical assessment of the species relationships.

## Materials and Methods

## Collection of plant material

The present work concerned with study of 89 accessions of five species of the genus Lolium L., these accessions represent 14 countries distributed over three continents (Table 1). These accessions include fresh plant material collected by the author during
periods of flowering and fruiting (March-April) of the years 2014 and 2015, plant specimens kept in the Egyptian herbaria of Cairo University Herbarium (CAI), Herbarium Flora of Phytotaxonomy Research, Agriculture Research Center (CAIM) as well as seeds obtained from the seed- bank of United states Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the seed- bank of Institut für Pflanzengenetik und Kulturpflanzenforschung 'Leibniz Institute of Plant Genetics and Crop Plant Research' (IPK).

For morphological description, specimens provided as seeds were planted until maturation then were examined by a binocular head zoom stereo microscope, model number MS003A in addition to examination of the herbarium specimens. Identification of the collected specimens was confirmed by revision with the specimens kept in CAI, CAIM; the abbreviations of "Index herbariorum" ed. 8 (Holmgren et al., 1990). The nomenclature was made according to T ckholm (1974), Cope and Hosni (op. cit.) and Cope (op. cit.).

The collected specimens were kept in the herbarium of Department of Botany, Faculty of Science, University of Fayoum (proposed abbreviation FAY).

Distribution of the studied species in the studied countries of the Mediterranean basin and Middle East region, is shown in Map 1.

## Morphological Analysis

Morphological data of the studied species is based on 80 morphological characters and 172 character states. Both qualitative and quantitative features were selected that describes the whole plant, culms, leaves, inflorescences, spikelets, florets and caryopses (Table 2). The qualitative characters were scored as binary while the quantitative ones were scored as multi-state characters. The phenotypic characters of the accessions of the five studied species were used as an operational taxonomic unit (OUTs). The dendrogram was obtained by using average linkage agglomerative clustering method according to Schütze and Silverstein (1997) and two-dimensional plot was obtained by principal component analysis (PCA) correlation according to Pearson (1901). All the computations were made by using Community Analysis Package (CAP) program (Seaby and Henderson, 2007).

## Molecular Assessment

## DNA preparation

Seeds of 86 accessions ( 15 seeds/accession) were germinated in clean sterile petri dishes on double layered filter papers and 10 mm distilled water in incubator in dark then light at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for ten days. DNA samples were extracted from 89 plants (fresh green juvenile leaves of the 86 previously germinated accessions, in addition to leaves of 3 herbarium specimens). DNA isolation was made according to the protocol attached with kit of ZR Plant/Seed DNA MiniPrep, Cat. No. D6020 (www.zymoresearch.com).

## ISSR genotyping

The reaction mixture with a total volume of $25 \mu \mathrm{l}$ contained $3 \mu \mathrm{l}$ DNA, $0.1 \% 3 \mu \mathrm{l}$ primer, $12.5 \mu$ l of master mix (GeneDirex, OnePCR ${ }^{\text {TM }}$, Cat. MB203-0100) diluted up to $19 \mu \mathrm{l}$ with sterile distilled water.

The amplification reactions was carried out by using PCR Biometra thermocycler as the following: preheating at $98^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, denaturation at $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 min , followed by 42 cycles each consists of the following steps: denaturation at $92^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 min , annealing at $44.6^{\circ}$ and $49^{\circ}$ for 1 min and 10 sec , extension at $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 min ; final extension at $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 min and hold at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

## Amplification product analysis

A modified protocol according to (Kirkpatrick, 1991) was followed: the amplified DNA for all samples ( $7 \mu \mathrm{l}$ ) were loaded on $2 \%$ agarose gel ( 2 gm agarose up to 100 ml 1 X SB buffer) containing ethidium bromide ( $5.6 \mu \mathrm{l}$ ) and electrophoresed by using electrophoresis unit (WIDE mini-sub-cell GT BIO-RAD) at 100 constant volt for 1.5 h by using 1X SB running buffer and was determined with (Syngene Bio imaging) UV transilluminator. The amplified fragments were compared with $0.1 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mu \mathrm{l} 100 \mathrm{bp}$ ladder (Fermentas, GeneRuler) and $56 \mu \mathrm{~g} / 500 \mu 150 \mathrm{bp}$ DNA ladder RTU (GeneDirex, Cat. No. DM012-R500).

## Data analysis

The genotypic characters were scored as a binary matrix as present (1) or absent (0) for each fragment. Genic variation statistics for all loci of all populations were calculated by using PopGene version 1.32 of Yeh et al. (2000). These statistics include Mean and standard deviation of Observed number of alleles (na), Effective number of alleles (ne) according to Kimura and Crow (1964), Nei's gene diversity (h) according to Nei (1973) and Shannon's information index (I) according to Lewontin (1972).

Nei's analysis of gene diversity in subdivided populations according to Nei (1987), including: Estimate of gene flow (Nm), Number of polymorphic loci and percentage of polymorphic loci; Nei's unbiased measures of genetic distance according to Nei (1978). Dendrogram based on Nei's (1978) Genetic distance: Method = UPGMA modified from NEIGHBOR procedure of PHYLIP Version 3.5, was obtained also. Two-dimensional plot was obtained by principal component analysis (PCA) correlation.

Table 1: Information about the accessions of Lolium that are included in both morphological and ISSR analyses.

| Item | Species name | Origin | Locality (collection site) | Plant ID or Accession number | Last date of update/ Collection date | Seed bank/ Herb. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L. perenne | Morocco | Near Meknes/Boufekrane, 37 km south of Meknes on road S331, Mrirt-Meknes. | PI 598864 | 2000/1994 | USDA |
| 2 | L. perenne | Morocco | 3 km from center of Ifrane toward El-Hajeb on road S309. | PI 598873 | 1998/ 1994 | USDA |
| 3 | L. perenne | Morocco | 2 km west of Azerzou on P33, Zeida to K. Tadla. | PI 598892 | 1998/ 1994 | USDA |
| 4 | L. perenne | Algeria |  | PI 231583 | 2003 | USDA |
| 5 | L. perenne | Algeria |  | PI 231585 | 2003 | USDA |
| 6 | L. perenne | Algeria |  | PI 231616 | 2003 | USDA |
| 7 | L. perenne | Tunisia | Near Teboursouk, 6 k west of Teboursouk on C75. | PI 610924 | 2001/ 1994 | USDA |
| 8 | L. perenne | Tunisia | Near Bizerte, 16 k west of Bizerte on C51. | PI 610926 | 2001/ 1994 | USDA |
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| 9 | L. perenne | Tunisia | Near Nefza, 16 k south of Nefza on C52. | PI 610958 | 2001/1994 | USDA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | L. perenne | Libya | Cyrenaica. | PI 231565 | 2003 | USDA |
| 11 | L. perenne | Libya | Cyrenaica. | PI 231566 | 2003 | USDA |
| 12 | L. perenne | Libya | Cyrenaica. | PI 231568 | 2003 | USDA |
| 13 | L. perenne | Egypt | Ras-el-Hekma. | PI 239730 | 2003 | USDA |
| 14 | L. perenne | Palestine | Goret El- Lout, Khan Yunis. |  | 1955 (collection date) | CAI |
| 15 | L. perenne | Iraq | 97 km . north of Mosul. | PI 254898 | 2004 | USDA |
| 16 | L. perenne | Iran | Market, Tehran. | PI 222527 | 1997 | USDA |
| 17 | L. perenne | Iran | From Livestock Station, Moghan Steppes, Zaerbaijan. | PI 223385 | 2003 | USDA |
| 18 | L. perenne | Iran | From cultivated fields near Ahwaz. | PI 227020 | 2003 | USDA |
| 19 | L. perenne | Turkey | 2km S Kizilhisar, Denizli province. | PI 545665 | 2004/1984 | USDA |
| 20 | L. perenne | Turkey | Weedy area, Ankara. | PI 598510 | 1998/ 1992 | USDA |
| 21 | L. perenne | Turkey | City border, Bolu, Ankara. | PI 598520 | 1998 | USDA |
| 22 | L. perenne | Cyprus |  | PI 204086 | 2003 | USDA |
| 23 | L. perenne | Cyprus |  | PI 206376 | 2003 | USDA |
| 24 | L. perenne | Cyprus |  | PI 206377 | 2003 | USDA |
| 25 | L. perenne | Romania | Faragau, Jud. Mures. | GR 8834 | 2003 | IPK |
| 26 | L. perenne | Romania | Dipsa (Jud. Bistrita Nasaud). | GR 8838 | 2003 | IPK |
| 27 | L. perenne | Romania | Sanger, Cimpia Transi Praniei, Mures District. | GR 9508 | 2003 | IPK |
| 28 | L. perenne | Greece |  | PI 199252 | 2003 | USDA |
| 29 | L. perenne | Greece |  | PI 231599 | 2003 | USDA |
| 30 | L. perenne | Greece |  | PI 231600 | 2003 | USDA |
| 31 | L. multiflorum | Morocco |  | PI 202509 | 2003 | USDA |
| 32 | L. multiflorum | Libya | El- Ryayna between Rumia and Zintan. |  | 1970 (Collection date) | CAI |
| 33 | L. multiflorum | Egypt |  | PI 343155 | 1997 | USDA |
| 34 | L. multiflorum | Egypt |  | PI 343156 | 1997 | USDA |
| 35 | L. multiflorum | Palestine |  | PI 200344 | 2003 | USDA |
| 36 | L. multiflorum | Iran | Market, Tehran. | PI 222526 | 2003 | USDA |
| 37 | L. multiflorum | Turkey | Seed store, Istanbul, Istanbul. | PI 170519 | 2003/1948 | USDA |
| 38 | L. multiflorum | Turkey | 3km E Kirsehir, Kirsehir province. | PI 545668 | 1992/ 1984 | USDA |
| 39 | L. multiflorum | Turkey | 15km SE Van, Van province. | PI 545671 | 1992/ 1984 | USDA |
| 40 | L. multiflorum | Romania |  | GR 2608 | 1983 | IPK |
| 41 | L. multiflorum | Romania |  | GR 9070 | 2003 | IPK |
| 42 | L. multiflorum | Romania |  | GR 9075 | 2003 | IPK |
| 43 | L. multiflorum | Greece |  | PI 199251 | 2003 | USDA |
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| 44 | L. rigidum | Morocco |  | PI 239779 | 2003 | USDA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45 | L. rigidum | Morocco |  | PI 239781 | 2003 | USDA |
| 46 | L. rigidum | Morocco | Flat grassland, sandy loam soil over sandstone, 7 km from Ben-Slimane, Bouznika, Ben Slimane | PI 516608 | 2004/1983 | USDA |
| 47 | L. rigidum | Algeria |  | PI 239750 | 2003 | USDA |
| 48 | L. rigidum | Algeria |  | PI 239755 | 2003 | USDA |
| 49 | L. rigidum | Algeria |  | PI 239761 | 2003 | USDA |
| 50 | L. rigidum | Libya |  | PI 239735 | 2003 | USDA |
| 51 | L. rigidum | Libya |  | PI 239737 | 2003 | USDA |
| 52 | L. rigidum | Libya |  | PI 239738 | 2003 | USDA |
| 53 | L. rigidum | Egypt | Fouka. | PI 239731 | 2003 | USDA |
| 54 | L. rigidum | Egypt | Shepparaton, Victoria. | PI 250804 | 2004 | USDA |
| 55 | L. rigidum | Egypt | Shepparaton, Victoria. | PI 250806 | 2004 | USDA |
| 56 | L. rigidum | Jordan |  | PI 202676 | 2003 | USDA |
| 57 | L. rigidum | Iraq | 70 km . east of Kirkuk. | PI 254899 | 2004 | USDA |
| 58 | L. rigidum | Iraq | Hilla. | GR 11896 | 1987/1986 | IPK |
| 59 | L. rigidum | Iran | Mosj.-Gol. | PI 239795 | 2003 | USDA |
| 60 | L. rigidum | Iran | Susa. | PI 239796 | 2003 | USDA |
| 61 | L. rigidum | Iran | Ahwaz. | PI 239798 | 2003 | USDA |
| 62 | L. rigidum | Turkey | Roadside between Mardin and Nusaybin. | PI 298416 | 2004 | USDA |
| 63 | L. rigidum | Turkey | 14km N Gaziantep toward Yavuzeli, Gaziantep province. | PI 545606 | 1992/ 1984 | USDA |
| 64 | L. rigidum | Turkey | Hwy 380 at Jct. Diyarbakir-Bismil Rd., Diyarbakir province. | PI 545612 | 1992/ 1984 | USDA |
| 65 | L. rigidum | Cyprus |  | PI 204081 | 1997 | USDA |
| 66 | L. rigidum | Cyprus |  | PI 204083 | 1997 | USDA |
| 67 | L. rigidum | Cyprus | Morphou. | PI 239733 | 2003 | USDA |
| 68 | L. rigidum | Greece | Levadia. | PI 239792 | 2003 | USDA |
| 69 | L. rigidum | Greece | Igoumenitsa. | PI 239793 | 2003 | USDA |
| 70 | L. temulentum | Morocco |  | PI 391427 | 2004 | USDA |
| 71 | L. temulentum | Morocco | 13km west of Tetouan, roadside. | PI 422589 | 2004/1975 | USDA |
| 72 | L. temulentum | Libya | Fezzan / Al Awaynat. | GR 5453 | 1983/ 1983 | IPK |
| 73 | L. temulentum | Egypt | Beheira Province, ElDilingat. |  | 1987 (Collection date) | CAI |
| 74 | L. temulentum | Iraq |  | GR 12759 | 1979 | IPK |
| 75 | L. temulentum | Iraq |  | GR 12760 | 1979 | IPK |
| 76 | L. temulentum | Turkey | Zigana Pass, between Torul and Macka. | PI 206691 | 2003 | USDA |
| 77 | L. temulentum | Turkey | 13 km N Buldan Jct., Denizli province. | PI 545641 | 1992/ 1984 | USDA |
| 78 | L. temulentum | Turkey | 9 km SE Ayvacik, Canakkale province. | PI 545644 | 1992/ 1984 | USDA |
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| 79 | L. temulentum | Albania | Fushë-Dukat, Prov. Vlorë. | GR 11902 | 1995/ 1994 | IPK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80 | L. temulentum | Albania | Katundishtë, Prov. <br> Këlcyr-Përmet. | GR 11903 | 1995/ 1994 | IPK |
| 81 | L. temulentum | Albania | Surrel, 20 km NO von Tirana, Hausgarten mit zahlreichem Material. | GR 11907 | 1995/ 1993 | IPK |
| 82 | L. temulentum | Greece | Karyai, Athos. | PI 249725 | 1997 | USDA |
| 83 | L. persicum | Libya | Fezzan / Aqar. | GR 5452 | 1983/ 1983 | IPK |
| 84 | L. persicum | Iran | Livestock Station, Sarab, Azerbaijan. | PI 222807 | 2004/1954 | USDA |
| 85 | L. persicum | Iran | 12 miles east of Sanandaj, Kurdistan. | PI 229764 | 2004 | USDA |
| 86 | L. persicum | Iran | Faridan. | PI 230110 | 2004 | USDA |
| 87 | L. persicum | Turkey | 31km SW Golbasi, <br> Adiyaman province. | PI 545637 | 1997/ 1984 | USDA |
| 88 | L. persicum | Turkey | 12km NE Ankara city limit sign, Ankara province. | PI 545661 | 1992/ 1984 | USDA |
| 89 | L. persicum | Turkey | 53 km E. Gole, Kars province. | PI 545680 | 1992/ 1984 | USDA |



Map 1: Distribution of the studied species over the studied countries of the Mediterranean and Middle East.

Table 2: Qualitative and quantitative features used as morphological markers.

| Characters | Character states | Code | Characters | Character states | Code |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Longevity | 1. Annual. | 1 | 43. Surface of glumes | 89. Glabrous. | 1 |
|  | 2. Annual or biennial. | 2 |  |  |  |
|  | 3. Perennial. | 3 |  |  |  |
| 2. Life form | 4. Tufted. | 1 |  |  |  |
|  | 5. Spreading. | 2 |  |  |  |
| 3. Branching | 6. Unbranched. | 1 |  |  |  |
|  | 7. Branched at base. | 2 | 44. Apex of glumes | 90. Acute. | 1 |
| 4. Erection of culms | 8. Erect. | 1 |  | 91. Acuminate. | 2 |
|  | 9. Decumbent. | 2 |  | 92. Obtuse. | 3 |
|  | 10. Prostrate. | 3 |  | 93. Sub-obtuse. | 4 |
|  | 11. Subprostrate. | 4 | 45. Curvature of glumes | 94. Rounded on the back. | 1 |
| 5. Surface of culms | 12. Glabrous. | 1 |  | 95. Broad on the back. | 2 |
|  | 13. Scaberulous below spike. | 2 | 46. Number of nerves of glumes | 96. 56. | 1 |
| 6. Length of culms/ cm | 14. <105. | 1 |  | 97. >6. | 2 |
|  | 15. >105. | 2 | 47. Central nerve of glumes | 98. Pointed. | 1 |
| 7. Number of nodes | 16. $\leq 3$. | 1 |  | 99. Not. | 2 |
|  | 17. >3. | 2 | 48. Length of glumes/ mm | 100. <13. | 1 |
| 8. Surface of leaf sheath | 18. Glabrous. | 1 |  | 101. > 13 . | 2 |
|  | 19. Scaberulous. | 2 | 49. Width of glumes/ mm | 102. $\frac{1}{}$ | 1 |
| 9. Colour of leaf sheath at node | 20. Green. | 1 |  | 103. >2. | 2 |
|  | 21. Purplish. | 2 | 50. Presence of lower glume | 104. Only on terminal spikelets. | 1 |
|  | 22. Loose. | 1 | 51. Texure of lower glumes | 105. Firm. | 1 |
| 10. Attachment of sheath to culm | 23. Tightly clasping and loose below. | 2 |  | 106. Very firm. | 2 |
| 11. Shape of ligules | 24. Truncate. | 1 | 52. Texure of upper glumes | 107. Firm. | 1 |
|  | 25. Obtuse. | 2 |  | 108. Muticous. | 2 |
| 12. Texure of ligules | 26. Membranous. | 1 | 53. Upper glumes according to | 109. Awned. | 1 |
| 13. Length of ligules/ mm | 27. 2.5. | 1 | presence of awns | 110. Awnless. | 2 |
|  | 28. >2.5. | 2 |  | 111.8.5. | 1 |
| 14. Presence of auricles | 29. Present. | 1 | awns of upper glumes/ mm | 112. Absent. | 2 |
|  | 30. Absent. | 2 | 55. Number of florets | 113. $<8$. | 1 |
| 15. Overlapping of auricles (if present) | 31. Extremely overlapped. | 1 |  | 114. $>8$. | 2 |
|  | 32. Not. | 2 | 56. Overlapping of lemmas | 115. Overlapped. | 1 |
| 16. Length of | 33. <12. | 1 |  | 116. Not. | 2 |


| leaf sheath/ cm | 34. >12. | 2 | 57. Shape of lemmas | 117. Ovate. | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17. Apex of leaf blades | 35. Acute. | 1 | 58. Surface of lemmas | 118. Oblong to lanceolate. | 1 |
|  | 36. Acuminate. | 2 |  | 119. Lanceolate. | 2 |
| 18. Texure of leaf blades | 37. Firm on upper surface and glossy on lower one. | 1 |  | 120. Elliptic to ovate. | 3 |
|  | 38. Firm on both surfaces. | 2 |  | 121. Oblong. | 4 |
| 19. Surface of leaf blades | 39. Glabrous. | 1 |  | 122. Glabrous. | 5 |
|  | 40. Scabrid. | 2 |  | 123. Glabrous but rough on margins. | 6 |
| 20. Behaviour of leaf blades when young | 41. Folded. | 1 | 59. Apex of lemmas | 124. Acute. | 1 |
| 21. Length of leaf blades/ cm | 42. <30. | 1 |  | 125. Obtuse. | 2 |
|  | 43. >30. | 2 |  | 126. Two toothed. | 3 |
| 22. Width of leaf blades/ mm | 44. 57. | 1 | 60. Texure of apex of lemmas | 127. Firm. | 1 |
|  | 45. >7. | 2 |  | 128. Hyaline. | 2 |
| 23. Erection of spikes | 46. Erect. | 1 | 61. Curvature of lemmas | 129. Rounded on the back. | 1 |
|  | 47. Curved. | 2 |  | 130. Broad on the back. | 2 |
| 24. Stifness of spikes | 48. Stiff. | 1 | 62. Turgidity of lemmas maturity | 131. Very turgid. | 1 |
|  | 49. Not. | 2 |  | 132. Not. | 2 |
| 25. Denesity of spikes | 50. Dense. | 1 | 63. Number of nerves of lemmas | 133. $\leq 4$. | 1 |
|  | 51. Loose. | 2 |  | 134. >4. | 2 |
| 26. Length of spikes/ cm | 52. $\leq 30$. | 1 | 64. Length of lemmas/ mm | 135. 56.5 . | 1 |
|  | 53. $>30$. | 2 |  | 136. >6.5. | 2 |
| 27. Spike central axis | 54. Cylinderical. | 1 | 65. Width of lemmas/ mm | 137. <6.5. | 1 |
|  | 55. Flattened. | 2 |  | 138. >6.5. | 2 |
| 28. Surface of spike central axis | 56. Glabrous. | 1 | $66 . \quad$ Lemmasaccording topresence of awns | 139. Awned. | 1 |
|  | 57. Scabridulous. | 2 |  | 140. Awnless. | 2 |
|  | 58. Scabrous. | 3 | 67. Straightness of awns | 141. Straight. | 1 |
| 29. Shape of spikelets | 59. Oblong to elliptic. | 1 |  | 142. Absent. | 2 |
|  | 60. Oblong to lanceolate. | 2 | 68. Thickness of awns | 143. Very fine. | 1 |
|  | 61. Oblong. | 3 |  | 144. Absent. | 2 |
|  | 62. Ovate. | 4 | 69. Origin of awns | 145. Below apex of lemma. | 1 |
|  | 63. Elliptic. | 5 |  | 146. Absent. | 2 |
| 30. Compression of spikelets | 64. Compressed. | 1 | 70. Length of awns of lemmas/ mm | 147. <14.5. | 1 |
|  | 65. Swollen. | 2 |  | 148. >14.5. | 2 |
| 31. Direction of | 66. Ascending. | 1 |  | 149. Absent. | 3 |


| spikelets |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32. Erection of spikelets | 67. Erect. | 1 | 71. Shape of palea | 150. Keeled. | 1 |
| 33. Stalk of spikelets | 68. Sessile. | 1 | 72. Surface of palea | 151. Glabrous. | 1 |
| 34. Arrangement of spikelets on the axis | 69. Alternate on both sides. | 1 |  | 152. Scabrid. | 2 |
| 35. Number of spikelets | 70. <14. | 1 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 153 . \\ & \text { scabrid. } \end{aligned} \text { Finely }$ | 3 |
|  | 71. >14. | 2 | 73. Length of | 154. 56.5. | 1 |
| 36. Length of spikelets (excluding awns)/ cm | 72. $\leq .5$. | 1 | palea/ mm | 155. >6.5. | 2 |
|  | 73. >2.5. | 2 | 74. Width of palea/ mm | 156. <1.5. | 1 |
|  |  |  |  | 157. >1.5. | 2 |
|  |  |  | 75. Length of anthers/ mm | 158. <2. | 1 |
| 37. Width of spikelets/ mm | 74. $\leq 4.5$. | 1 |  | 159. >2. | 2 |
|  | 75. >4.5. | 2 | 76. Shape of caryopsis | 160. Ovate. | 1 |
| 38. Concavities of rachillae | 76. Present. | 1 |  | 161. Oblong to lanceolate. | 2 |
|  | 77. Absent. | 2 |  | 162. Lanceolate. | 3 |
| 39. Length of glumes in comparison with spikelets | 78. G shorter than S. | 1 |  | 163. Elliptic to oblong. | 4 |
|  | 79. G longer than S. | 2 |  | 164. Oblong. | 5 |
|  | 80. G longer than or as long as S . | 3 | 77. Compression of caryopsis | 165. Swollen. | 1 |
|  | 81. G as long as S. | 4 |  | 166. Compressed. | 2 |
| 40. Texure of | 82. Firm. | 1 | 78. Length of caryopsis/ mm | 167. <7.5. | 1 |
| margin glumes of | 83. Hyaline. | 2 |  | 168. >7.5. | 2 |
| 41. Shape of | 84. Wing like. | 1 | 79. Width of caryopsis/ mm | 169. 1.5. | 1 |
| margin glumes of | 85. Not. | 2 |  | 170. >1.5. | 2 |
| 42. Shape of glumes | 86. Oblong to lanceolate. | 1 | 80. Colour of caryopsis | 171. Light brown. | 1 |
|  | 87. Oblong. | 2 |  | 172. Dark brown. | 2 |
|  | 88. Lanceolate. | 3 |  |  |  |

## Results

## 1. Morphological treatment

The dendrogram based on morphological data matrix (Figure 1), it was branched into two clusters, the first cluster combined accessions of L. persicum and L. temulentum;
while, the second one combined accessions of L. rigidum, L. multiflorum and $L$. perenne. The second cluster was sub-branched into two sub-clusters, the first subcluster included accessions of $L$. rigidum while the second one combined accessions of $L$. multiflorum and $L$. perenne.

The two-dimensional plot based on principal component analysis (PCA) correlation of morphological data illustrated the separation of the studied accessions into five groups which represented the five studied species of Lolium; morphologically, each group was sub-grouped according to the degree of dissimilarities among them (Figure 2).

## 2. Genotypic data information

A total of 137 fragments were resulted from the five primers, 131 ( $95.62 \%$ ) fragments were polymorphic ranged in size from 150 to 1750 bp , polymorphism percentage of the used primers ranged from 92 to 100\% (Table 3).

Generally, the greatest average value of Nei's gene diversity and Shannon's index (measure of gene diversity) in all the 40 studied populations were observed in $L$. multiflorum from Turkey. At the species level, the highest average level of gene diversity within populations of $L$. perenne was observed in Cyprus, while the population of L. multiflorum from Turkey showed the highest value. Considering populations of $L$. rigidum, the highest values of gene diversity were observed in that representing Libya, L. temulentum from Iraq, and in L. persicum from Turkey (Table 4). However, the remaining populations of the five studied species showed nearly similar gene diversity measures (Table 4).

The highest number and percentage of polymorphic loci all over the studied populations were observed in the populations of L. perenne from Cyprus and Greece and the population of $L$. multiflorum from Turkey. On the other hand, the populations of L. rigidum from Libya and Egypt; L. temulentum from Iraq and L. persicum from Turkey showed the highest number and percentage of polymorphic loci (Table 4).

The greatest average value of observed number of alleles (na) was estimated in the populations of $L$. perenne from Cyprus and Greece, L. multiflorum from Turkey, $L$. rigidum from Libya and Egypt, L. temulentum from Iraq and L. persicum from

Turkey. While the greatest average value of effective number of alleles (ne) was estimated in the populations of $L$. perenne from Cyprus, L. multiflorum from Turkey, L. rigidum from Libya, L. temulentum from Iraq and L. persicum from Turkey (Table 4).

Nei's analysis of gene diversity in the studied populations showed high level of the total gene diversity with an average of 0.2038 , low level of gene flow among the populations with an average of 0.0417 ; it was found that the mean of gene diversity within population was lower than proportion differentiation among the populations (Table 5).

In general, for all studied species, high levels were noticed in the mean values of observed and effective number of alleles (1.9562 and 1.2826) respectively, Nei's gene diversity (0.1966) and Shannon's information index (0.3283) as shown in Table 4.


Figure 1: Dendrogram based on morphological data.T


Figure 2: Two-dimensional plot obtained by principal component analysis (PCA) correlation based on morphological data.

The dendrogram based on genetic distance was classified into two clusters, the first combined the populations of L. persicum and L. temulentum and the second cluster combined populations of $L$. multiflorum, L. rigidum and $L$. perenne; in the second cluster, L. perenne more associated to $L$. rigidum than to $L$. multiflorum (Figure 3).Two-dimensional plot based on principal component analysis (PCA) correlation was obtained by using CAP program, which supported separation of the five studied species of Lolium, each group also was sub-grouped according to the degree of dissimilarities among them (Figure 4).

Legend: 1: Population 1 (accessions of L. perenne from Morocco). 2: Population 2 (accessions of L. perenne from Algeria). 3: Population 3 (accessions of L. perenne from Tunisia). 4: Population 4 (accessions of L. perenne from Libya). 5: Population 5 (accession of L. perenne from Egypt). 6: Population 6 (accession of L. perenne from Palestine). 7: Population 7 (accession of L. perenne from Iraq). 8: Population 8 (accessions of L. perenne from Iran). 9: Population 9 (accessions of $L$. perenne from Turkey). 10: Population 10 (accessions of L. perenne from Cyprus). 11: Population 11 (accessions of L. perenne from Romania). 12: Population 12 (accessions of $L$. perenne from Greece). 13: Population 13 (accession of L. multiflorum from

Morocco). 14: Population 14 (accession of L. multiflorum from Libya). 15: Population 15 (accessions of L. multiflorum from Egypt). 16: Population 16 (accession of L. multiflorum from Palestine). 17: Population 17 (accession of $L$. multiflorum from Iran). 18: Population 18 (accessions of L. multiflorum from Turkey). 19: Population 19 (accessions of L. multiflorum from Romania). 20: Population 20 (accession of $L$. multiflorum from Greece). 21: Population 21 (accessions of $L$. rigidum from Morocco). 22: Population 22 (accessions of L. rigidum from Algeria). 23: Population 23 (accessions of L. rigidum from Libya). 24: Population 24 (accessions of L. rigidum from Egypt). 25: Population 25 (accession of L. rigidum from Jordan). 26: Population 26 (accessions of $L$. rigidum from Iraq). 27: Populatio n 27 (accessions of $L$. rigidum from Iran). 28: Population 28 (accessions of L. rigidum from Turkey). 29: Population 29 (accessions of L. rigidum from Cyprus). 30: Population 30 (accessions of L. rigidum from Greece). 31: Population 31 (accessions of L. temulentum from Morocco). 32: Population 32 (accession of L. temulentum from Libya). 33: Population 33 (accession of L. temulentum from Egypt). 34: Population 34 (accessions of $L$. temulentum from Iraq). 35: Population 35 (accessions of $L$. temulentum from Turkey). 36: Population 36 (accessions of L. temulentum from Albania). 37: Population 37 (accession of L. temulentum from Greece). 38: Population 38 (accession of L. persicum from Libya). 39: Population 39 (accessions of L. persicum from Iran). 40: Population 40 (accessions of L. persicum from Turkey).

Table 3: Characteristics of ISSR primers used for detection of polymorphism in the studied genotypes.

| Primer <br> name | Sequence | Annealing <br> Temp. <br> $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathbf{C}\right)$ | Total <br> loci | Poly- <br> morphic <br> loci | Poly- <br> morphism <br> $(\%)$ | Range of <br> fragments <br> size $(\mathbf{b p})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ISSR 809 | GAGGAGAGAGAGAGAGG | 49 | 25 | 23 | 92 | $200-1750$ |
| ISSR 810 | GAGAGAGAGAGAGAGAT | 44.6 | 32 | 31 | 96.87 | $150-1750$ |
| ISSR 812 | GAGAGAGAGAGAGAGAA | 44.6 | 28 | 27 | 96.42 | $>150-1750$ |
| ISSR 813 | CTCTCTCTCTCTCTCTT | 44.6 | 26 | 24 | 92.30 | $200-1750$ |
| ISSR 834 | AGAGAGAGAGAGAGAGCTT | 49 | 26 | 26 | 100 | $>150-1750$ |

Table 4: Genic variation statistics for all loci of all populations according to Nei
(1987).

| Populations |  | Summary | Observed number of alleles (na) | Effective number of alleles (ne) | Nei's gene diversity <br> (h) | Shannon's informatio n index (I) | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. of } \\ \text { polymor } \\ \text {-phic } \\ \text { loci } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of } \\ \text { polymor } \\ \text {-phic } \\ \text { loci } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pop. <br> Name | Sample size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pop. 1 | 3 | Mean | 1.0219 | 1.0209 | 0.0107 | 0.0149 | 3 | 2.19 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.1469 | 0.1400 | 0.0717 | 0.1000 |  |  |
| Pop. 2 | 3 | Mean | 1.0219 | 1.0094 | 0.0066 | 0.0104 | 3 | 2.19 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.1469 | 0.0628 | 0.0440 | 0.0700 |  |  |
| Pop. 3 | 3 | Mean | 1.0657 | 1.0396 | 0.0238 | 0.0358 | 9 | 6.57 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.2487 | 0.1629 | 0.0930 | 0.1377 |  |  |
| Pop. 4 | 3 | Mean | 1.0876 | 1.0490 | 0.0304 | 0.0462 | 12 | 8.76 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.2837 | 0.1725 | 0.1013 | 0.1520 |  |  |
| Pop. 5 | 1 | Mean | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0 | 0.00 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |  |  |
| Pop. 6 | 1 | Mean | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0 | 0.00 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |  |  |
| Pop. 7 | 1 | Mean | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0 | 0.00 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |  |  |
| Pop. 8 | 3 | Mean | 1.0584 | 1.0365 | 0.0216 | 0.0323 | 8 | 5.84 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.2353 | 0.1595 | 0.0899 | 0.1324 |  |  |
| Pop. 9 | 3 | Mean | 1.0949 | 1.0521 | 0.0326 | 0.0497 | 13 | 9.49 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.2941 | 0.1754 | 0.1039 | 0.1564 |  |  |
| Pop. <br> 10 | 3 | Mean | 1.1095 | 1.0737 | 0.0424 | 0.0626 | 15 | 10.95 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.3134 | 0.2282 | 0.1254 | 0.1825 |  |  |
| Pop. 11 | 3 | Mean | 1.0511 | 1.0449 | 0.0236 | 0.0333 | 7 | 5.11 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.2210 | 0.1985 | 0.1030 | 0.1450 |  |  |
| Pop.$12$ | 3 | Mean | 1.1095 | 1.0660 | 0.0397 | 0.0597 | 15 | 10.95 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.3134 | 0.2061 | 0.1174 | 0.1737 |  |  |
| Pop. 13 | 1 | Mean | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0 | 0.00 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |  |  |
| Pop.$14$ | 1 | Mean | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0 | 0.00 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Pop. } \\ 15 \end{gathered}$ | 2 | Mean | 1.0584 | 1.0413 | 0.0242 | 0.0353 | 8 | 5.84 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.2353 | 0.1664 | 0.0975 | 0.1423 |  |  |
| Pop.$16$ | 1 | Mean | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0 | 0.00 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |  |  |
| Pop. 17 | 1 | Mean | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0 | 0.00 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |  |  |
| Pop. <br> 18 | 3 | Mean | 1.1241 | 1.0838 | 0.0482 | 0.0711 | 17 | 12.41 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.3309 | 0.2419 | 0.1327 | 0.1930 |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Pop. } \\ 19 \end{gathered}$ | 3 | Mean | 1.0438 | 1.0226 | 0.0145 | 0.0224 | 6 | 4.38 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.2054 | 0.1136 | 0.0696 | 0.1061 |  |  |
| Pop. | 1 | Mean | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0 | 0.00 \% |
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| 20 |  | St. dev. | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pop. 21 | 3 | Mean | 1.0730 | 1.0427 | 0.0260 | 0.0393 | 10 | 7.30 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.2611 | 0.1662 | 0.0959 | 0.1427 |  |  |
| Pop. 22 | 3 | Mean | 1.0803 | 1.0497 | 0.0296 | 0.0442 | 11 | 8.03\% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.2727 | 0.1835 | 0.1037 | 0.1529 |  |  |
| Pop.$23$ | 3 | Mean | 1.1022 | 1.0629 | 0.0375 | 0.0562 | 14 | 10.22 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.3040 | 0.2038 | 0.1152 | 0.1700 |  |  |
| Pop. 24 | 3 | Mean | 1.1022 | 1.0476 | 0.0320 | 0.0502 | 14 | 10.22 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.3040 | 0.1480 | 0.0965 | 0.1503 |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Pop. } \\ 25 \end{gathered}$ | 1 | Mean | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0 | 0.00 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |  |  |
| Pop. 26 | 2 | Mean | 1.0584 | 1.0413 | 0.0242 | 0.0353 | 8 | 5.84 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.2353 | 0.1664 | 0.0975 | 0.1423 |  |  |
| Pop. 27 | 3 | Mean | 1.0876 | 1.0567 | 0.0331 | 0.0492 | 12 | 8.76 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.2837 | 0.1990 | 0.1108 | 0.1622 |  |  |
| Pop. 28 | 3 | Mean | 1.0730 | 1.0427 | 0.0260 | 0.0393 | 10 | 7.30 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.2611 | 0.1662 | 0.0959 | 0.1427 |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Pop. } \\ 29 \end{gathered}$ | 3 | Mean | 1.0803 | 1.0459 | 0.0282 | 0.0427 | 11 | 8.03 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.2727 | 0.1694 | 0.0987 | 0.1475 |  |  |
| Pop. 30 | 2 | Mean | 1.0438 | 1.0310 | 0.0181 | 0.0265 | 6 | 4.38 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.2054 | 0.1452 | 0.0851 | 0.1242 |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Pop. } \\ 31 \end{gathered}$ | 2 | Mean | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0 | 0.00 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |  |  |
| Pop. 32 | 1 | Mean | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0 | 0.00 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |  |  |
| Pop. 33 | 1 | Mean | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0 | 0.00 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Pop. } \\ 34 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2 | Mean | 1.0365 | 1.0258 | 0.0151 | 0.0221 | 5 | 3.65 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.1882 | 0.1331 | 0.0780 | 0.1138 |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Pop. } \\ 35 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3 | Mean | 1.0219 | 1.0132 | 0.0079 | 0.0119 | 3 | 2.19 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.1469 | 0.0959 | 0.0548 | 0.0813 |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Pop. } \\ 36 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3 | Mean | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0 | 0.00\% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |  |  |
| Pop. 37 | 1 | Mean | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0 | 0.00 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |  |  |
| Pop. 38 | 1 | Mean | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0 | 0.00 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Pop. } \\ 39 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3 | Mean | 1.0365 | 1.0271 | 0.0151 | 0.0219 | 5 | 3.65 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.1882 | 0.1483 | 0.0797 | 0.1144 |  |  |
| Pop. <br> 40 | 3 | Mean | 1.0438 | 1.0302 | 0.0172 | 0.0254 | 6 | 4.38 \% |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.2054 | 0.1522 | 0.0833 | 0.1208 |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { pops. } \end{gathered}$ | 89 | Mean | 1.9562 | 1.2826 | 0.1966 | 0.3283 |  |  |
|  |  | St. dev. | 0.2054 | 0.2392 | 0.1305 | 0.1803 |  |  |

Table 5: Nei's analysis of gene diversity in subdivided populations according to

> Nei (1987).

| Populations |  | Summary | Total gene diversity (Ht) | Mean gene diversity within population (Hs) | Proportion differentiation among populations (Gst) | Estimate of gene flow ( Nm ) | No. of polymorphic loci | $\begin{gathered} (\%) \\ \text { poly- } \\ \text { morphic } \\ \text { loci } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pop. name | Sample size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All | 89 | Mean | 0.2038 | 0.0157 | 0.9229 | 0.0417 | 131 | 95.62\% |
| pops. |  | St. dev. | 0.0169 | 0.0009 |  |  |  |  |

Figure 3 : Dendrogram based on genetic distance according to Nei (1978):


Method=UPGMA modified from NEIGHBOR procedure of PHYLIP Version 35


Figure 4: Two-dimensional plot obtained by principal component analysis (PCA) correlation based on molecular data.

Legend: 1, 2 and 3: Population 1 (accessions of L. perenne from Morocco). 4, 5 and 6: Population 2 (accessions of L. perenne from Algeria). 7, 8 and 9: Population 3 (accessions of $L$. perenne from Tunisia). 10, 11 and 12: Population 4 (accessions of L. perenne from Libya). 13: Population 5 (accession of L. perenne from Egypt). 14: Population 6 (accession of $L$. perenne from Palestine). 15: Population 7 (accession of L. perenne from Iraq). 16, $\mathbf{1 7}$ and 18: Population 8 (accessions of L.perenne from Iran). 19, 20 and 21: Population 9 (accessions of L. perenne from Turkey). 22, 23 and 24: Population 10 (accessions of $L$. perenne from Cyprus). 25, 26 and 27: Population 11 (accessions of $L$. perenne from Romania). 28, 29 and 30: Population 12 (accessions of $L$. perenne from Greece). 31: Population 13 (accession of $L$. multiflorum from Morocco). 32: Population 14 (accession of L. multiflorum from Libya). 33 and 34: Population 15 (accessions of L. multiflorum from Egypt). 35: Population 16 (accession of L. multiflorum from Palestine). 36: Population 17 (accession of L. multiflorum from Iran). 37, 38 and 39: Population 18 (accessions of L. multiflorum from Turkey). 40, 41 and 42: Population 19 (accessions of $L$. multiflorum from Romania). 43: Population 20 (accession of L. multiflorum from Greece). 44, 45 and 46: Population 21 (accessions of $L$. rigidum from Morocco). 47, 48 and 49: Population 22 (accessions of L. rigidum from Algeria). 50, 51 and 52: Population 23 (accessions of L. rigidum from Libya). 53, 54 and 55: Population 24 (accessions of L. rigidum from Egypt). 56: Population 25 (accession of L. rigidum
from Jordan). 57 and 58: Population 26 (accessions of L. rigidum from Iraq). 59, 60 and 61: Population 27 (accessions of L. rigidum from Iran). 62, 63 and 64: Population 28 (accessions of L. rigidum from Turkey). 65, 66 and 67: Population 29 (accessions of L. rigidum from Cyprus). 68 and 69: Population 30 (accessions of $L$. rigidum from Greece). 70 and 71: Population 31 (accessions of L. temulentum from Morocco). 72: Population 32 (accession of L. temulentum from Libya). 73: Population 33 (accession of L. temulentum from Egypt). 74 and 75: Population 34 (accessions of L. temulentum from Iraq). 76, 77 and 78: Population 35 (accessions of $L$. temulentum from Turkey). 79, 80 and 81: Population 36 (accessions of L. temulentum from Albania). 82: Population 37 (accession of L. temulentum from Greece). 83: Population 38 (accession of L. persicum from Libya). 84, 85 and 86: Population 39 (accessions of $L$. persicum from Iran). 87, $\mathbf{8 8}$ and 89: Population 40 (accessions of $L$. persicum from Turkey).

## Discussion

Diversity is controlled by immigration, drift, selection or competition, heterogeneity, connectivity and fragmentation of regional landscapes. Identity, abundance and diversity of habitats influence the abundance of species live in certain areas (Noss, 1990). In the present study, the morphological diversity was investigated by scoring 80 characters and 172 character states including: habit, culms, leaves, inflorescences, inflorescences axes, spikelets, florets and caryopses to determine the relationships among these species by applying numerical analyses.

The agglomerative clustering based on morphological data revealed the separation of five groups that represent the five studied species., L. rigidum, L. multiflorum and $L$. perenne share morphological characters as small size of flowers and fruits and firm texture of leaf blade on the upper surface while glossy on the lower one; L. perenne is more associated with $L$. multiflorum than with $L$. rigidum as they have oblong to elliptic spikelets, overlapped and oblong lemmas and their glumes shorter than the spikelets; also, L. persicum and L. temulentum are closely associated with each other, where they have large size of flowers and fruits, firm texture of leaf blade on the both surfaces and their glumes as long as the spikelets. In this work, the resulted cluster as concluded by Stammers et al., 1995; Polok et al., 2006; Ma et al., 2013. Within each
species, populations were sub-grouped geographically according to degree of morphological dissimilarities. High level of morphological similarity was observed between majorities of the populations within each species from different origins, these similarities may be due to highly similar ecological and topographical features of the studied countries over short distances.

The present study showed polymorphism percentage as high as $95.62 \%$ for all populations, where we obtained 131 polymorphic fragments from a total number of 137 fragments. The relationships among these species reflected a high degree of divergence among the studied populations according to the geographical distribution of the accessions.

The highest degrees of gene diversity for all populations were observed among the accessions of $L$. perenne population from Cyprus, L. rigidum from Libya, L. temulentum from Iraq and L. persicum from Turkey. L. multiflorum from Turkey not only showed the highest degree of gene diversity, but also the highest degrees of Shannon's information index, observed number of alleles and effective number of alleles. From these results we can predict that Turkey may be the center of origin of the studied Lolium species. As the result of Blackmore et al. (2015) there is a great correlation between geographic distribution and genetic structure within and between populations of $L$. perenne.

Nei's gene diversity (h) has similar or the same values in some populations within each species (Table 4) this indicates that the gene diversity do not differ significantly among these populations.

In most of the studied populations it was observed that the average values of (na) was greater than that of (ne) at all loci which indicates that the allele frequencies are not equal for all alleles, while in remaining populations the average values of (na) equals that of (ne) which indicates extremely low level of gene diversity or absence of gene diversity in these populations (Table 4).

Nei's analysis of gene diversity of the studied populations (Nei, 1987) showed low level of gene flow among all the populations with an average of 0.0417 and showed high level of the total gene diversity ( Ht ) with an average of 0.2038 that reflects high
degree of complication and independence of the evolutionary line of these species. The level of Proportion differentiation among populations (Gst) is higher than Mean gene diversity within population (Hs), which refers to that the genetic variation within each species is due to differences among the populations not due to differences within each population.

It was found that the accession of L. persicum (GR 5452) from Libya (Fezzan / Aqar) collected in 1983 that was provided by IPK, is associated with the other accessions of L. persicum (from Iran and Turkey) morphologically and molecularly; but the origin of this accession is doubtful because it was not recorded in the Libyan flora 'Flora of Libya' (Sherif and Siddiqi, 1988). So we recommend revision of its collection in IPK to ensure its origin for future studies and to enable its study for other researchers.

Both two-dimensional plot based on principal component analysis (PCA) and the dendrogram based on Nei's (1978) genetic distance supported the separation of the studied accessions into five species. In the meantime, it supported the conclusion that L. rigidum, L. multiflorum and $L$. perenne are closely related to each other, while $L$. perenne is more related to $L$. rigidum than to $L$. multiflorum and $L$. persicum and $L$. temulentum are closely related to each other. Based on molecular data, within each species, the populations also were sub-grouped according to their geographical origin.

Geographical distribution of these species was made in the past due to climatic changes during glacial and interglacial periods since about 18000-25000 years ago, where species migrated northwards during the interglacial periods (Roberts, 1998), this may affect the genetic structure of the populations. Genetic differentiation among the European populations might be increased due to colonization of Lolium species from the Middle East during glaciation periods and their extinction during the interglacial periods or because the species came into Europe with the first farmers as weeds of cereal crops (Polok, 2007).

Finally, the difference between morphological results and molecular results (in relationships among L. perenne, L. multiflorum and $L$. rigidum) may be due to the evolutionary line of Lolium species and the genetic history of them, which impacted the genetic patterns of these species. This conclusion may affect the opinion that supports the point of view of that $L$. perenne and $L$. multiflorum are very associated
with each other (molecularly), another point of view was arose from this study and need to be confirmed by using further significant molecular tools in other future works.
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