

01 Genomics of Yams, a Common Source of Food 02 and Medicine in the Tropics 03 04

05 Hodeba D. Mignouna, Mathew M. Abang, and Robert Asiedu
06
07
08
09
10
11
12

13 **Abstract** Yams (*Dioscorea* spp., Dioscoreaceae), grown either for their starchy
14 tubers or medicinal properties, are important crops in the tropics and subtropics.
15 Yams broaden the food base and provide food security and income to over 300
16 million people. They are vegetatively propagated and comprise both diploid and
17 polyploid species. Despite their economic and socio-cultural importance, very little
18 is known about the genetics and genomics of yams due to research neglect and several
19 biological constraints. Consequently, conventional breeding efforts have been
20 severely hampered. Research to unravel the apparent complexity of the yam genome
21 will have far-reaching implications for genetic improvement of this important tuber
22 crop. Nevertheless, progress has been made recently towards understanding
23 *Dioscorea* phylogeny and phylogenetic relationships within the genus. Also, improved
24 molecular technologies have been developed for genome analysis, including
25 germplasm characterization, cytogenetics, genetic mapping and tagging, and
26 functional genomics. Genetic linkage maps have been constructed for *D. rotundata*
27 and *D. alata*, and quantitative trait loci associated with resistance to *Yam mosaic virus*
28 in *D. rotundata* and anthracnose (*Colletotrichum gloeosporioides*) in *D. alata*
29 have been identified. In addition, candidate random amplified polymorphic DNA
30 markers associated with major genes controlling resistance to *Yam mosaic virus* and
31 anthracnose have been identified. These markers could be converted to sequence-
32 characterized amplified regions and used for marker-assisted selection for resistance
33 to diseases. An initial cDNA library has been constructed to develop expressed sequence
34 tags for gene discovery and as a source of additional molecular markers. Genetic
35 engineering offers a powerful tool, complementing conventional breeding
36 approaches, for yam improvement. Methods for yam transformation, including in
37 vitro plant regeneration, gene delivery, selection of transformed tissues, and recovery
38 of transgenic plants have been developed but still need improvements. This
39 chapter reviews advances made in yam molecular marker development for genome
40
41
42

43 H.D. Mignouna
44 African Agricultural Technology Foundation (AATF), Nairobi, Kenya
45 e-mail: h.mignouna@aatf-africa.org

01 analysis, phylogeny, molecular cytogenetics, characterization of genetic diversity,
02 genetic mapping and tagging, and progress in functional genomics.

03

04

05 **1 Introduction**

06

07 Yams are classified in the genus *Dioscorea*, a genus widely reported as com-
08 prising around 600 species (Burkill 1960). More recent estimates indicate that
09 approximately 200 species are distributed throughout the tropics and subtropics
10 (Ayensu 1972). Plants of the genus *Dioscorea* are angiosperms that belong to the
11 monocotyledon order Dioscoreales. Interestingly, the order Dioscoreales is char-
12 acterized by several dicotyledonous features, such as reticulate-veining, stalked
13 net-nerving leaves, circularly arranged vascular bundles in the stem, and the lat-
14 eral position of the pistil. Yams show a second vestigial cotyledon, which renders
15 them intermediate with respect to the phylogenetic relationships between mono-
16 and dicotyledonous plants, even though the traditional division of the angiosperms
17 in mono- and dicotyledonous plants was formally discontinued with the introduction
18 of the Magnoliopsida as a distal class of the angiosperms (Frohne and Jensen 1998).
19 Yam plants are herbaceous or woody climbing plants with tuberous, starch-rich
20 storage organs. The aerial storage organ of Dioscoreaceae is the bulbil. They are
21 perennial plants with a strongly marked annual cycle of growth (Coursey 1983). In
22 the southern United States the name yam is used for sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas*,
23 L. Poir.) and elsewhere for the edible tubers of aroids (Frohne and Jensen 1998;
24 Purseglove 1988). More generally, and in the present chapter, the term yam is con-
25 fined to plants of the genus *Dioscorea*. Guinea yams (*D. rotundata* and *D. cayenen-*
26 *sis*) were domesticated in West Africa, while the water or greater yam (*D. alata*)
27 probably originated from the southeast Asian-Oceanian region (Malapa et al. 2005).
28 *D. alata* was previously considered to be a possible cultigen (Barrau 1965), but it
29 is now known to be a true species with normal sexuality (Lebot et al. 1998; Malapa
30 et al. 2005).

31 In West and Central Africa, where Guinea yams were domesticated about 7000
32 years ago, farmers selected genotypes that best suited their needs and thus have gen-
33 erated a large number of traditional cultivars. Yam production has increased steadily
34 in the last decade, from 18 million metric tonnes in 1990 to recent estimates of over
35 39 million (FAO 2006). This increase has been achieved mainly through the planting
36 of traditional landraces and can be explained by the rapid increase in acreage of yam
37 fields into marginal lands and into non-traditional yam growing areas. This expan-
38 sion highlights the need to provide farmers with improved varieties that combine
39 high yields with pest and disease resistance and acceptable tuber quality.

40 Collaborative evaluations of International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)-
41 derived breeding lines with national yam programs in Africa have led to the official
42 release of a number of white yam varieties having multiple pest and disease resis-
43 tance, wide adaptability, and good organoleptic attributes. However, this progress
44 has been difficult, time-consuming, and laborious due to biological constraints
45 that impede the elucidation of the genetics of important traits in yam. Genetic

01 improvement of yam has been hampered by a long growth cycle (lasting about eight
02 months or more), dioecy, poor to no flowering, asynchronous flowering of male and
03 female parents, polyploidy, vegetative propagation, high heterozygosity, and poor
04 knowledge of the crop's genetic diversity (Asiedu et al. 1998). Yam is cultivated in
05 widely varying agroecological zones and the performance of genotypes is disparate
06 across regions, thereby multiplying breeding goals.

07 Molecular markers that are linked to genes controlling economic traits would be
08 useful in selection at an early stage of the plant's growth, thereby enhancing the
09 speed and efficiency of selection. Biotechnology not only provides an alternative
10 approach, but also complements the efforts in conventional breeding (Mignouna
11 et al. 2003a). This chapter will review yam molecular marker development for
12 genome analysis, phylogeny, cytogenetics, characterization of genetic diversity, ge-
13 netic mapping and tagging, and progress in functional genomics.

17 **1.1 Economic, Agronomic, and Societal Importance of Yams**

18
19 Yam is produced throughout the tropical and sub-tropical regions of the world.
20 Guinea yams are the most popular and economically important yams in West and
21 Central Africa where they are indigenous, while water or greater yam is the most
22 widely distributed species globally. The majority of global yam production is in
23 Africa. West Africa accounts for about 95% of world production and 96% of the
24 area (FAO 2006). Yam production globally reached 39.85 million Mt harvested from
25 4.44 million ha in 2005 (FAO 2006). The largest producer was Nigeria with 26.59
26 million Mt, followed by Ghana (3.89), Côte d'Ivoire (3.00), and Benin (2.56). The
27 profitability of yam production, the value of yams in local trade (Hahn et al. 1987;
28 Nweke et al. 1991), as well as the current and potential revenue from their export
29 to ethnic markets in Europe and Northern America are often underestimated. In
30 many parts of West Africa, for instance southeastern Nigeria, yams rank first among
31 the major food crops in terms of cash income per hectare (IITA 1988; Nweke
32 et al. 1991).

33 Food yams are grown principally for the carbohydrate they provide. The tubers,
34 which are the only edible part, have a tremendous capacity to store food reserves.
35 They broaden the food base and bring food security to 300 million people in the
36 low-income, food-deficit countries of the tropics, providing them with about 200
37 kilocalories daily. The net dietary protein calorie content in yams is about 4.6%,
38 which compares well with 4.7% in maize (Hahn et al. 1987; FAO 1999). Socioeco-
39 nomic surveys conducted in Nigeria indicated that there was a positive elasticity of
40 demand for yams at all expenditure levels, and that production research towards in-
41 creasing yam supply will consequently increase quantities consumed at low-income
42 levels in sub-Saharan Africa (Nweke et al. 1992).

43 In West Africa, yam tubers are typically boiled and pounded into dough for
44 easy swallowing. In Madagascar, tubers of some species can be eaten raw (e.g.,
45 *D. soso*, *D. nako*, and *D. fandra*). Others are simply boiled or baked (e.g., *D. alata*),

01 while others need extensive preparation such as immersion in running water for
02 1–3 days or drying in the sun (e.g., *D. antaly*). *Dioscorea* species are not only
03 known for their food value but also for their secondary metabolites. They contain
04 steroidal saponins, diterpenoids, and alkaloids, which have been exploited for mak-
05 ing poisons (Neuwinger 1996) and pharmaceutical products (Chu and Figueiredo-
06 Ribeiro 1991).

10 **1.2 Yam as an Experimental Organism**

11
12 The genus *Dioscorea* has been considered to be an attractive model for investigating
13 ploidy events and chromosome evolution in wild and cultivated species in relation
14 to vegetative propagation and the process of domestication (Bousalem et al. 2006).
15 Yam, though an “orphan” crop, can provide a good model for traits not possessed by
16 other model crops. For instance, the tuber is an important ecological (and economic)
17 trait possessed by only a few models: potato may serve for eudicots, but we have
18 little basis to judge how suitable it might be as a model for monocots. In other
19 words, we do not know how general the tuberization process is in angiosperms.
20 Knowledge of gene expression at the appropriate stages in a tuberous monocot
21 (e.g., *Dioscorea*, yams), matched with a candidate gene approach, would allow us to
22 address this question. Phylogenetic morphology studies reveal that the “monocot”
23 mode of leaf development typifies a nested group. However, not all monocots have
24 this mode of leaf development; some have either dicot or intermediate modes of
25 development. The grass models may serve taxa with monocot modes; but other
26 taxa (e.g., *Dioscorea*) may be needed to understand other developmental modes
27 (Bharathan 1996).

28 Given its dioecious nature with different morphologies of staminate and pis-
29 tillate plants in some species; its dicot-like leaf structure (net-veined and petio-
30 late) with early development intermediate between dicot and monocot modes
31 (Bharathan 1996); distinct changes in shoot apical meristem (SAM) structure and
32 phyllotaxy during phase transition from juvenile to adult (Burkill 1960); tuber for-
33 mation and dormancy; small C-value and widespread polyploidy (Dansi et al. 2001;
34 Egesi et al. 2002; Bousalem et al. 2006), *Dioscorea* offers a system in which to
35 raise general biological questions that cannot be addressed in many other species.
36 It thus holds great promise of yielding important clues to explain differences be-
37 tween eudicot and grass models (e.g., non-orthology of KNOX genes controlling
38 SAM indeterminacy [Bharathan et al. 1999]) and offering examples of biological
39 phenomena such as dioecy, tuberization, and modes of vine twining.

40 Tuber dormancy is an important field adaptive mechanism that also helps to
41 maintain organoleptic quality during storage, but it creates a major problem for plant
42 breeders. This is because harvested tubers remain dormant (i.e. incapable of devel-
43 oping an internal shoot bud or external shoot bud/sprout) for 30 to 150 d (Orkwor
44 and Ekanayake 1998), only one crop cycle is possible per year, which slows progress
45 in yam improvement. Knowledge gained from yams may lead to the elucidation and

01 successful manipulation of tuber dormancy in other plant species. Elucidation of
02 the molecular changes taking place in yams during post-harvest storage will help in
03 understanding the process of tuber dormancy (Kone-Coulibaly et al. 2003).

07 **2 Development of Molecular Markers for Genome Analysis**

09 Yams are monocots, but very distantly related to the grasses. Thus there is no con-
10 venient model system for yam genomics. Initial efforts in yam genomics sought
11 to exploit heterologous DNA sequences as a source of RFLP markers (Terauchi
12 et al. 1992). Later, the approach of using uncharacterized DNA sequences was
13 adopted as a source of genetic markers. AFLP was the molecular marker of choice
14 (Mignouna et al. 1998). RAPD and AFLP polymorphism was high among diverse
15 yam species, with AFLP revealing the highest polymorphism. Sixty-four AFLP
16 primer combinations were tested for their potential use in assessment of genetic
17 diversity in white Guinea yam (Mignouna et al. 1998). Although RAPD mark-
18 ers were adequate for genetic diversity studies (Dansî et al. 2000a), the level of
19 polymorphism detected in mapping populations was low; therefore, RAPD was not
20 considered a good marker-system for mapping purposes. Contrary to RAPDs, the
21 high level of polymorphism revealed by AFLP markers, coupled with their robust-
22 ness, made AFLP a more reliable and reproducible marker-system for yam genome
23 analysis (Mignouna et al. 1998; Mignouna et al. 2003b; Malapa et al. 2005).

24 As progress was being made in yam genomics, co-dominant molecular markers
25 such as microsatellites or simple sequence repeats (SSRs) were required because of
26 their expected high polymorphism, co-dominant inheritance, high abundance and
27 even distribution across the genome. In a study of a natural population of *D. tokoro*,
28 a wild diploid East Asian yam species ($2n = 20$), Terauchi and Konuma (1994) de-
29 tected microsatellite polymorphisms. A high number of polymorphic alleles was
30 detected per microsatellite locus, suggesting that these microsatellite primers could
31 be transferable to other *Dioscorea* species. Unfortunately, when the *D. tokoro* mi-
32 crosatellite primers were applied to other yam species, they failed to amplify any
33 DNA, indicating that these primer sequences are not conserved among *Dioscorea*
34 species. However, the study demonstrated the potential usefulness of these markers
35 for yams. Microsatellite markers were later developed for food yams in a collabora-
36 tive project between IITA and the University of Saskatchewan, Canada, and used to
37 assess genetic diversity in *D. rotundata* (Mignouna et al. 2003b). A few microsatel-
38 lite markers were characterized by several authors, but because of the relatively
39 small number of markers developed (six in *D. tokoro* [Terauchi and Konuma 1994]
40 and nine in *D. rotundata* [Mignouna et al. 2003b]) and the low level of polymor-
41 phism detected in mapping populations, microsatellites were not considered a good
42 marker system for mapping purposes.

43 Increased interest in yam genomics and the need for robust molecular and genetic
44 tools for genome analysis led to the development of 10 microsatellite markers in
45 *D. japonica* (Mizuki et al. 2005). Tostain et al. (2006) developed and characterized 16

01 new SSR markers in different species of yam, several of which were transferable to
02 species of other *Dioscorea* sections. Transferability was higher among species belong-
03 ing to the same botanical section (*Enantiophyllum*. Within the *Enantiophyllum* sec-
04 tion, the patterns differed for the African species on one hand and the Asian-Oceanian
05 species *D. alata* and *D. nummularia* on the other. Similarly, Hochu et al. (2006)
06 developed 20 microsatellite markers in American yam (*D. trifida*) and found high
07 cross-species amplification involving four additional *Dioscorea* species: the cultivated
08 *D. alata*, *D. cayenensis*–*D. rotundata*, and the two African wild yams, *D. praehensilis*
09 and *D. abyssinica*. The four species tested are classified into the botanical section
10 *Enantiophyllum* that is phylogenetically distant from the section *Macrogynodium*
11 to which *D. trifida* belongs. This large cross-species applicability indicated that the
12 primers will be useful for additional studies within the *Dioscorea* genus.
13
14
15

16 **3 Phylogeny, Molecular Cytogenetics, and Genetic Diversity**

17 **3.1 Yam Phylogeny**

18
19
20 Phylogenetic relationships of yams have not been well established because of diffi-
21 culties in species identification due to a high level of polymorphism in morpholog-
22 ical characters. Although all species in the genus are dioecious, some species have
23 different species names for its male and female plants. Recent analyses of morpho-
24 logical and molecular data sets have indicated relationships within Dioscoreaceae
25 R. Br. (Caddick et al. 2002a), and a formal reclassification of the family has been
26 presented (Caddick et al. 2002b). Dioscoreaceae now contains four distinct genera,
27 *Dioscorea*, *Stenomeris*, *Tacca* (previously in Taccaceae), and *Trichopus*. The dioe-
28 cious Dioscoreaceae genera, *Borderea*, *Epipetrum*, *Nanarepenta*, *Rajania*, *Tamus*,
29 and *Testudinaria*, are nested within *Dioscorea* in phylogenetic analyses (Caddick
30 et al. 2002a), and are therefore sunk into it.

31 Wilkin et al. (2005) conducted phylogenetic analysis of yams based on sequence
32 data from the plastid genes *rbcL* and *matK*, using 67 species of *Dioscorea* and cov-
33 ering all the main Old World and selected New World lineages. They found that the
34 main Old World groups (such as the right-twining *Dioscorea* section *Enantiophyl-*
35 *lum* to which most edible yams belong) are monophyletic and that there are two
36 distinct lineages among the endemic Malagasy taxa. These findings have important
37 consequences for character evolution, intrageneric classification, and the origins
38 of diversity in *Dioscorea*. Earlier, Kawabe et al. (1997) had examined the phylo-
39 genetic relationship of six species (*D. gracillima*, *D. nipponica*, *D. quinqueloba*,
40 *D. septemloba*, *D. tenuipes*, and *D. tokoro*), in the section *Stenophora* of the genus
41 *Dioscorea*, based on nucleotide sequence variation in 1073 bp of the coding region
42 of the phosphoglucose isomerase locus. They found that *D. tenuipes* and *D. tokoro*
43 belonged to a monophyletic clade, while the other species formed a separate mono-
44 phyletic group. These studies point to the possibility of greatly simplifying the clas-
45 sification of yams proposed by Knuth and Burkill (Chair et al. 2005).

01 Based on RFLP analysis of the chloroplast and nuclear ribosomal DNA,
02 Terauchi et al. (1992) found four different taxonomic groups with *D. rotundata* and
03 *D. cayenensis* being classified in the same chloroplast DNA-defined group as the
04 wild species *D. praehensilis*, *D. abyssinica*, and *D. liebrechtsiana*. The other three
05 classes identified among the wild species comprised *D. minutiflora*, *D. burkilliana*,
06 *D. smilacifolia*, and *D. togoensis*. Cluster analysis based on the enzyme system 6-
07 PGD revealed a tendency towards separation of the annual species (*D. abyssinica*,
08 *D. praehensilis*, *D. rotundata*) from the perennial species (*D. burkilliana*, *D. smi-*
09 *lacifolia*, *D. minutiflora*) and their derivative (*D. cayenensis*) (Mignouna et al.
10 2003c). This indicated that 6-PGD may be useful in phylogenetic studies in yam.

14 3.2 Molecular Dissection of the *D. cayenensis-rotundata* Complex

16 Ayensu and Coursey (1972), Martin and Rhodes (1978), and Miège (1982a, b) pro-
17 posed merging of Guinea yams, *D. cayenensis* and *D. rotundata*, into a species
18 complex based on a comparison of their morphological characteristics. However,
19 the taxonomy and evolution of the *D. cayenensis-rotundata* complex remains con-
20 troversial (Dansi et al. 1999), with different authors considering Guinea yam to be
21 represented either by one species, two species, or a species complex (Martin and
22 Rhodes 1978; Miège 1982a, b; Onyilagha and Lowe 1985; Hamon and Touré 1990a,
23 b; Hamon et al. 1992; Terauchi et al. 1992; Asemota et al. 1996). Cluster analysis
24 of 467 Guinea yam accessions based on seven polymorphic enzyme systems clearly
25 separated the *D. rotundata* (white yam) and the *D. cayenensis* (yellow yam) acces-
26 sions (Dansi et al. 2000b). This clear partition into two groups was consistent with
27 the concept that the two forms of Guinea yam represent different genetic entities
28 which may be treated as two separate taxa, supporting the view of Onyilagha and
29 Lowe (1985).

30 Molecular markers have been used to delineate species boundaries surround-
31 ing *D. rotundata* and *D. cayenensis* (Terauchi et al. 1992; Mignouna et al. 1998;
32 Mignouna et al. 2005a, b; Chair et al. 2005). On the basis of RFLP analysis
33 of chloroplast and nuclear ribosomal DNA, Terauchi et al. (1992) proposed that
34 *D. rotundata* was domesticated from one of the wild species that shared the same
35 chloroplast genotype, and that *D. cayenensis* is of hybrid origin and should be
36 considered as a variety of *D. rotundata*. Similar results were obtained by Chair
37 et al. (2005), who reported that *D. cayenensis* and *D. rotundata* share the same
38 cpSSR haplotype. However, Ramser et al. (1997) used four molecular marker sys-
39 tems (RAPD, microsatellite-primed PCR random amplified microsatellite polymor-
40 phism, and a comparative sequence analysis of three noncoding chloroplast DNA
41 sequences) to confirm the separation of Guinea yams into two distinct species,
42 *D. rotundata* and *D. cayenensis*. Mignouna et al. (1998) used two AFLP primer
43 combinations to generate a total of 87 polymorphic loci across 20 Guinea yam
44 cultivar groups. Phylogenetic analysis of the data revealed five major cultivar
45 groups among which the group that corresponded to *D. cayenensis* was genetically

01 distant from the varietal groups of *D. rotundata*, as found in other molecular stud-
02 ies. In another study with RAPD and double stringency PCR markers (Mignouna
03 et al. 2005a), accessions of Guinea yam, which were classified into seven morpho-
04 types/cultivar groups, could be clearly separated into two major groups correspond-
05 ing to *D. rotundata* and *D. cayenensis*. It was proposed, based on these results, that
06 cultivars classified into *D. cayenensis* should be considered as a taxon separate from
07 *D. rotundata*. Mignouna et al. (2005a) considered that the discrepancy between their
08 results and those of Terauchi et al. (1992) probably arose from the fact that they
09 scanned the entire genome using PCR-based markers while the RFLP analysis of
10 Terauchi et al. (1992) was based on the rDNA gene. Although useful for inferring
11 phylogenetic relationships, the rDNA gene represents only a small fraction of the
12 total genome and there are risks of recreating gene trees rather than species trees.
13
14
15

16 **3.3 Molecular Cytogenetics**

17
18 Identification of the most common gametic ploidy level of each accession in a
19 polyploid species, such as yams, is necessary for efficient hybridization. It is of
20 practical importance for yam breeders to determine the ploidy status of clones, es-
21 pecially of new introductions, before they can be utilized in a breeding program,
22 to enable matching of ploidy levels as well as facilitate ploidy manipulations in
23 intraspecific crosses. The existence of various ploidy levels and the lack of a diploid
24 relative to the cultivated polyploid yams have greatly complicated genetic studies
25 of the crop. Unlike most plants, differences in ploidy levels in yam plants are not
26 reflected by any characteristic morphological feature. Phenotypic differences are ex-
27 pectedly greater within than between ploidy levels as also observed in other species
28 (Dessauw 1988). Thus, cytological irregularities leading to erratic flowering and
29 reproductive behavior are expected. Observations have been restricted in most cases
30 to the determination of chromosome numbers and chromosome pairing from mitotic
31 (Sharma and De 1956; Raghavan 1958, 1959; Ramachandran 1968; Essad 1984)
32 and meiotic (Abraham and Nair 1990; Abraham 1998) cells. However, because
33 yam chromosomes are small, generally dot-like, and most often clumped, determin-
34 ing ploidy levels by counting chromosomes is tedious and difficult (Baquar 1980;
35 Zoundjhehpon et al. 1990).

36 Our current knowledge of yam ploidy is based on the basic chromosome number
37 of 10 or nine, with a high frequency of polyploid species (Essad 1984;
38 Zoundjhehpon et al. 1990; Gamiette et al. 1999; Dansi et al. 2000c, 2001; Egesi
39 et al. 2002). Tetraploid species are the most frequent, followed by 6x and 8x forms
40 in similar proportions. The base chromosome number $x = 10$ is reported in all the
41 Asian species, but is found in only 52% of the African species and 13% of the
42 American species examined so far. The remaining African and American species
43 are considered to have a basic number of $x = 9$ (Essad 1984). In segregating popu-
44 lations of water yam (*D. alata*) and white Guinea yam (*D. rotundata*) ($2n = 4x =$
45 40), the observed segregation of AFLP markers reflected a disomic inheritance

01 (Mignouna et al. 2002a, b). These results indicated an allotetraploid structure for
02 *D. rotundata* and *D. alata*. However, segregation analysis using isozyme and mi-
03 crosatellites markers led to the conclusion that *D. rotundata*, belonging to the botani-
04 cal section *Enantiophyllum*, is a diploid species (Scarcelli et al. 2005). *D. trifida* was
05 considered to be an octoploid species with 80 chromosomes ($x = 10$) (Esad 1984).
06 In microsatellite segregation analysis, individual patterns showed a maximum of
07 four alleles, strongly suggesting that *D. trifida* is a tetraploid species with $2n = 4x$
08 $= 80$ chromosomes (Hochu et al. 2006). Bousalem et al. (2006) used cytogenetic
09 evidence to show that the species is autotetraploid with a basic chromosome num-
10 ber of $x = 20$. Interestingly, Segarra-Moragues et al. (2004) concluded that the two
11 species of the *Bordera* section, *D. pyrenaica* and *D. chouardii* (Caddick et al. 2002b)
12 endemic to the Pyrenees (Spain and France), are allotetraploid with the chromosome
13 base number of $x = 6$, which was not previously reported within the Dioscoreaceae.
14 The finding of two new basic chromosome numbers, $x = 6$ (Segarra-Moragues and
15 Catalán 2003; Segarra-Moragues et al. 2004) and $x = 20$ (Scarcelli et al. 2005),
16 raises questions on the validity of the current ploidy data in the genus *Dioscorea*.
17 If these new basic chromosome numbers are confirmed in a larger number of yam
18 species, that should lead us to reconsider the basic chromosome number of yams on
19 a more general level and, as a consequence, to decrease the level of ploidy of at least
20 some species.

21 22 23 24 **3.4 Genetic Diversity**

25
26 Molecular markers are increasingly being used to examine the genetic diversity of
27 cultivated and wild yam species (Mignouna et al. 2005b). Dansi et al. (1999) used
28 a comparative morphological study to establish linkages between Guinea yam mor-
29 photypes/cultivar groups and their wild relatives. RAPD markers showed considerable
30 variability when used for cultivar identification of Jamaican yam cultivars belonging
31 to five food yam species: *D. alata*, *D. cayenensis*, *D. esculenta*, *D. rotundata*, and
32 *D. trifida* (Asemota et al. 1996). The usefulness of RAPD as a discriminative and
33 informative marker system in yam was also demonstrated by Ramser et al. (1996)
34 using 23 *D. bulbifera* accessions collected from different geographic locations in
35 Africa, Asia, and Oceania. That study also provided evidence in support of an earlier
36 proposal of the independent domestication of this species in Africa and Asia.

37 Mignouna et al. (1998) found one varietal group among germplasm originat-
38 ing from Cameroon clustered separately from all other West African genotypes,
39 indicating that this group constitutes a separate gene pool, which could be useful
40 for genetic improvement of West African *Dioscorea* germplasm. A study to in-
41 vestigate the genetic relationships among West and Central African *D. rotundata*
42 germplasm revealed a low level of genetic similarity between the yam accessions,
43 with each genotype being identified as a unique individual using the three marker
44 assays (Mignouna et al. 2003b). This study confirmed the high intraspecific varia-
45 tion within *D. rotundata* reported by Asemota et al. (1996), Mignouna et al. (1998),

01 and Dansi et al. (2000a, b). Tostain et al. (2006) surveyed the diversity at
02 10 microsatellite loci for 146 *D. rotundata* accessions from Benin and the diver-
03 sity of six microsatellite loci on 56 others. A significant excess of heterozygotes
04 was observed at nine of the 15 polymorphic loci, which is expected in this vege-
05 tatively propagated crop. The significant excess of homozygotes, estimated at two
06 loci, could be explained by the presence of null alleles.

07 Malapa et al. (2005) showed that *D. alata* is a heterogeneous species that shares a
08 common genetic background with *D. nummularia*. Cluster analysis, using UPGMA
09 (unweighted pair group method with arithmetic mean) based on AFLP profiles,
10 revealed the existence of three major groups of genotypes within *D. alata*, each
11 assembling accessions from distant geographical origins and different ploidy lev-
12 els. Lebot et al. (1998) found no correlations between morphotypes, chemotypes,
13 and zymotypes of 269 cultivars of *D. alata* (originating from the South Pacific,
14 Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean), which were analyzed with four enzyme systems,
15 including 6-PGD. The existing genetic variation is believed to be due to sexual re-
16 combination imposed by outcrossing (Lebot et al. 1998; Malapa et al. 2005).

17 Mignouna et al. (2005a) investigated genetic relationships among wild and
18 cultivated yams in Nigeria and found that *D. rotundata* cultivars appeared most
19 closely related to *D. praehensilis* and *D. liebrechtsiana* De Wild. *D. abyssinica*
20 was widespread in the northern savannahs of the country. Similar to the situation
21 with *D. praehensilis*, cultivars classified in 10 cultivar groups were morphologically
22 very similar to *D. abyssinica* and might have been domesticated from this species
23 (Chair et al. 2005). Isozyme analysis of wild yam species from Côte d'Ivoire re-
24 vealed three groups: annual, semi-perennial, and perennial. Some cultivated ac-
25 cessions clustered with annual wild species, whereas others clustered with semi-
26 perennial or perennial species (Hamon 1987). For Miège (1968), *D. burkilliana*
27 and *D. minutiflora* are two morphologically very close species that differ only by
28 the characteristics of their below-ground parts. However, Mignouna et al. (2003c)
29 used 6-PGD isozyme analysis to show that the two species are genetically distinct.
30 The principal species associations revealed by cluster analysis were *D. abyssinica*/
31 *D. praehensilis*, *D. liebrechtsiana*/*D. praehensilis*, *D. mangelotiana*/*D. praehen-*
32 *silis*, *D. rotundata*/*D. praehensilis*, *D. cayenensis*/*D. burkilliana*.

33 There is unanimity among farmers and considerable agreement in research
34 findings (Hamon 1987; Terauchi et al. 1992) that all the cultivated forms of the
35 *D. cayenensis*/*D. rotundata* complex are the products of an ancient, or more or
36 less recent, domestication of the four major wild species *D. abyssinica* Hochst,
37 *D. praehensilis* Benth., *D. burkilliana* Miège, and *D. mangelotiana* Miège) a pro-
38 cess that is still in progress in certain parts of West and Central Africa (Dumont
39 and Vernier 2000; Mignouna and Dansi 2003; Scarcelli et al. 2006a, b). Mignouna
40 and Dansi (2003) called for a revision of the taxonomy of *Dioscorea* species be-
41 cause they found it difficult to understand how individuals identified in the wild as
42 *D. praehensilis* or *D. abyssinica* can directly become *D. rotundata* or *D. cayenen-*
43 *sis* following “domestication” without any genetic change. In fact, Mignouna and
44 Dansi (2003) showed that predomesticated yam plants could not always be clearly
45 identified as belonging to either wild or cultivated species.

01 To assess the effect of farmers' practices on the diversity of *D. cayenensis*–*D.*
02 *rotundata* cultivars, Scarcelli et al. (2006a) used AFLP analysis of a total of 213
03 yam accessions consisting of predomesticated yams, *D. cayenensis*–*D. rotundata*,
04 *D. abyssinica*, and *D. praehensilis*. Of the 32 predomesticated accessions, 16%
05 clustered with *D. praehensilis*, 37% with *D. abyssinica*, and the remaining 47%
06 with *D. cayenensis*–*D. rotundata*. They thus demonstrated the use of wild plants
07 by farmers in their domestication process and showed that through domestication
08 farmers influence and increase the genetic diversity in yam by using sexual repro-
09 duction of wild and possibly cultivated yams. In a related study on the impact of
10 ennoblement of spontaneous yams on the genetic diversity of yam in Benin, Scar-
11 celli et al. (2006b) used 11 microsatellite markers to analyze yam tubers from a
12 small village in northern Benin and demonstrated that wild × cultivated hybrids
13 are spontaneously formed. Many of the spontaneous yams collected by farmers
14 from surrounding savannah areas for ennoblement were shown to be wild and
15 hybrid genotypes. They demonstrated that some yam varieties have a wild or hy-
16 brid signature and performed a broader-ranging genetic analysis on yam material
17 from throughout Benin, which revealed that ennoblement is practiced in different
18 ecological and ethno-linguistic regions. By maintaining a mixed yam propagation
19 system (sexual cycle and asexual propagation), farmers ensure widespread culti-
20 vation of the best genotypes while preserving the potential for future adaptation.
21 The mechanism underlying phenotypic modifications during “domestication” is un-
22 known. They could result from phenotypic plasticity, epigenetic modifications, or
23 somatic mutations. The latter two explanations are compatible with the fact that
24 morphological changes are maintained through vegetative multiplication.

29 **4 Genetic Mapping and Tagging in Yam**

31 Molecular genetic maps and marker-aided analysis of complex traits can be used to
32 elucidate the genetic control of yield potential and tuber quality and to locate genes
33 of pest and disease resistance, nutrient use efficiency, tuberization, and flowering.
34 For these reasons, a concerted effort to map the yam genome and dissect the in-
35 heritance of complex traits was initiated at IITA. It was anticipated that cultivated
36 yams would have their origin from a cross between genetically distinct individuals,
37 so the alleles derived from each parent may be different. One general approach to
38 mapping plants of this type is to examine the genotypes of selfed progeny; however,
39 this is not feasible for dioecious yams, so the approach taken was to generate multi-
40 ple F₁ individuals derived from crosses between the same parents, male or female.
41 F₁ mapping populations of *D. alata* and *D. rotundata* were subjected to in vitro
42 micropropagation based on techniques developed by Ng (1992). *D. rotundata* pop-
43 ulations segregated components of resistance to *Yam mosaic virus* (YMV), genus
44 *Potyvirus* (Mignouna et al. 2001b), while the *D. alata* populations segregated for
45 yam anthracnose disease resistance (Mignouna et al. 2001a).

01 YMV is a major limiting factor for stable production of yams and *D. rotundata*
02 is particularly susceptible to the virus (Thouvenel and Dumont 1990). A study of
03 the genetic control of YMV resistance in three *D. rotundata* cultivars to a Nigerian
04 isolate of YMV showed that resistance is manifested differentially as the action
05 of a single dominant gene in simplex condition or a major recessive gene in du-
06 plex condition (Mignouna et al. 2001b). The dominant locus that contributes to
07 YMV resistance was tentatively named *Ymv-1* until tests of allelism are conducted.
08 Anthracnose disease, caused by *C. gloeosporioides* (Abang et al. 2003), is a ma-
09 jor constraint to the production of yam worldwide (Winch et al. 1984; McDonald
10 et al. 1998), with *D. alata*, the most widely distributed species, being particularly
11 susceptible to the disease. Initial genetic inheritance studies showed that resistance
12 to yam anthracnose in *D. alata* is dominantly but quantitatively inherited (Mignouna
13 et al. 2001a). A single major dominant locus controlling resistance in the breeding
14 line TDa 95/00328 was tentatively designated *Dcg-1* until allelism is investigated.
15 The efficiency and effectiveness of breeding for YMV and anthracnose resistance
16 will be greatly improved by marker-assisted selection based on genetic mapping of
17 major genes controlling the resistance.
18
19
20

21 **4.1 Linkage Mapping**

22
23 Chromosome pairing in tetraploids can occur such that only homologues pair or
24 such that any two homeologues may pair. These two types of pairing have very
25 different consequences for segregation patterns so that these plants may, in the ex-
26 treme, exhibit either diploid or tetraploid genetics. Intermediate types of behavior
27 may also occur. Thus it was important to establish which type of segregation was
28 being observed in the cultivated yams. Genes controlling important traits such as
29 yield, tuber quality, and pest and disease resistance are usually distributed among
30 several quantitative trait loci (QTLs), which may not be linked, thus making these
31 traits difficult to manipulate using conventional breeding methods. The recessive
32 nature of YMV resistance in some *D. rotundata* genotypes means that such resis-
33 tance cannot be easily tracked at the phenotypic level, demanding refined diagnostic
34 procedures such as molecular mapping for detailed genetic localization of specific
35 genes (Mignouna et al. 2001b). Screening by molecular markers linked to QTLs has
36 the advantage of selecting pairs of parents with genes at different loci for the same
37 trait (Solomon-Blackburn and Barker 2001).

38 Genetic mapping using AFLP led to construction of the first, separate, compre-
39 hensive, molecular linkage maps of *D. rotundata* and *D. alata* (Mignouna et al. 2002c,
40 d). The *D. rotundata* map was based on 341 co-dominantly scored AFLP markers
41 segregating in an intraspecific F₁ cross (Mignouna et al. 2002d). Separate maternal
42 and paternal linkage maps were constructed, comprising 12 and 13 linkage groups,
43 respectively. The mapping population was produced by crossing a landrace, TDr
44 93-1, as female parent and a breeder's line, TDr 87/00211, as the male parent. The
45 markers segregated like a diploid cross-pollinator population, suggesting that the

01 *D. rotundata* genome is an allotetraploid ($2n = 4x = 40$). More recent findings have
02 confirmed that *D. rotundata* is a diploid species (Scarcelli et al. 2005). Three QTLs
03 with effect on resistance to YMV were identified on the maternal linkage map,
04 while one QTL for YMV was detected on the paternal linkage map (Mignouna
05 et al. 2002d). These results showed that both parents contributed to resistance in the
06 progeny.

07 Similarly, a genetic linkage map of the water yam (*D. alata*) genome was con-
08 structed based on 469 co-dominantly scored AFLP markers segregating in an in-
09 traspecific F_1 cross (Mignouna et al. 2002c). The F_1 was obtained by crossing two
10 improved breeding lines, TDa 95/00328 as female parent and TDa 87/01091 as the
11 male parent. The 469 markers were mapped on 20 linkage groups with a total map
12 length of 1,233 cM. Again, the markers segregated as in a diploid cross-pollinator
13 population, suggesting that the water yam genome is allotetraploid ($2n=4x=40$).
14 One QTL located on linkage group 2 was found to be associated with anthracnose
15 resistance, explaining 10% of the total phenotypic variance (Mignouna et al. 2002c).

16 Conservative estimates put the genome coverage of the *D. rotundata* and *D. alata*
17 maps at 56% and 65%, respectively. There are several reasons why the maps may
18 not give complete coverage. The most obvious is that the two parents may have
19 some common ancestry so that segments of the linkage maps may be devoid of
20 polymorphism and thus cannot be identified in genetic analysis.

21 One approach towards gaining insights on this issue would be to align the *D.*
22 *alata* and *D. rotundata* maps. This would give us additional confidence in the gen-
23 eral map structures and enable the development of suitable markers for genomic
24 surveys of other populations. An attempt was made to derive gene sequence-based
25 markers, but unfortunately the cDNA library used for this analysis contained an un-
26 expectedly high proportion of rRNA sequences. Nevertheless, this remains a viable
27 objective, and would also permit the alignment of these maps with that recently
28 presented for diploid *D. tokoro*, $2n=2x=20$ (Terauchi and Kahl 1999). Both maps
29 provide useful tools for further genetic analysis of agronomically important traits in
30 yam. While AFLPs continue to be identified and used for mapping the yam genome,
31 efforts are geared towards saturating the map with simple sequence repeats (SSRs)
32 and expressed sequence tags (ESTs), for greater ease of application in yam breeding.

33
34
35

36 **4.2 Gene Tagging**

37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

Bulked segregant analysis has been shown to be efficient for initial identification
of disease resistance-linked markers. The approach has been successfully applied
in yams for identification of YMV and anthracnose resistance genes (Mignouna
et al. 2002a, b). Two RAPD markers, OPW18₈₅₀ and OPX15₈₅₀, closely linked in
coupling phase with the dominant YMV-resistance locus *Ymv-1* were identified.
These markers successfully identified the resistance gene in resistant genotypes
among a sample of 12 *D. rotundata* varieties (Mignouna et al. 2002b). Similarly,
a single locus, *Dcg-1*, that contributes to anthracnose resistance was identified in

01 *D. alata*. Two RAPD markers, OPI17₁₇₀₀ and OPE6₉₅₀, closely linked in coupling
02 phase with *Dcg-1* were identified (Mignouna et al. 2002a). Both markers success-
03 fully identified *Dcg-1* in resistant *D. alata* genotypes among 34 breeding lines, in-
04 dicated their potential use in marker-assisted selection (MAS). The RAPD markers
05 identified in these studies will be made more reliable and specific and easier to apply
06 for indirect selection by converting them into co-dominant PCR-based sequence-
07 characterized amplified regions. Further AFLP mapping is planned to identify addi-
08 tional QTLs and strengthen existing marker-QTL linkages. Candidate gene analyses
09 are yet to be employed to investigate a variety of traits. To date, significant associ-
10 ations have been demonstrated for disease resistance in numerous crops. The yam
11 breeding program at IITA plans to use MAS for selecting parental lines for breeding
12 purposes. It is likely that as QTL experiments are expanded, additional genes will
13 be identified for use in breeding.

16 5 Functional Genomics

18 The development of genomic resources and technology is a major focus in the yam
19 genetics and breeding community. A cDNA library, produced from male flowers,
20 was constructed in Bluescript vector and used for EST analysis (H. Mignouna, un-
21 published data). This approach has proven to be efficient for gene identification,
22 gene expression profiling, and cataloging. It also provides markers and resources
23 for the development of cDNA microarrays. Microarrays are not yet available for
24 yams, mainly because the number of available gene sequences is still very small.
25 Two cDNA libraries, one each for *D. alata* genotypes resistant or susceptible to
26 yam anthracnose disease, have also been constructed recently (based on total RNA
27 isolated from young leaves) towards identification of clones that are differentially
28 expressed in the two genotypes (Narina et al. 2007). The libraries from the resistant
29 and susceptible genotypes now have 10,000 and 6,000 cDNA clones, respectively,
30 which are being sequenced.

31 Another reliable and potentially powerful way to identify candidate loci control-
32 ling agronomic traits in yam is application of the cDNA/AFLP technique, which
33 generates polymorphic transcript-derived fragments (TDFs) between the parents of
34 a mapping cross. cDNA generated from total RNA was subjected to cDNA-AFLP
35 techniques to gain molecular insights and identify differentially expressed genes up-
36 regulated and down-regulated during the dormancy in yam tubers (Kone-Coulibaly
37 et al. 2003). Two primer pairs were identified that had equal potential for pro-
38 ducing the same number of TDFs in dormant yam samples. The resulting TDFs
39 from postharvest-treated tubers will aid in the selection of putative up- and down-
40 regulated fragments during yam dormancy. Once candidate genes have been iden-
41 tified, they can be employed in gene tagging and QTL mapping studies to look for
42 associations between the candidate gene and the trait in question. The availability
43 of a BAC library and the development of an effective system for transforming yam
44 with large DNA fragments will provide conclusive evidence of the contribution of
45 the candidate gene through complementation studies.

5.1 EST Development

The genome size of *D. rotundata* was estimated by Feulgen-stained root tip nuclei to be 0.8 pg per haploid nucleus, and thus is equivalent to the genome size of species such as rice, soybean, and spinach (Conlan et al. 1995). The current *D. rotundata* map covers a minimum of 56% of the yam genome. Based on the haploid nuclear DNA content of *D. rotundata* of 800 Mbp/1C, the physical distance per map unit could be estimated at 400 kb per cM, making map-based gene cloning feasible (Mignouna et al. 2002d). We have generated 1100 ESTs from cDNA clones randomly picked from libraries constructed from male flowers. However, most of the sequenced ESTs were either ribosomal or housekeeping genes. To understand the physiological complexity of the yam genome, expression and/or functional gene analyses need to be undertaken. Northern analysis and differential display PCR techniques could be used, but these techniques have limitations in the number of genes that can be analyzed simultaneously. There is a need to develop approaches such as the use of cDNA microarrays. Other plant microarrays could be evaluated for use. As pointed out earlier, the development of a large number of ESTs will allow larger scale expression analysis.

5.2 Transformation

Attempts have been made to develop *in vitro* breeding strategies (such as somatic hybridization and gene insertion techniques) to overcome breeding barriers and to hasten the genetic improvement of food yams. For instance, Mantell (1994) fused protoplast mixtures between disease-sensitive and disease-resistant clones of *D. alata* in attempts to develop somatic hybrids with increased tolerance to anthracnose. There is considerable scope for introducing specific genes encoding resistance to fungal diseases (i.e., glucanase, chitinase, and antimicrobial protein gene constructs) and to nonpersistently transmitted potyviruses (i.e., sense and antisense genes of the coat protein of yam mosaic viruses). Three prerequisites for applying genetic transformation for plant improvement are: (1) a reliable regeneration system that is compatible with transformation methods allowing regeneration of transgenic plants; (2) an efficient way to introduce DNA into the regenerable cells; and (3) a procedure to select and regenerate transformed plants at a satisfactory frequency (Birch 1997).

Early plant transformation experiments on yam were hampered by false positive transformants that were found to be due to endophytic bacteria which exist within aseptically micropropagated shoot cultures and which express β -glucuronidase (Tor et al. 1992). Eventually, Tor et al. (1993) successfully demonstrated stable genetic transformation of *D. alata* embryogenic cell suspensions using biolistic insertion methods. However, biolistic approaches have a number of disadvantages such as the production of chimeric colonies containing mixtures of transformed and non-transformed cells and the instability of such colonies to retain inserted genes once

01 antibiotic and/or herbicide selection conditions are withdrawn following plant re-
02 generation. Later efforts gave rise to successful yam protoplast culture leading to
03 cell regeneration and direct gene transfer into yam protoplasts (Tor et al. 1998). Em-
04 bryogenic cell suspension protoplasts of *D. alata* cv. Oriental Lisbon were success-
05 fully transformed using a standard polyethylene glycol-mediated uptake method.
06 The availability of a protoplast system for transient gene expression studies in yams
07 is expected to speed efforts towards the transformation of these tuber crops. The
08 functional expression of valuable disease resistance genes, such as viral coat pro-
09 tein genes of yam mosaic viruses in either sense or anti-sense configurations, and
10 combinatorial chitinase, glucanase, and anti-microbial protein genes driven by a
11 range of either dicot promoters (NOS and CaMV35S) or monocot promoters such
12 as ubiquitin, actin, ricin, and *emu*, needs to be investigated.

13 A number of host defense genes that could be good candidates for use in yam
14 transformation have been characterized. Five chitinase isoforms, designated A, E,
15 F, H1, and G, from yam tuber have been purified and characterized (Arakane
16 et al. 2000). Chitinases E, F, and H1 had the highest lytic activity against the
17 pathogen *Fusarium oxysporum*, while chitinase E was shown to be a possible bio-
18 control agent against strawberry powdery mildew (*Spherotheca humuli*) (Karasuda
19 et al. 2003). Yam chitinase E has a similar amino acid sequence to a reported family
20 19 chitinase from *D. japonica* (Araki et al. 1992). Mitsunaga et al. (2004) cloned and
21 sequenced a class IV chitinase from yam (*D. opposita*). The deduced amino acid se-
22 quence showed 50 to 59% identity to class IV chitinases from other plants. The yam
23 chitinase, however, had an additional sequence of eight amino acids (a C-terminal
24 extension) following the cysteine that was reported as the last amino acid for other
25 class IV chitinases; this extension is perhaps involved in subcellular localization. A
26 homology model based on the structure of a class II chitinase from barley suggested
27 that the class IV enzyme recognizes an even shorter segment of the substrate than
28 class I or II enzymes. This might explain why class IV enzymes are better suited to
29 attack against pathogen cell walls.

30
31

32 6 Perspectives

33
34

35 The development and application of biotechnology tools are necessary to comple-
36 ment field breeding of yams. Molecular approaches have the potential to make yam
37 breeding more efficient to reduce the cost and time required to produce new vari-
38 eties. However, understanding and exploiting the complexity of the yam genome
39 for improved yield and quality of yams remains a huge challenge. Large-scale gene
40 identification and mapping have taken place in a number of model plants (e.g., *Ara-
41 bidopsis* and *Medicago*) as well as some important food crops (e.g., rice, soybean,
42 tomato, and maize). Whole genome sequencing and expression analyses have been
43 conducted in *Arabidopsis* and rice and offer opportunities to understand the biolog-
44 ical complexity of other plant genomes. However, these advances are yet to benefit
45 under-researched tropical food crops such as yams (Nelson et al. 2004).

01 Completed genome sequences provide templates for the design of genome anal-
02 ysis tools in “orphan” crops lacking sequence information. Feltus et al. (2006) have
03 shown that conserved-intron scanning primers are an effective means to explore
04 poorly characterized genomes. Genes involved in many biochemical pathways and
05 processes are similar across the plant kingdom (Thorup et al. 2000). Functions such
06 as gene regulation, general metabolism, nutrient acquisition, disease resistance, gen-
07 eral defense, flowering time, and flower development are largely conserved across
08 taxa. Comparative mapping studies reveal that gene order is conserved for chromo-
09 somal segments among grass species (Devos and Gale 2000), with weaker chromo-
10 somal colinearity between monocots and dicots (Bennetzen 2000). Given the
11 unique position of yams between monocots and dicots, it is doubtful how the work
12 on models such as *Arabidopsis* and *Medicago* will benefit the species (e.g., Conlan
13 et al. 1995). Although *Dioscorea* is a complex and highly variable genus, with sev-
14 eral aspects of its biology still unresolved, we consider that there is a case for the
15 adoption of yam as a “model” for plant genomics.

16 Efforts in yam genetics and genomics should be pursued and we believe the
17 following specific areas need to be addressed in the near future. There is still a
18 paucity of information, and some of the reports are conflicting, on yam phylogeny
19 and the evolution of *Dioscorea* based on morphological, cytological, and molecular
20 data. In this regard, the importance of non heritable or heritable epimutations in
21 the development of yams should be investigated. Also, there is need for compar-
22 ative analysis of the genomes of potato (dicotyledon) and yam (monocotyledon).
23 The relationship between monoecious plants of *D. rotundata* (Scarcelli et al. 2005)
24 and their normally dioecious relatives deserves further examination, as well as the
25 nature of spontaneous hybrids in sympatric populations of wild and cultivated yams
26 in Africa (Scarcelli et al. 2006). Selection and domestication of other annual yam
27 species, including several indigenous West African and Malagasy species, should be
28 undertaken before the natural populations disappear. Intraspecific hybridization be-
29 tween genetically distant landraces should be continued; for instance, between early
30 and late maturing varieties of *D. rotundata* or between *D. alata* with and without
31 bulbils. Hybrids obtained from these crosses do not require embryo culture.

32 Genetic linkage mapping of the two most important yam species (*D. rotundata*
33 and *D. alata*) should be pursued. Denser genetic maps of each species and a con-
34 sensus map for both must be constructed for practical breeding and germplasm
35 enhancement purposes. QTL mapping should be reactivated with the initial iden-
36 tification of markers linked to disease resistance genes. Candidate gene identifica-
37 tion using microarray and other approaches should be conducted to pin down the
38 genes or QTLs involved in important agronomic traits. BAC library construction
39 should be initiated, and efforts towards establishing a system for yam transformation
40 should now be given more impetus (Tör et al. 1998). Embryo rescue will enable yam
41 breeders to successfully make wide crosses with a greater number of related species
42 of wild yams and have access to a much wider range of genes that can be used
43 for the genetic improvement of yams. Wide crosses and embryo culture hold great
44 promise for the transfer of tolerance to biotic and abiotic stresses from wild rela-
45 tives to cultivated yams. Research to better understand the biology and agronomy of

01 wild relatives will greatly facilitate efforts aimed at unlocking the genetic potential
02 hidden in the wild yam germplasm.

03
04 **Acknowledgments** The authors would like to acknowledge the financial support from Gatsby
05 Charitable Foundation, UK, through funds to support yam genome analysis at IITA. We thank
06 Prof. Stephen Kresovich and the staff of the Institute for Genomic Diversity of Cornell University
07 for their technical assistance in developing genomics tools for yam genome analysis.

08 09 10 **References**

- 11
12 Abang MM, Winter S, Mignouna HD, Green KR, Asiedu R (2003) Molecular taxonomic, epidemi-
13 ological and population genetic approaches to understanding yam anthracnose disease. *African*
14 *J Biotechnol* 2:486–496
- 15 Abraham KA (1998) Occurrence of hexaploid males in *Dioscorea alata* L. *Euphytica* 99:5–7
- 16 Abraham KA, Nair PG (1990) Vegetative and pseudogamous parthenocarpy in *Dioscorea alata*.
17 *J Root Crops* 16:58–60
- 18 Arakane Y, Hoshika H, Kawashima N, Fujiya-Tsujimoto C, Sasaki Y, et al. (2000) Comparison of
19 chitinase isozymes from yam tuber enzymatic factor controlling the lytic activity of chitinases.
20 *Biosci Biotechnol Biochem* 64:723–730
- 21 Araki T, Funatsu J, Kuramoto M, Konno H, Torikata T (1992) The complete amino acid sequence
22 of yam (*Dioscorea japonica*) chitinase. A newly identified acidic class I chitinase. *J Biol Chem*
23 267:19944–19947
- 24 Asemota HN, Ramser J, Lopez-Peralta C, Weising K, Kahl G (1996) Genetic variation and cultivar
25 identification of Jamaican yam germplasm by random amplified polymorphic DNA analysis.
26 *Euphytica* 92:341–351
- 27 Asiedu R, Ng SYC, Bai KV, Ekanayake IJ, Wanyera NMW (1998) Genetic Improvement. In:
28 Orkwor GC, Asiedu R, Ekanayake IJ (eds) *Food yams: Advances in research*. Ibadan, Nigeria:
29 IITA and NRCRI pp 63–104
- 30 Ayensu ES (1972) *Dioscoreales*. In: Metcalfe CR (ed) *Anatomy of the monocotyledons*. Clarendon
31 Press, Oxford, UK, pp 182
- 32 Ayensu ES, Coursey DG (1972) Guinea yams. The botany, ethnobotany, use and possible future of
33 yams in West Africa. *Econ Bot* 26:301–318
- 34 Baquar SR (1980) Chromosome behaviour in Nigerian yams (*Dioscorea*). *Genetica* 54:1–9
- 35 Barrau J (1965) Histoire et prehistoire horticole de l’Océanie tropicale. *J Soc Oceaniste* 21:55–78
- 36 Bennetzen JL (2000) Comparative sequence analysis of plant nuclear genomes: Microcolinearity
37 and its many exceptions. *Plant Cell* 12:1021–1029
- 38 Bharathan G (1996) Does the monocot mode of leaf development characterize all monocots? *Aliso*
39 14:271–27
- 40 Bharathan G, Janssen B-J, Kellogg EA, Sinha N (1999) Phylogenetic relationships and evolution
41 of the KNOTTED class of plant homeodomain proteins. *Mol Biol Evol* 16:553–563
- 42 Birch RG (1997) Plant transformation: problems and strategies for practical application. *Annu Rev*
43 *Plant Physiol Mol Biol* 48:297–326
- 44 Bousalem M, Arnau G, Hochu I, Arnolin R, Viader V, et al. (2006) Microsatellite segregation
45 analysis and cytogenetic evidence for tetrasomic inheritance in the American yam *Dioscorea*
trifida and a new basic chromosome number in the *Dioscoreae*. *Theor Appl Genet* 113:439–451
- Burkill IH (1960) The organography and the evolution of the *Dioscoreaceae*, the family of the
yams. *J Linn Soc (Bot) London* 56:319–412
- Caddick LR, Rudall PJ, Wilkin P, Hedderson TAJ, Chase MW (2002a) Phylogenetics of *Diosco-*
reales based on combined analyses of morphological and molecular data. *Bot J Linn Soc*
138:123–144

- 01 Caddick LR, Wilkin P, Rudall PJ, Hedderson TAJ, Chase MW (2002b) Yams reclassified: a recir-
02 cumscription of Dioscoreaceae and Dioscoreales. *Taxon* 51:103–114
- 03 Chair H, Perrier X, Agbangla C, Marchand JL, Dainou O, et al. (2005) Use of cpSSRs for the
04 characterisation of yam phylogeny in Benin. *Genome* 48:674–684
- 05 Chu EP, Figueiredo-Ribeiro RCL (1991) Native and exotic species of *Dioscorea* used as food in
06 Brazil. *Econ Bot* 45:467–479
- 07 Conlan SR, Griffiths LA, Napier JA, Shewry PR, Mantell S, et al. (1995) Isolation and charac-
08 terization of cDNA clones representing the genes encoding the major tuber storage protein
09 (dioscorin) of yam (*Dioscorea cayenensis* Lam). *Plant Mol Biol* 28:369–380
- 10 Coursey DG (1983) Yams. In: Chan HC (ed) *Handbook of tropical foods*. Marcel Dekker Inc,
11 New York, USA
- 12 Dansi A, Mignouna HD, Zoundjihékpon J, Sangaré A, Asiedu R, et al. (1999) Morphological
13 diversity, cultivar groups and possible descent in the cultivated yams (*Dioscorea cayenensis*-*D.*
14 *rotundata* complex) of Benin Republic. *Genet Resourc Crop Evol* 46:371–388
- 15 Dansi A, Mignouna HD, Zoundjihékpon J, Sangaré A, Asiedu R, et al. (2000a) Identification of
16 some Benin Republic's Guinea yam (*Dioscorea cayenensis*/*Dioscorea rotundata*) cultivars us-
17 ing randomly amplified polymorphic DNA. *Genet Resourc Crop Evol* 47:619–625
- 18 Dansi A, Mignouna HD, Zoundjihékpon J, Sangaré A, Asiedu R, et al. (2000b) Using
19 isozyme polymorphism to assess genetic variation within cultivated yams (*Dioscorea*
20 *cayenensis*/*Dioscorea rotundata* complex) of the Benin Republic. *Genet Resourc Crop Evol*
21 47:371–383
- 22 Dansi A, Pillay M, Mignouna HD, Mondeil F, Dainou O (2000c) Ploidy level of the cultivated
23 yams (*Dioscorea cayenensis*/*D. rotundata* complex) from Benin Republic as determined by
24 chromosome counting and flow cytometry. *African Crop Sci J* 8:355–364
- 25 Dansi A, Mignouna HD, Pillay M, Zok S (2001) Ploidy variation in the cultivated yams (*Dioscorea*
26 *cayenensis*-*D. rotundata* complex) from Cameroon as determined by flow cytometry. *Euphytica*
27 119:301–307
- 28 Dessauw D (1988) Etude des facteurs de la stérilité du bananier (*Musa* spp) et des relations cyto-
29 taxonomiques entre *M. acuminata* et *M. balbisiana* Colla. *Fruits* 43:539–700
- 30 Devos KM, MD Gale (2000) Genome relationships: The grass model in current research. *Plant*
31 *Cell* 12:637–646
- 32 Dumont R, Vernier P (2000) Domestication of yams (*Dioscorea cayenensis-rotundata* complex)
33 within the Bariba ethnic group in Benin. *Outlook Agric* 29:137–142
- 34 Egesi CN, Pillay M, Asiedu R, Egunjobi JK (2002) Ploidy analysis in water yam, *Dioscorea alata*
35 L. germplasm. *Euphytica* 128:225–230
- 36 Essad S (1984) Variation géographique des nombres chromosomiques de base et polyploïdie dans
37 le genre *Dioscorea* à propos du dénombrement des espèces transversa Brown, pilosiuscula Bert
38 et trifida. *Agronomie* 4:611–617
- 39 FAO (1999) FAO's Position Paper. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations,
40 Rome, Italy <http://www.fao.org/>
- 41 FAO (2006) FAOSTAT Agricultural database: agricultural production, crops primary, yams. Food
42 and Agriculture Organization, Rome, Italy (<http://www.fao.org>)
- 43 Feltus FA, Singh HP, Lohithaswa HC, Schulze SR, Silva TD, et al. (2006) A comparative genomics
44 strategy for targeted discovery of single-nucleotide polymorphisms and conserved-noncoding
45 sequences in orphan crops. *Plant Physiol* 140:1183–1191
- Frohne D, Jensen U (1998) *Systematik des Pflanzenreichs: unter besonderer Berücksichtigung chemischer Merkmale und pflanzlicher Drogen*. Wissenschaftliche Verlagsgesellschaft, Stuttgart, Germany
- Gamiette F, Bakry F, Ano G (1999) Ploidy determination of some yam species (*Dioscorea* spp) by flow cytometry and conventional chromosomes counting. *Genet Resourc Crop Evol* 46:19–27
- Hahn SK, Osiru DSO, Akoroda MO, Otoo JA (1987) Yam production and its future prospects. *Outlook Agric* 16:105–110

- 01 Hamon P (1987) Structure, origine génétique des ignames cultivées du complexe *D. cayenensis-*
02 *rotundata* et domestication des ignames en Afrique de l'Ouest. Thèse de Doctorat es-Sciences,
03 Université Paris XI, Centre d'Orsay: 223 pp
- 04 Hamon P, Touré B (1990a) Characterisation of traditional yam varieties belonging to the *Dioscorea*
05 *cayenensis-rotundata* complex by their isozymic patterns. *Euphytica* 46:101–107
- 06 Hamon P, Touré B (1990b) The classification of the cultivated yams (*Dioscorea cayenensis-*
07 *rotundata* complex) of West Africa. *Euphytica* 47:179–187
- 08 Hamon P, Brizard JP, Zoundjehkpon J, Duperray C, Borgel A (1992) Etude des index d'ADN de
09 huit espèces d'ignames (*Dioscorea* species) par cytométrie en flux. *Can J Bot* 70:996–1000
- 10 Hochu I, Santoni S, Bousalem M (2006) Isolation, characterization and cross-species amplification
11 of microsatellite DNA loci in the tropical American yam *Dioscorea trifida*. *Mol Ecol Notes*
12 6:137–140
- 13 IITA (1988) IITA Strategic Plan 1989–2000. IITA, Ibadan. 108 pp
- 14 Karasuda S, Tanaka S, Kajihara H, Yamamoto Y, Koga D (2003) Plant chitinase as a possible bio-
15 control agent for use instead of chemical fungicides. *Biosci Biotechnol Biochem* 67:221–224
- 16 Kawabe A, Miyashita NT, Terauchi R (1997) Phylogenetic relationship among the section
17 *Stenophora* in the genus *Dioscorea* based on the analysis of the nucleotide sequence variation
18 in the phosphoglucose isomerase (pgi) gene. *Genes Genet Syst* 72:253–262
- 19 Kone-Coulibaly S, Egnin M, He G, Prakash CS (2003) Profiling differentially expressed gene in
20 yam (*Dioscorea rotundata* Poir) during dormancy. *In Vitro Cell Dev Biol* 39(4):27A
- 21 Lebot V, Trilles B, Noyer JL, Modesto J (1998) Genetic relationships between *Dioscorea alata* L
22 cultivars. *Genet Resourc Crop Evol* 45:499–509
- 23 Malapa R, Arnau G, Noyer JL, Lebot V (2005) Genetic diversity of the greater yam (*Dioscorea*
24 *alata* L) and relatedness to *D. nummularia* Lam. and *D. transversa* Br. as revealed with AFLP
25 markers. *Genet Resourc Crop Evol* 52:919–929
- 26 Mantell SH (1994) Summary of the Final report of EU Contract TS2-A-117: Development of
27 anthracnose disease resistant *Dioscorea* yams using somatic fusion techniques. In: Risopoulos
28 S (ed) Projets de recherche 1987 – 1991 Vol 1. CTA/DGXII Joint Publication pp 69–75
- 29 Martin FW, Rhodes AM (1978) The relationship of *Dioscorea cayenensis* and *D. rotundata*. *Trop*
30 *Agric (Trinidad)* 55:193–206
- 31 McDonald FD, Alleyne AT, Ogarro LW, Delauney AJ (1998) Yam anthracnose in the English-
32 speaking islands of the Eastern Caribbean—successes and research advances in disease man-
33 agement. *Trop Agric* 75:53–57
- 34 Miège J (1968) *Dioscoreaceae*. In: Hepper FN (ed) Flora of West Tropical Africa. J Hutchinson &
35 J M Dalziel Vol 3, Millbank, London, UK, pp 144–154
- 36 Miège J (1982a) Etude chimiotaxonomique de dix cultivars de Côte d'Ivoire relevant du complexe
37 *D. cayenensis-D. rotundata*. In: Miège J, Lyonga SN (eds) Yams-Ignames. Clarendon Press,
38 Oxford pp 197–231
- 39 Miège J (1982b) Notes sur les espèces *Dioscorea cayenensis* Lamk. et *D. rotundata* Poir. In: Miège
40 J, Lyonga SN (eds) Yams-Ignames. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, pp 367–375
- 41 Mignouna HD, Dansi A (2003) Yam (*Dioscorea* spp) domestication by the Nago and Fon ethnic
42 groups in Benin. *Genet Resourc Crop Evol* 50:519–528
- 43 Mignouna HD, Ellis NTH, Asiedu R, Ng QN (1998) Analysis of genetic diversity in Guinea yams
44 (*Dioscorea* spp) using AFLP fingerprinting. *Trop Agric (Trinidad)* 75:224–229
- 45 Mignouna HD, Abang MM, Green KR, Asiedu R (2001a) Inheritance of resistance in water
yam (*Dioscorea alata*) to anthracnose (*Colletotrichum gloeosporioides*). *Theor Appl Genet*
103:52–55
- Mignouna HD, Njukeng P, Abang MM, Asiedu R (2001b) Inheritance of resistance to Yam mosaic
virus, genus *Potyvirus*, in white yam (*Dioscorea rotundata*). *Theor Appl Genet* 103:1196–1200
- Mignouna HD, Abang MM, Onasanya A, Asiedu R (2002a) Identification and application of
RAPD markers for anthracnose resistance in water yam (*Dioscorea alata*). *Ann Appl Biol*
141:61–66

- 01 Mignouna HD, Abang MM, Onasanya A, Agindotan B, Asiedu R (2002b) Identification and po-
02 tential use of RAPD markers linked to *Yam mosaic virus* resistance in white yam (*Dioscorea*
03 *rotundata* Poir). *Ann Appl Biol* 140:163–169
- 04 Mignouna HD, Mank RA, Ellis THN, van den Bosch N, Asiedu R, et al. (2002c) A genetic linkage
05 map of water yam (*Dioscorea alata* L) based on AFLP markers and QTL analysis for anthrac-
06 nose resistance. *Theor Appl Genet* 105:726–735
- 07 Mignouna HD, Mank RA, Ellis THN, van den Bosch N, Asiedu R, et al. (2002d) A genetic link-
08 age map of Guinea yam (*Dioscorea rotundata* L) based on AFLP markers. *Theor Appl Genet*
09 105:716–725
- 10 Mignouna HD, Abang MM, Asiedu R (2003a) Harnessing modern biotechnology for tropical tuber
11 crop improvement: Yam (*Dioscorea* spp) molecular breeding. *African J Biotechnol* 2:478–485
- 12 Mignouna HD, Abang MM, Fagbemi SA (2003b) A comparative assessment of molecular marker
13 assays (AFLP, RAPD and SSR) for white yam (*Dioscorea rotundata* Poir) germplasm charac-
14 terisation. *Ann Appl Biol* 142:269–276
- 15 Mignouna HD, Dansi A, Asiedu R (2003c) 6-phosphoglucose dehydrogenase (6-PGD) in yam
16 (*Dioscorea* spp): variation and potential in germplasm characterization and classification. *Plant*
17 *Genet Resourc Newsl* 133:27–30
- 18 Mignouna HD, Abang MM, Wanyera NW, Chikaleke VA, Asiedu R, et al. (2005a) PCR marker-
19 based analysis of wild and cultivated yams (*Dioscorea* spp) in Nigeria: genetic relationships
20 and implications for *ex situ* conservation. *Genet Resourc Crop Evol* 52:755–763
- 21 Mignouna HD, Abang MM, Dansi A, Asiedu R (2005b) Morphological, biochemical and molecu-
22 lar approaches to yam (*Dioscorea* spp) genetic resource characterization. In: Thangadurai
23 D, Pullaiah T, Pinheiro de Carvalho MA (eds) *Genetic Resources and Biotechnology Vol 1*.
24 Regency Publications, New Delhi, pp 162–185
- 25 Mitsunaga T, Iwase M, Ubhayasekera W, Mowbray SL, Koga D (2004) Molecular cloning of a
26 genomic DNA encoding yam class IV chitinase. *Biosci Biotechnol Biochem* 68:1508–1517
- 27 Mizuki I, Tani N, Ishida K, Tsumura Y (2005) Development and characterization of microsatellite
28 markers in a clonal plant, *Dioscorea japonica* Thunb. *Mol Ecol Notes* 5:721–723
- 29 Narina SSS, Andebrhan T, Mohamed A, Asiedu R, Mignouna HD (2007) Development of genomic
30 tools for improvement of yam (*Dioscorea alata* L). *Plant Animal Genome Conf*, P21, p 106
- 31 Nelson RJ, Naylor RL, Jahn MM (2004) The role of genomics research in improvement of “or-
32phan” crops. *Crop Sci* 44:1901–1904
- 33 Neuwinger HD (1996) *African ethnobotany: poisons and drugs: chemistry, pharmacology, toxicol-
34 ogy*. Chapman and Hall, London UK
- 35 Ng SYC (1992) Micropropagation of white yam (*Dioscorea rotundata* Poir) In: Bajai VPS
36 (Ed) *Biotechnology in Agriculture and Forestry, High-tech and Micropropagation III*, Vol 19.
37 Springer-Verlag Berlin, Heidelberg. pp 135–159
- 38 Nweke FI, Ugwu BO, Asadu CLA, Ay P (1991) Production costs in the yam-based cropping sys-
39 tems of S.E. Nigeria. RCMD Research Monograph No 6. RCMD, IITA, Ibadan, 29 pp
- 40 Nweke FI, Okorji EC, Njoku JE, King DJ (1992) Elasticities of demand for major food items in
41 a root and tuber-based food system: emphasis on yam and cassava in southeastern Nigeria.
42 RCMP Research Monograph No 11, International Institute of Tropical Agriculture, Ibadan.
43 pp 11–19
- 44 Onyilagha JC, Lowe J (1985) Studies on the relationship of *Dioscorea cayenensis* and *D. rotundata*
45 cultivars. *Euphytica* 35:733–739
- Orkwor GC, Ekanayake IJ (1998) Growth and development. In: Orkwor GC, Asiedu R, Ekanayake
IJ (eds) *Food yams: Advances in research*. Ibadan, Nigeria: IITA and NRCRI pp 39–62
- Purseglove JW (1988) *Tropical crops: monocotyledons*. Longman Scientific and Technical, Har-
low, UK
- Raghavan SR (1958) A chromosome survey of Indian *Dioscorea*. *Proc Indian Acad Sci Sec B*
48:59–63
- Raghavan SR (1959) A note on some South Indian species of the genus *Dioscorea*. *Curr Sci*
28:337–338

- 01 Ramachandran K (1968) Cytological studies in *Dioscoreaceae*. *Cytologia* 33:401–410
- 02 Ramser J, Lopez-Peralta C, Wetzel R, Weising K, Kahl G (1996) Genomic variation and relationships in aerial yam (*Dioscorea bulbifera* L) detected by random amplified polymorphic DNA. *Genome* 39:17–25
- 03
- 04 Ramser J, Weising K, Lopez-Peralta C, Terhalle W, Terauchi R, et al. (1997) Molecular marker-based taxonomy and phylogeny of Guinea yam (*Dioscorea rotundata*-*D. cayenensis*). *Genome* 40:903–915
- 05
- 06
- 07 Scarcelli N, Daïnou O, Agbangla C, Tostain S, Pham JL (2005) Segregation patterns of isozyme loci and microsatellite markers show the diploidy of African yam *Dioscorea rotundata* ($2n = 40$). *Theor Appl Genet* 111:226–232
- 08
- 09 Scarcelli N, Tostain S, Vigouroux Y, Agbanla C, Daïnou O, et al. (2006a) Farmers' use of wild relative and sexual reproduction in a vegetatively propagated crop. The case of yam in Benin. *Mol Ecol* 15:2421–2431
- 10
- 11
- 12 Scarcelli N, Tostain S, Mariac C, Agbangla C, Daïnou O, et al. (2006b) Genetic nature of yams (*Dioscorea* sp) domesticated by farmers in Benin (West Africa). *Genet Resour Crop Evol* 53:121–130
- 13
- 14 Segarra-Moragues JG, Catalán P (2003) Life history variation between species of the relictual genus *Borderea* (*Dioscoreaceae*): phylogeography, genetic diversity, and population genetic structure assessed by RAPD markers. *Biol J Linn Soc* 80:483–498
- 15
- 16 Segarra-Moragues JG, Palop-Esteban M, Gonza'Lez-Candelas F, Catalán P (2004) Characterization of seven $(CTT)_n$ microsatellite loci in the Pyrenean Endemic *Borderea pyrenaica* (*Dioscoreaceae*): remarks on ploidy level and hybrid origin assessed through allozymes and microsatellite analyses. *J Hered* 95:177–183
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20 Sharma AK, De DN (1956) Polyploidy in *Dioscorea*. *Genetica* 28:112–120
- 21 Solomon-Blackburn RM, Barker H (2001) Breeding virus resistant potatoes (*Solanum tuberosum*): a review of traditional and molecular approaches. *Heredity* 86:17–35
- 22
- 23 Terauchi R, Kahl G (1999) Mapping of the *Dioscorea tokoro* genome: AFLP markers linked to sex. *Genome* 42:752–762
- 24
- 25 Terauchi R, Konuma A (1994) Microsatellite polymorphism in *Dioscorea tokoro*, a wild yam species. *Genome* 37:794–801
- 26
- 27 Terauchi R, Chikaleke V, Thottappilly G, Hahn SK (1992) Origin and phylogeny of Guinea yams as revealed by RFLP analysis of chloroplast DNA and nuclear ribosomal DNA. *Theor Appl Genet* 83:743–751
- 28
- 29 Thorup TA, Tanyolac B, Livingstone KD, Popovsky S, Paran I, et al. (2000) Candidate gene analysis of organ pigmentation loci in the Solanaceae. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 97:11192–11197
- 30 Thouvenel JC, Dumont R (1990) Perte de rendement de l'igname infectée par le virus de la mosaïque en Côte d'Ivoire. *L'Agron Trop* 45:125–129
- 31
- 32 Tör M, Mantell S H, Ainsworth C C (1992) Endophytic bacteria expressing β -glucuronidase cause false positives in transformation of *Dioscorea* species. *Plant Cell Rep* 11:452–456
- 33
- 34 Tör M, Ainsworth C, Mantell S H (1993) Stable transformation of the food yam *Dioscorea alata* L by particle bombardment. *Plant Cell Rep* 12:468–473
- 35
- 36 Tör M, Twyford CT, Funes I, Boccon-Gibod J, Ainsworth CC, et al. (1998) Isolation and culture of protoplasts from immature leaves and embryogenic cell suspensions of *Dioscorea* yams: tools for transient gene expression studies. *Plant Cell Tiss Organ Cult* 53:113–125
- 37
- 38 Tostain S, Scarcelli N, Brottier P, Marchand JL, Pham J-L, et al. (2006) Development of DNA microsatellite markers in tropical yam (*Dioscorea* sp). *Mol Ecol Notes* 6:173–175
- 39
- 40 Wilkin P, Schols P, Chase MW, Chayamarit CA, Huysmans S, et al. (2005) A plastid gene phylogeny of the Yam genus, *Dioscorea*: roots, fruits, and Madagascar. *Syst Bot* 30:736–749
- 41 Winch JE, Newhook FJ, Jackson GVH, Cole JS (1984) Studies of *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides* disease on yam, *Dioscorea alata*, in Solomon Islands. *Plant Pathol* 33:467–477
- 42
- 43 Zoundjihékpou J, Essad S, Touré B (1990) Dénombrement chromosomique dans dix groupes variétaux du complexe *Dioscorea cayenensis-rotundata*. *Cytologia* 55:115–120
- 44
- 45