

1 **TITLE:** **International Genetic, Cytogenetic and Germplasm**
2 **Resources for Cotton Genomics and Genetic**
3 **Improvement**
4
5 **DISCIPLINE:** **Genomics and Biotechnology**
6
7 **AUTHORS:** D.M. Stelly (Corresponding author)
8 Texas A&M University
9 Department of Soil & Crop Sciences
10 370 Olsen Boulevard
11 College Station, TX 77843-2474
12 Phone: 979-845-2745
13 Fax: 979-845-0456 (Attn. David Stelly)
14 Email: stelly@tamu.edu
15
16 J.-M. Lacape
17 CIRAD
18 Avenue Agropolis
19 TA A-96/03
20 Montpellier, 34398
21 France
22
23 D.E.G.A. Dessauw
24 CIRAD
25 TA B-10/02
26 Avenue Agropolis
27 Montpellier, 34398
28 France
29
30 R. Kohel
31 USDA-ARS
32 2765 F & B Road
33 College Station, TX 77845
34
35 G. Mergeai
36 Faculté des Sciences Agronomiques de Gembloux,
37 Passage des Déportés,
38 2-5030, Gembloux,
39 Belgium
40

1 M. Sanamyan
2 National University of Uzbekistan
3 Department of Biology
4 Laboratory of Cotton Genetics
5 Vuzgorodok, Tashkent
6 Tashkent, 700174
7 Uzbekistan
8
9 I.Y. Abdurakhmonov
10 Institute of Genetics and Plant Experimental Biology
11 Yuqori-Yuz, Kibray region
12 Tashkent, 702151
13 Uzbekistan
14
15 T. Zhang
16 Nanjing Agriculture University
17 National Key Laboratory of Crop Genetics and Germplasm
18 Enhancement and Cotton Research Institute
19 Nanjing, 210095
20 China
21
22 K. Wang
23 Cotton Research Institute
24 Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences
25 Avenue Huanghe
26 Anyang, 455000
27 China
28
29 B. Zhou
30 Nanjing Agriculture University
31 National Key Laboratory of Crop Genetics and Germplasm
32 Enhancement and Cotton Research Institute
33 Nanjing, 210095
34 China
35
36 S. Saha
37 USDA-ARS
38 Genetics and Precision Agriculture Research Unit
39 810 Hwy 12 East
40 Mississippi State, MS 39762
41
42 J. Frelichowski
43 USDA-ARS
44 Crop Germplasm Research Unit
45 2881 F&B Road
46 College Station, TX 77845

1 **ABBREVIATIONS:**

2 ICGI, International Cotton Genome Initiative;
3 RIL, recombinant inbred line; USDA, United States
4 Department of Agriculture; CIRAD, Centre de coopération
5 Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le
6 Développement; MAS, marker assisted selection

1
2
3

**International Genetic, Cytogenetic and Germplasm Resources for Cotton Genomics
and Genetic Improvement**

1 **KEY WORDS:**

2 cotton, germplasm, breeding, improvement, diversity

1 *“International Genetic, Cytogenetic and Germplasm Resources for Cotton Genomics and*
2 *Genetic Improvement”*. As illustrated by many of the presentations at the WCRC, the scientific
3 and practical inter-relationships between germplasm, genomics and genetic improvement are
4 numerous, and often bi-directionally informative. Accordingly, this talk is titled *“International*
5 *Genetic, Cytogenetic and Germplasm Resources for Cotton Genomics and Genetic*
6 *Improvement”*. Moreover, it should be noted that the maintenance, development, and uses of
7 cotton germplasm collections are deeply rooted in the International Cotton Genome Initiative
8 (ICGI), in which they constitute one of the five existing Work Groups (see <http://icgi.tamu.edu/>).

9 **Main topics.** It is important for cotton, as for all economically important plants, that
10 broad recognition exist for the need of germplasm resources, and their crucial roles in genetic
11 improvement. It is also important that everyone, not just curators, geneticists and breeders, be
12 wary of the biological fragility of germplasm collections, so that our institutions and
13 governments are vigilant and consistent in their support for germplasm collections. Adequate
14 appreciation of these values can perhaps be best gained through some comprehension of the
15 absolute need for genetic diversity in genetic improvement efforts, an awareness of the amount
16 of diversity in the cotton germplasm collections, challenges in using the germplasm, and the need
17 for genetic improvement as part of a successful future for cotton, its producers and related
18 industries.

19 **What is “Germplasm”?** Let us start with the concept of “germ plasm”, or as it is often
20 written now “germplasm”. Etymologically, “Germ” refers to something that initiates
21 development or serves as an origin, and “-plasm” refers to something that is formative or a
22 formed material. But, more importantly, the concept of “germplasm” traces back to the latter
23 part of the 19th century, when the nature of reproduction and inheritance were hotly debated

1 topics, and the subject of intense research fueled by advances in optics and cytological stains.
2 One of the great advances was the “Germplasm Theory” of August Weismann (ca. 1880), which
3 soundly countered the “Theory of Acquired Characteristics” advocated by Lysenko. In simple
4 terms, Weismann said that the “*soma*” or body was totally separate from the “*germ*”, and only
5 the latter gave rise to the next generation, through to equal contributions from male and female.
6 In effect, he said that modifications of the *soma* had no effect on the *germ*, and thus there is no
7 transmission of acquired characteristics. In alluding to “germplasm” today, we extend the
8 concept of “germ” to the genus level, including all species in the genus *Gossypium*.

9 **Genetic fitness as a “Landscape”.** To appreciate genetic diversity and the importance
10 of germplasm as a source of genetic diversity for genetic improvement, it is worthwhile to
11 conceptualize genetic fitness as a geographic “landscape”, with different species occupying the
12 mountain tops, i.e., “adaptive peaks”, *sensu* Sewall Wright. The “adaptive peak” of fitness (each
13 species) is conferred *collectively* by the set of genes, in that environment, at least. The analogy
14 implies that [1] genes work as teams and traits or performance could be very similar, even if
15 genes are different; and [2] it may be quite difficult to move a gene from one peak to another,
16 because the level of fitness in the intervening generations will be very low, i.e., across a fitness
17 “valley” where the generations will be potentially weak or inviable. The analogy implies, too,
18 that once transferred, an alien gene’s functional ramifications *might* be quite different than
19 expected, i.e., due to interactions with a new set of genes. Perhaps more important, however, is
20 that while it may in some cases be possible to assess a potential source of alien genes according
21 to its performance in its original genetic background, the effects of some genes will change once
22 they are put into a new genetic background. This phenomenon, *epistasis*, is well known, and
23 more common in “wide crosses” between less related types or species. The implications of

1 epistasis, however, seem to be greatly under-appreciated if not ignored when reviewers of
2 proposals for germplasm introgression demand a priori evidence of a valuable gene in the source
3 germplasm. The “Catch-22” is that introgression of such genes involved in such epistasis would
4 be requisite to their detection. This might be particularly important for multigenic traits that
5 have been under selection pressure in the cultivated forms. Analogous difficulties extend to
6 prediction of “transgressive segregation”, i.e., the occurrence of traits more extreme than found
7 in either parent. Thus, while *a priori* evidence of value is always nice, one must challenge its
8 pre-existence as a stipulation for investments in introgression, because empirically we can
9 predict that beneficial genetic variation exists in different species. Large amounts of recent data
10 from cotton and tomato strongly support this concept, e.g., Saranaga et al. (2001); Gur and Zamir
11 (2004); Lacape et al. (2005); Jenkins et al. (2006); Saha et al. (2006); and He et al. (2007).

12 **Germplasm or gene “pools”.** We know that genetic diversity is essential to genetic
13 progress from breeding, but too much of good thing can be a hindrance. The facility and
14 predictability of results from alien germplasm transfer is highest when it is closely related to the
15 target. Thus, Harlan and DeWet (1971) defined “gene pools” as a convenient way of
16 categorizing potential sources of germplasm for a given target, e.g., an agronomic crop. Briefly,
17 germplasm in the “Primary Gene Pool” will hybridize and breed readily with the target species,
18 i.e., using conventional techniques. For the “Secondary Gene Pool” however, the processes are
19 more difficult and special methods are required to hybridize and breed. Species in the “Tertiary
20 Gene Pool” are problematic, and are generally very difficult or impossible to hybridize or
21 introgress into the target; and if so, extreme measures are required.

22 **Categorization of *Gossypium* into gene pools.** The concept of “Gene Pools” extends
23 meaningfully to *Gossypium*. For Upland and Pima types of cottons, the primary gene pool

1 contains all of the five “AD” species. Among these, hybrids and introgressed materials are
2 produced readily. This grouping reflects differences in chromosome number per genome, where
3 “genome” refers to a complete set of chromosomes. Upland and Pima cottons, like all “(AD)”
4 species have 26 chromosomes per haploid genome, as in pollen, whereas all other *Gossypium*
5 species have just 13 chromosomes per genome. The “AD” species diverged during evolution
6 from an ancestor formed by uniting genomes very similar to extant A and D genomes, so even
7 today strong genetic similarities exist in the AD and the A and D genomes. Nevertheless, the
8 difference in chromosome numbers leads to extensive sterility in hybrids, so that exceptional
9 efforts are required to introgress germplasm from species with “A” or “D” genomes, as well as
10 “B” and “F” genomes. Introgression is even more difficult from species containing the other
11 genomes, i.e., C, E, G, and K, which thus constitute the “Tertiary Gene Pool”. In preparing for
12 sexual reproduction, the meiotic interactions required between homologous chromosomes for
13 successful reproduction are steeply reduced between them and the AD-genome chromosomes.
14 These lead to imbalanced chromosome numbers during sexual reproduction, a lot of sterility and
15 very low rates of genetic exchange. Extreme methods are required to address these and other
16 difficulties from these species into any of the AD species. Thus, we find that the “gene pools”
17 relate to the genomic groups defined according to chromosome number and ability of their
18 chromosomes pair and recombine during meiosis.

19 **Geographic distribution of cotton germplasm.** When genomic groups are visualized
20 according to their world distributions, their distributional correlation with geography is readily
21 apparent. Thus, the gene pools also correlate well with geographic distributions, as well as
22 phylogenetic relatedness, e.g., as deduced by DNA sequence comparisons.

23

1 **The *Gossypium* mountain range.** Let us consider the situation more specifically, e.g.,
2 the *Gossypium* mountain range. Each species with a 13-chromosome haploid genome contains
3 and estimated 30,000 genes, working as a team to achieve high levels of fitness and local
4 adaptation. There remains some variation among individuals in each population, though the
5 amount can differ widely. By definition, however, there are major differences between species,
6 especially across genomic groups. If only 10% differ, ~3000 new alleles would potentially be
7 available for transfer.

8 **Elite types – a peak in the *Gossypium* mountain range.** We can extend this *Gossypium*
9 Mountain Range analogy to our target of interest, e.g., the cultivars of *G. hirsutum* cottons.
10 These are a very select group within the species, and the vast majority of *G. hirsutum* genotypes
11 differ in numerous ways from the elite individuals. For our purposes, we can envision elite
12 cultivars and breeding lines as at the very top of the *G. hirsutum* peak.

13 **Gene transfer – going from one peak to another.** What do we anticipate genetically
14 during alien gene transfer? What sorts of genetic results do we expect? The patterns of
15 expectation conform well to this model, too. Each species is genetically unique, in part by
16 chance fixation during evolution, but also because it arose by way of selection for fitness its
17 “environment”. Given 30,000+ genes per genome, extant species are expected to differ at many
18 genes, different forms of which are alluded to as “alleles”. Alien gene transfer, if successful, can
19 result in many new genes becoming available for breeding. Consider gene transfer from *G.*
20 *tomentosum* (Hawaiian) and *G. mustelinum* (Brazilian) to *G. hirsutum*, where the former is more
21 closely related to Upland cotton. Moving genes between species entails a difficult process,
22 because “regions” of extremely low genetic fitness must be traversed. Natural selection can
23 directly affect many genes, and lead to their loss or reduction in frequency, as well as many other

1 genes that are “linked” to them, i.e., near them on the same chromosome. Albino seedlings that
2 occur during *G. mustelinum* introgression visually exemplify this phenomenon, which has far-
3 reaching impact on breeding. Interspecific germplasm transfer is a genetically complicated
4 process that requires many recombination events and multiple generations to disassociate
5 desirable and undesirable alleles. As in the model, the more genetically distant the alien gene
6 source, the deeper the valley, and the more difficult the transfer. On the other hand, the potential
7 gains, genetically and economically, would also be higher. Thus, gene transfer from a more
8 distant species, e.g. *G. mustelinum*, would be expected from more difficult, less genomically
9 comprehensive, and more time-consuming than from a more closely related species, e.g. *G.*
10 *tomentosum*, but also potentially more valuable.

11 **Germplasm -- a key for cotton improvements.** Essentially all naturally existing traits
12 of cotton are subject to genetic effects and thus amenable genetic improvement through
13 germplasm introgression and breeding. These include but are not limited to the following classes
14 of traits: morphology, structure and habit, biochemical constitution, stress resistances and
15 tolerances to biotic and abiotic challenges, plant fertility and reproduction traits, seed oil content
16 and profiles, and fiber quality and yield. In some cases, simply inherited plant and resistance
17 traits offer quantum, high-value advantages. In most cases, however, the advances are
18 incremental, because most traits of greatest importance, such as fiber yield and quality are
19 subject to the effects of many loci and their many interactions with each other and the
20 environment, as well as environmental effects, per se.

21 **Germplasm collection components.** The above indicate that there are very practical
22 reasons to have comprehensive germplasm collections that include all of the germplasm pools.
23 For each of the major crops, like cotton, there is also a need for long-term funding of projects

1 that introgress germplasm from various species and discover valuable effects. Additional
2 concerns are that wild cotton populations have diminished greatly already and continue to
3 diminish at an alarming rate. Each of the major cotton germplasm collections includes thousands
4 of accessions. These can be separated into three main categories, [1] naturally occurring types,
5 [2] new off-types and mutants, and [3] artificially constructed or engineered individual, lines or
6 populations. The largest numbers of accessions, by far, fall into the first and third categories.
7 The first includes species, racestocks, biotypes, and so on, which are the sources of most new
8 variability. The third includes germplasm from research and breeding efforts, including
9 obsolete cultivars from conventional breeding, chromosome substitution and recombinant inbred
10 populations. The second includes spontaneous and induced mutations, i.e., another source of
11 variability.

12 **Examples of national collections.** World cotton germplasm accessions total about
13 50,000, about half or more of the accessions are held in the collections of Uzbekistan (17K),
14 China (8K), the USA (9K), and France (3K) (Bernard and Hau, 2007).

15 **Genus coverage / USDA & CIRAD collections.** Natural and man-made lines from
16 breeding and mapping predominate the collections, and only relatively small numbers of
17 accessions involve species outside of the four cultivated species *G. hirsutum*, *G. barbadense*, *G.*
18 *arboreum* and *G. herbaceum*. This is illustrated in a side-by-side comparison of USA (USDA)
19 and French (CIRAD) collections (Table 1).

20 **Factors affecting ease of use.** The process of germplasm introgression into cotton is
21 influenced by characteristics of the germplasm donor, relative to the target, and by certain
22 aspects of a targeted trait. Juvenility and/or photoperiodicity of an alien germplasm source can
23 significantly delay the initiation of introgression, and impede overall progress. In interspecific

1 and wider crosses, the effectiveness can be increasingly marginalized by extensive “breakdown”.
2 Differences in ploidy level and the meiotic (dis)similarity of genomic group(s) are common
3 impediments. Genetic incompatibilities can also affect introgression, such as the complementary
4 hybrid lethals in the D3-genomes of *G. davidsonii* and *G. klotzchianum*. It is noteworthy that a
5 trait is more likely to be targeted for improvement by introgression given prior evidence of its
6 importance, the existence of natural variation, heritability, simple inheritance, and evaluation
7 methods that are quick, inexpensive and effective. Linkages between genes conferring desirable
8 and undesirable traits can greatly influence the usefulness of introgression products, so prior or
9 concomitant genetic dissection and linkage mapping are often bundled with introgression efforts.
10 The availability of good markers for marker-assisted selection makes possible the introgression
11 of beneficial genes for traits that are difficult or expensive to evaluate, or plagued by linkage to
12 an undesirable gene.

13 **Traits involving introgression from primary and secondary gene pools.** As might be
14 expected, the Primary Gene Pool has been used most extensively as for germplasm introgression,
15 followed by the Secondary Gene Pool. Germplasm-based introgression has been used to
16 increase diversity for fiber yield and quality traits, as well as morphological, fertility and
17 pathogen resistance. Examples include the following:

- 18o Blight resistance (*Xanthomonas*, i.e., *B* genes)
- 19o Glanding; nectaries; leaf shapes...; pubescence
- 20o Male sterility (genic, CMS)
- 21o Fiber yield, qualities, color

22 **Usage patterns - primary gene pool.** A number of different approaches have been used
23 with varying degrees of effectiveness to introgress primary gene pool germplasm. They include

1 F2, F2-derived inbreds, RILs, backcross-inbreds and isolines, chromosome substitution, complex
2 populations with and without male sterility and, soon, chromosome-specific RILs.

3 **Primary gene pool -- complementarity among patterns of usage.** The methods offer
4 complementarity by varying widely in the time and labor required, and their susceptibility to
5 constraints imposed by genetic and biological problems that about in wide crosses. While we
6 still have much to learn about these problems and their interactions with various breeding
7 schemes, it is implicit that some progress can be made with virtually any breeding method, and
8 also that there are marked differences among the breeding schemes. When severe, these
9 hindrances constitute barriers, and alternative methods must be deployed. In contemporary
10 introgression projects, molecular markers are often used to create linkage maps and/or associate
11 map loci with the genes significantly affecting trait governance.

12 **Germplasm introgression from secondary and tertiary gene pools.** In cotton, targets
13 for improvement by means of germplasm introgression have typically included lint yield, fiber
14 quality, manipulation of the cytoplasmic-genic male fertility, pathogen, pest or abiotic stress
15 resistance. Three examples of recent and ongoing usage to address rapidly escalating pathogen
16 problems include the Burewala Strain of Cotton Virus in Pakistan (Naveed and Zahid, 2007),
17 reniform nematodes in Belgium and the USA (Robinson et al., 2006), and fusarium in Australia
18 (McFadden et al., 2004). The prospect of manipulating the patterns of glanding through
19 introduction of the so-called glanded-plant glandless-seed trait from Australian species (Altman
20 et al. 1987; Brubaker et al., 1999; Guy Mergeai, 2006), with the ultimate aim of enhancing value
21 of cotton seed as feed without undermining resistance to pests.

22 **Patterns of usage -- 2^o and 3^o pools.** The main patterns of germplasm introgression
23 differ markedly for secondary and tertiary germplasm (e.g., see Brubaker et al., 1999; Mergeai,

1 2006; Robinson et al., 2006), yet both entail manipulations of ploidy levels (chromosome
2 number) and genomic composition, which are often difficult and time-consuming. For the
3 secondary gene pool, utilization usually entails synthesis of balanced or quasi-balanced ~52-
4 chromosome synthetics (e.g., A_hAD_hD , A_hFD_hD , A_hBD_hD), followed by further hybridization
5 and various amounts of backcrossing and/or inbreeding. These typically lead to significant
6 levels of homologous recombination in some regions of secondary gene pool genomes, if not
7 most. Chromosome addition lines have been derived in some instances, e.g., some African
8 species. For tertiary germplasm, the more common route has been synthesis of hexaploids,
9 followed by backcrossing to derive monosomic addition lines. Recombination, if any occurs, is
10 quite limited, especially with Australian genomes, and its distribution remains to be
11 characterized.

12 **Solving challenges and answering opportunities for cotton on global scale.** The
13 future of cotton research holds a number of anticipatable challenges and opportunities, and
14 probably many that are not so obvious now. Clearly, cotton must compete well against man-
15 made fibers for marketshare. New resistance genes must be identified and deployed to offset
16 ever-evolving pathogens and pests, as well as to reduce costs and hazards of production
17 associated with chemical control methods. They might also be used to reduce reliance on
18 expensive GMO methods, and instead of GMOs in countries or cultivation regimes where GMOs
19 are not allowed, and/or for resistance traits not yet available through GMOs. Cotton production
20 systems must become increasingly sustainable, ecologically, environmentally “friendly” and
21 healthy for the producer and farm worker. Water usage must be reduced, as water is almost
22 certain to continue becoming less available and more costly. Moreover, with increased
23 population and urbanization, the urban populations may impose relatively severe requirements

1 for changes that affect water usage and quality. There are opportunities to enhance economic
2 yields by expanding the value of cottonseed, e.g., as a source of higher quality vegetable oil,
3 better feed and as a bio-fuel or bio-diesel. Genetic modifications will be key to addressing the
4 above, and so our genetic bank, the world's cotton germplasm collections, are certain to be a
5 major contributor.

6 **The future.** As we look to the future, it is important that we maintain focus on [1]
7 maintaining and improving the collections, [2] sharing them and thus keeping them well “backed
8 up”, [3] characterizing them, [4] studying and improving the germplasm transfer methods, and
9 [5] actually transferring germplasm and “pre-breeding” to put new genetic variation into genetic
10 backgrounds that are fit for use by applied breeding programs. Increasingly, high-throughput
11 markers will be used not only to better characterize and maintain the collections but also to
12 conduct interspecific introgression of germplasm. In addition to enabling genetic dissection of
13 complex traits, the high-throughput markers offer the prospect of detailing the ramifications of
14 genetic and cytogenetic hurdles to introgression, as well as the definition of the localization and
15 biological basis of those barriers. Once the genes are introgressed, the markers will increasingly
16 be used in concert with phenotypic breeding, i.e., for MAS that will facilitate simultaneous
17 manipulation of multiple genes for cotton improvement.

18 REFERENCES

19 Altman, D.W., D.M. Stelly, and R.J. Kohel. 1987. Introgression of the glanded-plant and
20 glandless-seed trait from *Gossypium sturtianum* Willis into cultivated Upland cotton
21 using ovule culture. *Crop Sci.* 27:880-884.

1 Brubaker, C.L., A.H.D. Brown, J.McD. Stewart, M.J. Kilby, and J.P. Grace. 1999. Production
2 of fertile hybrid germplasm with diploid Australian *Gossypium* species for cotton
3 improvement. *Euphytica* 108: 199–213.

4 Dessauw D., and B. Hau. 2007. Inventory and history of the CIRAD cotton (*Gossypium* spp.)
5 germplasm collection. *Plant Genetic Resources Newsl.* 147: 52-58.

6 Gur, A., and D. Zamir. 2004. Unused natural variation can lift yield barriers in plant breeding.
7 *Publ. Libr. Sci. (Biol.)* 2(10): e245.

8 Jenkins, J.N., J. Wu, J.C. McCarty, S. Saha, O. Gutiérrez, R. Hayes, and D.M. Stelly. 2006.
9 Genetic effects of thirteen *Gossypium barbadense* L. chromosome substitution lines in
10 topcrosses with Upland cotton cultivars: I. Yield and yield components. *Crop Sci* 46:
11 1169-1178.

12 Harlan, J.R., and J.M.J. de Wet. 1971. Toward a rational classification of cultivated plants.
13 *Taxon* 20: 509-517.

14 He, D-H, Z-X. Lin, X-L. Zhang, Y-C. Nie, X-P. Guo, Y-X. Zhang, and W. Li. 2007. QTL
15 mapping for economic traits based on a dense genetic map of cotton with PCR-based
16 markers using the interspecific cross of *Gossypium hirsutum* x *Gossypium barbadense*.
17 *Euphytica* 153: 181-197.

18 Koto, E. 1983. Tentative d'utilisation de l'espece sauvage diploide *Gossypium longicalyx* pour
19 l'amelioration de l'espece cultivate'e tetraploide *G. hirsutum* L. par la methode des lignes
20 d'addition et de substitution. Ph.D. thesis. Universite Pierre et Marie Curie. Paris. 91 pp.

21 Lacape, J-M., and T.B. Nguyen. 2005. Mapping quantitative trait loci associated with leaf and
22 stem pubescence in cotton. *J. Hered.* 2005:96(4): 441–444.

- 1 McFadden, H., D. Beasley, and C.L. Brubaker. 2004. Assessment of *Gossypium sturtianum* and
2 *G. australe* as potential sources of Fusarium wilt resistance to cotton. *Euphytica* 138:
3 61–72.
- 4 Mergeai, G. 2006. Introgessions interspécifiques chez le cotonnier. *Cahiers Agric.* 15:
5 135-143.
- 6 Naveed, M., and I.A. Zahid. 2007. Resistance Found for Burewala Strain Cotton Virus BSCV.
7 *Whitefly Newsl.* Jan. 2007.
- 8 Robinson, A.F., A.A. Bell, D. Stelly, N. Dighe, and M. Menz. 2006. Progress report on
9 introgression of reniform nematode resistance from *G. longicalyx* into Upland cotton.
10 *Proc. Beltwide Cotton Proc. Res. Conf., San Antonio, TX. 3-6 Jan. 2006. Natl. Cotton*
11 *Counc. Amer., Memphis, TN.*
- 12 Saha, S., J.N. Jenkins, J. Wu, J.C. McCarty, O.A. Gutierrez, R.G. Percy, R.G. Cantrell, and
13 D.M. Stelly. 2006. Effects of chromosome specific introgression in Upland cotton on
14 fiber and agronomic traits. *Genetics* 172: 1927-1938.
- 15 Saranga Y., M. Menz, C.X. Jiang, R.J. Wright, D. Yakir, and A.H. Paterson. 2001. Genomic
16 dissection of genotype x environment interactions conferring adaptation of cotton to arid
17 conditions. *Genome Res.* 11: 1988–1995.

1 Table 1. Summary of USA and French cotton germplasm collections, by gene pool, species,
 2 and genome (ID).

Pool	Species	ID	US-07	FR-05	Pool	Species	ID	US-07	FR-05
1	<i>G. hirsutum</i>	(AD)1	5243	2173	3	<i>G. stocksii</i>	E1	4	3
	<i>G. barbadense</i>	(AD)2	1600	483		<i>G. somalense</i>	E2	3	3
	<i>G. tomentosum</i>	(AD)3	28	2		<i>G. areysianum</i>	E3	2	1
	<i>G. mustelinum</i>	(AD)4	22	1		<i>G. incanum</i>	E4	2	2
	<i>G. darwinii</i>	(AD)5	142	95		<i>G. benadirensis</i>	E		
2	<i>G. herbaceum</i>	A1	223	50		<i>G. bricchettii</i>	E		
	<i>G. arboreum</i>	A2	2490	69		<i>G. vollesenii</i>	E		
	<i>G. anomalum</i>	B1	4	20		<i>G. sturtianum</i>	C1	10	3
	<i>G. triphyllum</i>	B2	3			<i>G. nandewarensis</i>	C1N	6	
	<i>G. capitata-viridis</i>	B3	1	3		<i>G. robinsonii</i>	C2	11	1
	<i>G. longicalyx</i>	F	4	2		<i>G. australe</i>	G	29	2
	<i>G. thurberi</i>	D1	37	6		<i>G. nelsonii</i>	G	7	1
	<i>G. armourianum</i>	D2-1	10	3	<i>G. bickii</i>	G1	6	3	
	<i>G. harknessii</i>	D2-2	20	3	<i>G. anapoides</i>	K1			
	<i>G. davidsonii</i>	D3-d	31	4	<i>G. populifolium</i>	K2	22		
	<i>G. klotzchianum</i>	D3-k	66	45	<i>G. cunninghamii</i>	K3	7		
	<i>G. aridum</i>	D4	31	2	<i>G. pulchellum</i>	K4	1		
	<i>G. raimondii</i>	D5	56	1	<i>G. pilosum</i>	K5	5		
	<i>G. gossypoides</i>	D6	8	2	<i>G. costulatum</i>	K6	6		
	<i>G. lobatum</i>	D7	7	2	<i>G. enthyle</i>	K7			
	<i>G. trilobum</i>	D8	11	3	<i>G. exiguum</i>	K8			
<i>G. laxum</i>	D9	9	1	<i>G. londonderriense</i>	K9				
<i>G. turneri</i>	D10	8	1	<i>G. marchantii</i>	K10				
<i>G. schwendimanii</i>	D11	3	1	<i>G. nobile</i>	K11				
				<i>G. rotundifolium</i>	K12				
				NI			79		
				TOTAL		10057	3070		

3

4