



ISSN (E): 2320-3862  
ISSN (P): 2394-0530  
<https://www.plantsjournal.com>  
JMPS 2024; 12(4): 10-14  
© 2024 JMPS  
Received: 03-04-2024  
Accepted: 07-05-2024

**Anmol Fatima Iqbal**  
Riphah International  
University, Faisalabad, Pakistan

**Muhammad Haris Sultan**  
Department of Biochemistry,  
University of Agriculture  
Faisalabad, Pakistan

**Muhammad Faizan**  
Department of Biochemistry,  
University of Agriculture  
Faisalabad, Pakistan

**Usman Naveed**  
Department of Biochemistry,  
University of Agriculture  
Faisalabad, Pakistan

**Muhammad Sohaib Iftikhar**  
Department of Biochemistry,  
University of Agriculture  
Faisalabad, Pakistan

**Noreen Kanwal**  
Department of Biochemistry,  
University of Sargodha,  
Pakistan

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Muhammad Faizan**  
Department of Biochemistry,  
University of Agriculture  
Faisalabad, Pakistan

## A review of comparison and applications of DNA markers for plant genetic analysis

**Anmol Fatima Iqbal, Muhammad Haris Sultan, Muhammad Faizan, Usman Naveed, Muhammad Sohaib Iftikhar and Noreen Kanwal**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22271/plants.2024.v12.i4a.1686>

### Abstract

DNA markers for plant genetic analysis are compared and discussed in this review article. DNA markers are vital in concentrating on legacy designs, genomic variety, transformative cycles, and allele-aggregate cooperation. The decision of a hereditary marker for a particular application relies upon variables like actual qualities, genomic position, cost, straightforwardness of purpose, and throughput necessities. Numerous DNA markers, such as RFLP, RAPD, AFLP, and microarray-based markers, have been developed over the past few decades. These markers have reformed plant reproducing by empowering the planning of genomes, recognizable proof of qualities influencing various cycles and aggregates, appraisal of hereditary variety and advancement, and backing for crop improvement through marker-helped rearing. DNA markers offer dependability, unwavering quality, biosafety, and the capacity to choose for testing characteristics. They have likewise tracked down applications in legal sciences, sickness, determination, systematics, and protection science. Generally speaking, DNA markers have added to the field of plant hereditary investigation and have opened up new roads for atomic reproducing.

**Keywords:** Genomic diversity, molecular breeding, high-resolution melting (HRM) analysis, diversity array technologies (DArT)

### Introduction

DNA markers are essential to plant genetic analysis because they provide useful information about genetic variation and interesting traits. These markers are explicit qualities or DNA arrangements related to known positions on chromosomes. They can be seen as variations brought about by genetic changes or mutations.

As of late, there has been a developing interest in sub-atomic markers that display DNA-level polymorphism in plant hereditary qualities research. These markers have several benefits, one of which is that they can help with breeding practices through a process called "Smart Breeding." Reproducers can choose creatures with unrivaled hereditary potential as guardians for the cutting edge in light of marker-helped determination. At first, morphological markers, which depend on visual perception and estimation of outside creature qualities, were utilized in creature rearing <sup>[1]</sup>.

Be that as it may, DNA markers have altered plant hereditary investigation by giving more precise and solid data. One of the most well-known uses of DNA markers is the advancement of hereditary linkage maps. These guides are made by genotyping an enormous populace of people and investigating the recombination paces of hereditary markers. By distinguishing markers that are firmly connected to hereditary loci of interest, like quantitative quality loci (QTL), specialists can pinpoint the basic qualities answerable for explicit characteristics <sup>[2]</sup>.

Among the different sorts of DNA markers, single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) are especially helpful for hereditary planning because of their high recurrence, quick genotyping capacities, and quick distinguishing proof. SNPs have been effectively connected with monetary plant qualities, for example, overshadowing qualities in rice, male sterility in onions, and the waxy quality in rice, which controls amylose focus <sup>[3]</sup>.

Notwithstanding SNPs, other broadly involved DNA markers in plant genome examination incorporate microsatellites, enhanced part length polymorphisms (AFLPs), arbitrary enhanced polymorphic DNA (RAPD), and single-strand conformational polymorphism (SSCP) <sup>[4,5]</sup>.

Generally speaking, DNA markers have upset plant hereditary examination by giving significant experiences into hereditary variety, genetic linkage, and the recognizable proof of qualities answerable for explicit characteristics. These markers have enormously improved rearing practices and our comprehension of plant populaces and their elements <sup>[6]</sup>.

**Types of DNA markers used in plant genetic analysis**

**Restriction Fragment Length Polymorphism (RFLP):** RFLP markers recognize transformations in unambiguous areas of DNA called limitation locales. By dissecting DNA breakage designs, RFLP can recognize DNA polymorphisms and make exceptionally immersion linkage maps. However, the labor-intensive use of radioactive probes and the requirement for a large quantity of high-quality DNA make RFLP markers less common today [7].

**Random Amplified Polymorphic DNA (RAPD):** RAPD markers are PCR-based markers that amplify DNA segments with random primers. These markers were well-known before, but are currently viewed as less dependable and precisely contrasted with other marker frameworks [8].

**Amplified Fragment Length Polymorphism (AFLP):** AFLP markers arose during the 1990s and are known for their expanded dependability and viability contrasted with RAPD markers. AFLP markers include the specific enhancement of limitation pieces, taking into consideration the genotyping of countless markers [9].

**Single Nucleotide Polymorphism (SNP):** In plant genomes, SNPs are the most common type of genetic variation. These markers recognize single nucleotide changes that can make or erase limitation destinations, prompting polymorphisms in DNA sections. Due to their abundance and capacity for high-throughput genotyping, SNPs are widely used [10].

**Microsatellites or Simple Sequence Repeats (SSRs):** Microsatellites are short couple rehashes of DNA groupings. These markers are exceptionally polymorphic and have been broadly utilized in plant hereditary examination for planning genomes, surveying hereditary variety, and concentrating on developmental cycles [10].

It's essential to take note that the field of DNA markers and hereditary examination is continually developing, and new marker types might arise from now on. Cost, ease of use, and specific research goals all play a role in the selection of a marker.

**Comparison of different DNA marker technologies**

**Restriction Fragment Length Polymorphism (RFLP):** RFLP examination recognizes changes in unambiguous areas of DNA known as limitation locales. It is a profoundly polymorphic and codominant marker that can separate between homozygote and heterozygote genotypes. Notwithstanding, RFLP examination expects earlier arrangement data and is work escalated [7].

**Random Amplified Polymorphic DNA (RAPD):** RAPD markers are PCR-based markers that utilize arbitrary preliminaries to enhance DNA fragments. RAPD markers can be made quickly, at a low cost, and without knowing the sequence. They have been extensively utilized in studies of breeding and population genetics [10].

**Amplified Fragment Length Polymorphism (AFLP):** AFLP markers are additionally PCR-based markers that utilize limitation proteins to process DNA and ligate connectors for intensification. AFLP markers are exceptionally reproducible and can create an enormous number of markers. They have been utilized in poplule hereditary qualities and reproducing studies [10].

**Simple Sequence Repeats (SSRs):** SSRs, otherwise called microsatellites, are short pair rehashes of DNA groupings. SSR markers are exceptionally polymorphic and have high reproducibility. They have been generally utilized for hereditary variety examination, linkage planning, and marker-helped reproduction [10].

**Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms (SNPs):** SNPs are variations in DNA sequences that only have one base pair. SNP markers are plentiful in plant genomes and can be effectively genotyped by utilizing high-throughput sequencing advancements. SNPs have turned into the markers of decisions for expansive affiliation studies and genomic choice [10].

The principles, prices, throughput, and applications of these DNA marker technologies vary. The decision on marker innovation relies upon the particular exploration goals and assets accessible.

**Forensics and Plant Identification:** DNA markers are used in forensic investigations to identify plant species and trace their origin. They are also employed in plant identification and systematics, helping to classify and differentiate plant species based on their genetic profiles.

Overall, genetic diversity analysis using DNA markers plays a crucial role in plant genetic analysis by providing insights into population dynamics, supporting breeding programs, understanding evolutionary relationships, and aiding in plant identification and conservation.

**Marker-assisted breeding and selection using DNA markers**

Marker-helped reproducing, or sub-atomic marker-helped determination (MAS), has changed the field of hereditary qualities and rearing. DNA markers are used in this novel method to select individuals with desirable traits more precisely and effectively for breeding programs. The improvement of different hereditary markers, like single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), microsatellites, and other DNA-based markers, has essentially added to the headway of marker-helped rearing [11].

Customary reproducing strategies vigorously depended on noticeable qualities, frequently evaluated through morphological markers, which were dependent upon emotional appraisals and possible blunders. Be that as it may, the presentation of atomic markers has empowered raisers to straightforwardly dissect a creature's DNA and recognize explicit hereditary varieties related to wanted characteristics.

Atomic markers offer a few benefits with regard to rearing projects. As a matter of some importance, they give a degree of accuracy and precision that was beforehand out of reach with conventional rearing techniques. By straightforwardly looking at a person's hereditary cosmetics, reproducers can distinguish and choose explicit qualities or genomic locales related to wanted characteristics, prompting more designated and productive rearing cycles [11].

Additionally, the efficiency of marker-assisted breeding is enhanced. Early and precise recognizable proof of people with wanted qualities speeds up the rearing system, decreasing the time and assets required contrasted with customary techniques. This proficiency is especially significant in present-day farming, where the interest in further developed crop assortments and animals is always developing.

The decreased susceptibility of molecular markers to the

influence of the environment is one of their primary benefits. Unlike customary techniques that depend on phenotypic perceptions, DNA markers are less impacted by outside factors, upgrading the unwavering quality of rearing results across assorted natural circumstances.

Besides, marker-helped rearing takes into account the determination of people in light of complicated qualities constrained by different qualities. This is a critical improvement over customary strategies, which frequently battled with the choice of polygenic characteristics.

### **Advantages and limitations of DNA markers in plant genetic analysis**

#### **Advantages**

##### **a. High Throughput Genotyping with SNPs**

The ability of DNA markers, particularly Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms (SNPs), to perform high-throughput genotyping is a significant advantage. SNPs empower the concurrent examination of various hereditary loci, giving a savvy and productive way to deal with concentrating on hereditary variety and quality affiliations <sup>[11]</sup>.

##### **b. Precision in Marker-Assisted Selection (MAS)**

DNA markers, when utilized in Marker-Helped Choice (MAS), offer accuracy in reproducing programs. The capacity to distinguish explicit markers connected to positive attributes permits reproducers to choose plants with designated qualities. For instance, the accuracy of disease resistance selection is improved by using Sequence Characterized Amplified Regions (SCARs) derived from Random Amplified Polymorphic DNA (RAPD) markers <sup>[12]</sup>.

##### **c. Quantitative Trait Locus (QTL) Mapping for Complex Traits**

DNA markers, particularly SNPs, have demonstrated worthwhile use in Quantitative Quality Locus (QTL) planning for complex characteristics like yield improvement. The high overflow and usefulness of SNPs work with the distinguishing proof of genomic areas related to quantitative attributes, supporting the advancement of yields with upgraded execution <sup>[2]</sup>.

##### **d. Assessment of Genetic Diversity with Microsatellites (SSRs)**

Straightforward Succession Rehashes (SSRs), or microsatellites, give important benefits in evaluating hereditary variety. Their high polymorphism and co-prevailing nature make them successful instruments for describing hereditary varieties inside plant populaces. This supports preservation endeavors and illuminates manageable reproducing rehearsals <sup>[11]</sup>.

##### **e. Versatility of SCoT Markers**

Begin codon designated polymorphism (SCoT) markers offer flexibility in concentrating on populace elements and hereditary variety. Their reproducibility and education make them important for assorted applications, adding to the protection of plant hereditary assets and understanding population structures <sup>[6]</sup>.

##### **f. Cost-Effective Genomic Analysis with AFLPs**

Intensified Part Length Polymorphisms (AFLPs) consolidate the benefits of both restriction absorption and polymerase chain response (PCR). These markers give a financially savvy technique to genomic examination, working with linkage

planning and supporting the gathering of genomic sequencing information <sup>[13]</sup>.

### **Limitations**

#### **a. Expense of SNP Marker Development**

Notwithstanding the upsides of SNPs, their improvement can be costly, particularly when depending on DNA arrangement information. In any case, the diminishing expense of cutting-edge sequencing advances has relieved this limit somewhat.

#### **b. Dominance of Some DNA Markers**

Some DNA markers, like SCoTs, may transcendently produce predominant markers. This strength can restrict the data acquired from heterozygous people, possibly influencing the exactness of hereditary variety appraisals.

#### **c. Complexity and skill requirements in AFLPs**

While AFLPs are savvy, they require specialized skills and can be taken seriously. Moreover, the translation of AFLP banding examples might present difficulties, requesting talented staff for exact examination.

#### **d. Environmental Influence on Marker Expression**

Biochemical markers like isozymes, which were utilized by and large, might be affected by ecological circumstances since they are the aftereffect of quality articulation. This can present inconstancy that isn't intelligent because of the hereditary cosmetics alone.

#### **e. Limited Resolution of Morphological Markers**

Customary morphological markers given outside attributes can give results inclined toward mistakes because of erratic appraisals and depictions. Their restricted goal might prevent precise experiences in hereditary advancement and variety.

### **Prospects and advancements in DNA marker technology for plant genetic analysis**

#### **a. Single Nucleotide Polymorphism (SNP) Markers and High-Throughput Genotyping Methods**

Strategies, like divided, intensified polymorphic arrangements (covers), Sanger sequencing, SNP-RFLP, and single-strand conformational polymorphism (SSCP) are utilized for SNP genotyping, considering point-by-point examination of hereditary varieties <sup>[14]</sup>.

**b. High-Throughput Genotyping:** SNP markers, especially with headways in high-throughput genotyping strategies like Cutting Edge Sequencing (NGS), DARt markers, genotyping by sequencing, and allele-explicit PCR, empower fast and synchronous genotyping of thousands of polymorphic loci, improving the comprehension of plant hereditary variety.

#### **c. Diversity Array Technologies (DARt)**

Microarray-Based Hybridization Strategies: DARt markers, in light of microarray-based hybridization procedures, offer an efficient option for planning and hereditary variety studies. They empower synchronous genotyping of thousands of polymorphic loci in a solitary measure, giving a profoundly reproducible and practical strategy <sup>[15]</sup>.

**d. Application in Plant Diversity Studies:** Due to their ability to handle high DNA fragment densities, DARt markers are preferred for examining genetic variation, constructing genetic maps, and studying plant diversity <sup>[16]</sup>.

### e. Advancements in Marker Systems

**Co-Dominant SCAR Markers:** Co-predominant SCAR markers, a superior variation of RAPDs, offer higher explicitness and reproducibility. Notwithstanding challenges, progressing endeavors are coordinated towards tending to constraints, for example, the requirement for extra data before PCR and recognition cutoff points of preliminaries to improve their utility <sup>[17, 18]</sup>.

**f. Dominant SRAP Markers:** SRAP, a prevailing and successful framework for vast piece creation, is hearty, productive, and cheap, making it broadly pertinent in map development, hereditary assortment examination, and DNA fingerprinting <sup>[19, 20]</sup>.

### g. Integration of High-Resolution Melting (HRM) Analysis with ISSR Markers

**Upgrading ISSR Marker Innovation:** Joining ISSR markers with high goal softening (HRM) examination tends to difficulties and further develops ID and verification of plant species. This blend gives valuable outcomes for establishing a variety of studies and cultivar advancement <sup>[21, 22]</sup>.

### Challenges and Future Directions

**Detection Limits: Location Cutoff points:** Tending to difficulties, for example, the identification of furthest reaches of specific marker frameworks, going from 0.1 to 25 ng, by expanding test numbers and utilizing quantitative PCR for further developed awareness.

**NGS Technology for Plant Species:** Beating constraints in the utilization of NGS innovation for plant species, for example, the requirement for more examination to lay out standard working methods and handle the enormous information age <sup>[23]</sup>.

### Conclusion

DNA markers have introduced a groundbreaking period in plant hereditary examination, offering accuracy and productivity in unwinding the complexities of plant genomes. From customary morphological markers to contemporary high-throughput genotyping strategies, like Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms (SNPs) and microsatellites, these markers have upset rearing practices.

The effect of DNA markers reaches out past rearing, incorporating criminological examinations, sickness analysis, and preservation endeavors. While every marker type presents one of a kind benefits and constraints, their determination relies upon factors like expense and exploration targets. Challenges, including the advancement expenses of specific markers and specialized ability required, continue.

Looking forward, the possibilities for DNA marker innovation are promising. Progressing research tries to improve recognition limits, refine conventions, and incorporate arising innovations for a more extensive comprehension of plant genomes. As we explore this developing scene, the significant effect of DNA markers on plant hereditary qualities and rearing commitments proceeded with advancement, adding to maintainable agribusiness and worldwide food security.

### References

1. Al-Samarai FR, Al-Kazaz AA. Molecular markers: An introduction and applications. *Eur. J Mol. Biol. Biochem.* 2015;9:118-130.
2. Hayward AC, Tollenare R, Dalton-Morgan J, Batley J.

- Molecular marker applications in plants. In: *Plant genotyping: Methods and protocols.* 2015;47:13-27.
3. Restrepo CM, Llanes A, Lleonart R. Use of AFLP for the study of eukaryotic pathogens affecting humans. *Infect Genet Evol.* 2018;63:360-369.
4. Adhikari S, Saha S, Biswas A, Rana TS, Bandyopadhyay TK, Ghosh P; c2017.
5. Kordrostami M, Rahimi M. Molecular markers in plants: Concepts and applications. *Genet 3<sup>rd</sup> Millenn.* 2015;13:4024-4031.
6. Hasan N, Choudhary S, Naaz N, Sharma N, Laskar RA. Recent advancements in molecular marker-assisted selection and applications in plant breeding programmes. *Biotechnol Genet Eng.* 2021;1:1-26.
7. Al-Hadeithi ZS, Jasim SA. Study of plant genetic variation through molecular markers: An overview. 2021;33:464-473.
8. Kumari N, Thakur SK. Randomly amplified polymorphic DNA - a brief review. *Am J Anim. Vet. Sci.* 2014;9(1):06-13.
9. Sheeja TE, Kumar IPV, Giridhari A, *et al.* Amplified fragment length polymorphism: Applications and recent developments. In: *Molecular Plant Taxonomy: Methods and Protocols;* c2021. p. 187-218.
10. Ramesh P, Mallikarjuna G, Sameena S, *et al.* Advancements in molecular marker technologies and their applications in diversity studies. *J Biosci.* 2020;45:1-15.
11. Barman M, Kundu S. Molecular markers and a new vista in plant breeding: A review. *Int. J Curr. Microbiol. App Sci.* 2019;8:1921-1929.
12. Bhagyawant SS. RAPD-SCAR markers: An interface tool for authentication of traits. *J Biosci. Med.* 2016;4:01-11
13. Stölting KN, Clarke AC, Meudt HM, Blankenhorn WU, Wilson AB. Cost-effective fluorescent amplified fragment length polymorphism (AFLP) analyses using a three primer system. *Mol. Ecol. Resour.* 2011;11(3):494-502. DOI: 10.1111/j.1755-0998.2010.02957.x.
14. Amiteye S. Basic concepts and methodologies of DNA marker systems in plant molecular breeding. *Heliyon,* 2021, 7(10). DOI: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e08093.
15. Loera-Sánchez M, Studer B, Kölliker R. DNA-based assessment of genetic diversity in grassland plant species: Challenges, approaches, and applications. *Agronomy,* 2019, 9(12). DOI: 10.3390/agronomy9120881.
16. Emrey TM. Application of molecular markers SNP and DArT in plant breeding: A review paper. *J Agric. Crops.* 2018;4(8):86-92.
17. Ambreetha S, Balachandar D. SCAR marker: A potential tool for authentication of agriculturally important microorganisms. *J Basic Microbiol.* 2022;63(1):4-16. DOI: 10.1002/jobm.202200419.
18. Dar AA, Mahajan R, Sharma S. Molecular markers for characterization and conservation of plant genetic resources. *Indian J Agric. Sci.* 2019;89(11):1764-1772. DOI: 10.56093/ijas.v89i11.95286.
19. Nadeem MA, Nawaz MA, Shahid MQ, Doğan Y, Comertpay G, Yıldız M, *et al.* DNA molecular markers in plant breeding: Current status and recent advancements in genomic selection and genome editing. *Biotechnol Biotechnol Equip.* 2017;32(2):261-285. DOI: 10.1080/13102818.2017.1400401.
20. Asande LK, Ombori O, Nyaboga EN, Oduor RO. Efficient shoot organogenesis using leaf disc and nodal

- explants of passion fruit (*Passiflora edulis* Sims) and genetic fidelity assessment using sequence-related amplified polymorphism (SRAP) markers. *Int. J Agronomy*; c2020. DOI: 10.1155/2020/3205710.
21. Buddhachat K, Changtor P, Ninket S. An accurate and rapid method for species identification in plants: Melting fingerprint-high resolution melting (MFin-HRM) analysis. *Plant Gene*, 2019, 20.  
DOI: 10.1016/j.plgene.2019.100203.
  22. Stavridou E, Lagiotis G, Kalaitzidou P, *et al.* Characterization of the genetic diversity present in a diverse sesame landrace collection based on phenotypic traits and EST-SSR markers coupled with an HRM analysis. *Plants*, 2021, 10(4).  
DOI: 10.3390/plants10040656.
  23. Hess JF, Kohl TA, Kotrová M, Rönsch K, Paprotka T, Mohr V, *et al.* Library preparation for next-generation sequencing: A review of automation strategies. *Biotechnol. Adv.*; c2020. p. 41.  
DOI: 10.1016/j.biotechadv.2020.107537.